

Concord Middle School Building Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2021

PRESENT: Laurie Hunter, Dawn Guarriello, Court Booth, Pat Nelson, Matt Root, Charles Parker, Stephen Crane, Frank Cannon, Jared Stanton, Chris Popov, John Harris, Kate Hanley, Russ Hughes, Heather Bout, Justin Cameron, Peter Fischelis, Matt Johnson

PRESENT FROM HILL INTERNATIONAL: Peter Martini, Ian Parks, Duclinh Hoang

PRESENT FROM SMMA/EWING COLE: Kristen Olsen, Philip Poinelli, Bill Smarzewski, Keith Fallon, Matt Rice, Michael Dowhan

MEETING ORGANIZER: Dawn Guarriello

Call to Order

Dawn Guarriello called the meeting to order at 7:30 A.M. via Zoom Virtual Conference call. A recording of the meeting will be made available at the Concord Public School's project page and Town of Concord's website.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 18, 2021 will be approved at the next Concord School Building Committee meeting.

Correspondence

Heather Bout provided an update of the Community Forum. Heather noted on March 31, 2021, the Community Forum had about 150 people in attendance. The summary of comments and questions will be posted on the Middle School Building project website.

Heather provided an overview of the Feasibility Study Community Survey results. The survey was launched on March 26, 2021 and was open through April 5, 2021. There were almost 1,500 responses to the survey. Heather noted some of the questions are more useful as the project works towards Schematic Design and some are helpful now. Some of the questions were related to use of outdoor space, use of the new building and project cost. Kate Hanley provided some survey takeaways noting a lot of comments were not new information and there were strong opinions and opposite views on cost, spaces and speed.

Heather Bout noted the subcommittee is working on a website for the project which includes a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) page.

Heather Bout provided an update on correspondence. Heather noted there have been 87 emails since March 18, 2021. The topics of the emails were related to the gym, auditorium, construction delivery method and finance.

Co-chair Pat Nelson provided an update on the Finance Committee and Select Board meetings. The general trend from the Finance Committee included concerns on the cost of the project, impact on tax payers and wanting to have a needs assessment to support making a decision on the gym and auditorium. The Finance

Committee was concerned there was not enough back up or information for the community needs. Pat Nelson noted during the Select Board meeting they were concerned with cost and impact on citizen's taxes but also if the community needs a larger gym or auditorium. During the Select Board meeting, a community member stated that these additions to the building should be invested now. The Select Board was also concerned with the process to support the town-wide need.

Court Booth provided an update on the School Committee meeting. The Committee looked at the issues around continuing school operations, safety and logistics. The sentiment of the School Committee was largely toward the Construction Management At-Risk.

Pat Nelson noted they received a letter from the Rec Commission. The letter supports that the town needs more gym space. During the Rec meeting the team participated in on March 30, there were comments on updating the strategic plan and having a broader needs assessment of recreational needs in the town. The Commissioner and Director of the Rec Department expressed interest in working with any groups to talk about how revenue could be generated by other recreation resources in Town. There were some discussions related to community use of the middle school to be included in the town-wide facilities available for use.

CMSBC, Subcommittee, and Project Team Business

Dr. Laurie Hunter presented a recap of Article 14 Town meeting from April 2019. Jared Stanton noted the cost of the new building in Article 14: CMS facilities was based on \$648 per square foot, recommended Concord Middle School square footage of 125,000 and 6-8% annual escalation which came to an estimated cost of \$90M. Jared noted the project cost would go up approximately 3-7% based on the 2019 Feasibility. Dr. Hunter also pointed to the article that was voted on which noted the building would be net zero ready. Article 14 also included \$1.5M for Feasibility and Schematic Design. The Concord School Building Committee charge, created by the Select Board in May 2019, was created to guide the committee through the process to make a recommendation to the Town Manager on finance and schedule matters. Dr. Hunter noted in July 2019 the CMSBC needed a target cost range in the RFS during the early stages of the Committee which is where the \$80-100M range came from.

