



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: 12/10/2020
 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
9.1	Call to Order: 9:36 am meeting was called to order by SBC Chair B. Dunne with 10 of 14 voting members in attendance.	Record
9.2	Previous Topics & Approval of November 5, 2020 Meeting Minutes: A motion to approve the 11/05/2020 meeting minutes as submitted made by J. Hochman and seconded by E. McGivern. Discussion: None. Abstentions: None. All in favor: Motion passes, minutes approved.	Record
9.3	<p>Community Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ B. Dunne shares the community meeting was well attended. There were over 400 views through various methods. It was very informative. ➤ C. Dell Angelo mentions this was well received. A lot of the SBC members were able to attend and we thank for you for your participation. We reached out to all the local neighbors which was important to start including them now. The next community meeting will happen in the next couple of months. Over the next few months, we will continue to inform the community with updates on the project. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
9.4	<p>PDP Submission and Approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ B. Dunne shares with the SBC, we need to take a vote on whether to submit the PDP to the MSBA. ➤ D. DiNisco explains the purpose of the preliminary design program (PDP), is to focus and establish the educational program and provide the MSBA with a list of options. We will continue to study these options through the feasibility study. Then, at the end of preferred schematic the SBC will decide on which option to proceed with. ➤ D. DiNisco shares after reviewing the spaces in the existing building, we then compared the spaces to the MSBA guidelines. We need to make sure the spaces for Special Education are adequate for the Welch School. Currently, art and music are on a cart and it would be a great improvement to give them their own space. Health/PE are slightly undersized. Based on enrollment, we only need one class in the gym at a time. We are hopeful we can enlarge the media center space and expand medical. The administrative space is slightly under the MSBA guidelines, but we will improve it if possible. If you look at the total program area, we are not that far off. We feel comfortable the space in the facility can support program. ➤ <u>Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option R: Code Upgrades (MAAB/Repairs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MAAB & Code Upgrades – Stage ramp, new elevator, replace non-compliant door hardware, comprehensive 	

	<p>signage, stair modifications, toilet rooms & water fountains, classroom sinks, MAAB site improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Exterior/Envelope Repairs – New exterior windows, soffit replacement, new exterior doors, repair and paint CMU fin walls▪ Building Systems Repairs – Replace unit ventilators (no A/C). Sprinkler and fire alarm, power system, security system, lighting and controls, communications, limited interior construction, paint 50% of building interiors, acoustic ceilings. <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Option R-AC: Code Upgrades w/ Air Conditioning<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ MAAB & Code Upgrades – Includes all scope for Option R▪ Exterior/Envelope Repairs – Includes all scope from Option R▪ Building Systems Repairs – Includes all scope from Option R, except a VRF Air Conditioning system is provided in lieu of heat-only Unit Ventilators○ Option R-1: Renovations w/ A/C (VRF System) – All electric. Option R-2: Renovations w/ A/C (Unit Vent System) – Possibly bring in gas.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ MAAB & Code Upgrades – Includes all scope for Option R-AC▪ Exterior/Envelope Repairs – Includes all scope from Option R-AC▪ Building Systems Repairs – Includes all scope from Option R-AC▪ Additional Building Improvements – Replace balance of door hardware to match new, paint all interiors (remaining 50% of Building), replace exterior asbestos fascia, replace interior doors, frames, wire glass, vinyl asbestos flooring hazmat removal, install new linoleum flooring throughout, administration offices relocate to building entrance.▪ Educational Improvements – classroom reno w/ storage & de-escalation areas, enlarge media center to support STE/DL, create new SPED spaces windows and views, new markerboards & tack boards, classroom speech reinforcement system, new appliances, new gym equipment & wall pads○ Option AR-1: Minor Renovation/Addition<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ MAAB & Code Upgrades – Includes all scope for Option R-AC▪ Exterior/Envelope Repairs – Includes all scope from Option R-AC	
--	---	--

- Building Systems Repairs – Includes all scope from Option R-AC
- Additional Building Improvements – Includes all scope from Option R-1 & R-2
- Educational Improvements – Includes all scope from Option R-1 & R-2
- Additional AR-1 Scope – Option AR-1 restructures the corridors and captures roof space to create interior educational space. Project area “pods” accommodate small group instruction, break-out spaces, and student storage (lockers or cubbies) off the main corridors
- Option AR-2: Major Renovation/Addition
 - MAAB & Code Upgrades – Includes all scope for Option R-AC
 - Exterior/Envelope Repairs – Includes all scope from Option R-AC
 - Building Systems Repairs – Includes all scope from Option R-AC
 - Additional Building Improvements – Includes all scope from Option R-1 & R-2
 - Educational Improvements – Includes all scope from Option R-1 & R-2
 - AR-1 Scope – Includes all scope from Options AR-1
 - Additional AR-2 Scope – Option AR-2 creates a 1-bay addition to the south of the building and a 2nd floor to the center bays of the building. The overall expansion includes new classrooms, project areas, learning commons/media center, dedicated art & music rooms and additional SPED and small group spaces.
- Option N: New Construction – Students would remain in the existing school. Use a good portion of O’Conner Park. Demolish the existing building and put in a larger field and include circulation for shared parking with the park.
- Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives: Construction costs are provided. The renovation is the least expensive option at \$18 Million and new construction would be about \$46 Million. D. DiNisco shares the project team has spent a lot of timing looking at project costs and this needs to be a phased occupied construction project. Within the construction cost, we have included \$2 Million for portable classrooms. There could be other alternatives and we will continue to explore options.
- D. DiNisco mentions, we want to continue evaluating all options and we will explore these over the next couple of months. In February, we will look for a vote from the SBC to select one option or a hybrid of the options. Then, we will submit the preferred solution to the MSBA.

	<p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ J. Hochman asks does the project cost include temporary structures? D. DiNisco responds yes. The contractor or CM is responsible for installing those. We are estimating \$2 million and those costs are not reimbursable by the MSBA. M. Burton explains reimbursements vary based on which option (renovation, renovation/addition or new construction) is selected. ➤ J. Hochman asks does the \$57 Million for new construction include the demolition and fields? D. DiNisco responds yes. We have not studied this option in depth, but these are based on estimated construction costs today. The costs will be inflated by the time it goes out to bid in a couple of years. There is about \$5 Million in site costs, but we would have to evaluate and spend more time on it if new construction is what Peabody wanted to proceed with. ➤ E. Bettencourt mentions I had asked DiNisco and DWMP not to focus on new construction. It is not a feasible option for us, so we asked them to focus on other options for renovations and upgrades. D. DiNisco comments the submission for the PDP states that the initial statement of interest for Welch was based on repairs. The MSBA felt with the number of repairs that need to be done, it made more sense to be part of the CORE program. The focus has been on how to extend the useful life of the building while also providing program upgrades. We will focus on what options are important to Peabody. P. McGinn asks what is the anticipated life for these various options? D. DiNisco comments the goal is to extend the buildings life for 25-30 years. ➤ B. Dunne comments a new school would be beautiful, but repairs are more fiscally responsible. These repairs will help the schools educational program. ➤ M. Burton mentions the vote today is just to submit the PDP as reviewed here today. We are not selecting an option. We are just showing what options there are. <p><u>Vote:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A motion was made by J. Hochman and seconded by E. Colbert for the approval of submitting the PDP to the MSBA for the Welch Elementary School. Discussion: None. Abstentions: None. All in favor, motion passes. 	
9.5	<p><u>Schedule Update:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ M. Burton mentions the key milestones dates can be found on this schedule shown to the SBC monthly. ➤ C. Dell Angelo shares the schedule can be found on the FTP site. ➤ B. Dunne comments we are on schedule with submissions and future milestone dates. 	Record

9.6	<p>Budget Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Dell Angelo shares this is our monthly budget report from dashboard. This is a live view of invoices approved to date. This can also be found on the FTP site. We will continue to review this with the SBC monthly. 	Record
9.7	<p>Design Bid Build vs. Construction Manager at Risk Method Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ M. Burton explains at the last SBC meeting, we shared information on the OIG application for Construction Manager at Risk. A lot of the information for the application has been assembled. The final piece we need is the approval from the SBC. The approval allows us to submit the packet of information. The state has up to 60 days to review our application. If we have a vote today, that allows us to submit. It gives us the ability to exercise this option should we choose to do so. We are simply going to apply and if later do not want to go with Construction Manager at Risk, we do not have to. There is a large advantage bringing in a CM during schematic design. If we are going to move forward with the repair option, they can assist with the schedule and phasing. Having additional input on that would be critical. Once the project scope and budget are agreed on, that is the final maximum grant amount, and it will never go up. Having CM input is hugely valuable. <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ B. Dunne comments DWMP has worked on phased projects. Phasing is key and can be complicated on an occupied site. B. Dunne asks, did you use CM at Risk on the phased projects? M. Burton responds yes. The projects being referred to were 2 elementary schools in Wellesley. These projects included similar scope. It included mechanical, electrical, plumbing, ADA, roofing upgrades, etc. That scope aligns with the renovations options we have right now. The first summer was interior work, and the second summer was exterior work. Summer schedules allow you about 8 full weeks to get work done and we were able to do that. In Wellesley, we did utilize CM at Risk because the district did not have swingspace and there were concerns. ➤ E. Bettencourt comments DBB worked excellent with Higgins Middle School but this will be a tricky project. From what I gather and the recommendations, I would defer to DWMP and DiNisco's expertise. CMR would be the better move for us here. I value DWMP's and DiNisco's recommendation a great deal. My thoughts are to go the CMR direction and listen to advice of the experts. ➤ D. DiNisco shares DiNisco and DWMP have done DBB & CMR successfully. With how compact this building is, there is no way to separate it easily for safety. It is critical to have a CM involved who will own schedule and trades to ensure this is done in the most efficient, effective and safe way for the occupants of the building. B. Dunne 	Record

	<p>comments a CM would allow us to save time and money. It makes sense to follow the recommendation.</p> <p><u>Vote:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A motion was made by B. Dunne and seconded by M. Massa for the approval of the OIG application submission for Construction Manager at Risk for the Welch Elementary School. Discussion: None. Abstentions: None. All in favor, motion passes. 	
9.8	<p>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
9.9	<p>Public Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
9.10	<p>Next Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ SBC 10 – January 7, 2020 @ 9:30 am (Tentatively) 	Record
9.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Adjourn: 10:39 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.