Kristen Olsen of SMMA provided an update on the Feasibility Work Plan and a recap of the Ed Plan and Program. In the month of January and February, SMMA attended multiple listening sessions and outreach and reviewed the Ed Plan. On March 4, 2021, there was a vote on the scope and space summary that reflects the Ed Plan. Then on March 18, 2021, SMMA and EwingCole updated the concepts for the larger gym. At the next meeting, April 29, 2021, the project team will be looking for the Committee to vote on the Preferred Schematic to kick off the Schematic Design in May. The approved Space Summary accommodates the team teaching model and adjustments were made to the educational spaces so that an auditorium was added and an enlarger gym by 1000 square feet.

Next topic, Kristen Olsen noted the above budget scope were items the project team had been hearing from the community. The items are gym considerations, auditorium considerations and cost associated. The above budget scope analysis includes a gym with the addition of 1 MIAA court or a gym with two larger but not MIAA cross courts, and an auditorium with the addition of 80 seats (for a total of 350 seats which is the Sanborn's current seating capacity) and addition of 280 auditorium seats (for a total of 550 seats which would accommodate two grade levels with additional seats for staff). SMMA looked into 4 different combination

scenarios and cost ranges for reach scenario. The only combination that is above 15% lot coverage threshold is Option 4. Kristen Olsen noted that the School does not gather two grade levels for any of the current or planned programs, so the 550 seat scenario for the auditorium is not something that is rooted in any specific request. Kristen also noted that, of the two gymnasium scenarios, the community request in hand is that from CCYB which is for the 74'x46' cross courts and *not* the two MIAA cross courts.

Ian Parks of Hill International provided a recap of what was previously presented and additional information on the construction delivery method describing Chapter 149 (Design-Bid-Build) and Chapter 149a (Construction Manager At-Risk). The known factors for the Concord Project are: sufficient time for design and bid phases, risk can be managed through quality drawing and specifications and sustainability features can be designed without CM/builder input. Ian presented a side-by-side comparison between DBB and CMAR for each phase of the project. For estimating, the project team would hire an estimator and the CM would be brought on board and provide estimating services. During design reviews, the CM would also be involved along with SMMA and Hill. The Bid/Award for DBB would require 100% bid set and prequalification for General Contractor and subcontractors which includes reviews past performances and references. Alternatively, for CMAR, CM selection is needed where the town would issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Construction Management Services after which the town would interview the Construction Managers and select the most qualified CM. The Construction Manager Preconstruction Services include estimating, design review, logistics and schedule review. Design-Bid-Bid allows for project costs to be known during bid/award while for CMAR can take months for the Guaranteed Maximum Price to be finalized. In the case of savings, the money would go back to Concord for both methods.

Above Budget Scope Discussion, including

Dawn Guarriello noted questions related to the gym, auditorium and construction delivery method should be asked today and during the next meeting they can be answered in the interest of time.

Charlie Parker asked how the design of the gym went from 8,600 sqft to 10,600 sqft and what is the necessity for increasing the size of the gym to 10,600 sqft?

Frank Cannon asked who is going to give direction on the need for a second court?--The Building Committee or community?

Chris Popov asked how much over the impermeable lot coverage limit Combination D is. Would the project require a variance. Is it desirable to get a variance with respect to the environmental goals for the project? If we want a variance, how probable are we to get a variance? Are there still design variables? For example, is the amount of space allocated to the core functions a constant that we have to work around or are they flexible when considering space for auditorium and gym?

Matt Root asked if the Committee still able to have discussions about the auditorium and gym in Schematic Design if the vote is to happen next week or is the decision final.

Peter Fischelis noted the community is looking for the CMSBC to include the community in the auditorium and gym discussions. There have been past projects that they did not do a good enough job. Peter asked if the town could have two designs and go out to bid one based on the design of the existing space summary

and design including the larger gym/auditorium; Peter asked if the numbers being presented accurately represent what the additional costs would be or if they would come in lower.

Heather Bout questioned if it is realistic to keep assumptions that parking stays the same if the gym and auditorium size were to increase and, if we were to look at the other combinations, what else may be affected other than potentially parking. Also, Heather asked what the ramifications are of potentially bringing two design options to the town. Is the committee looking to ask the design team to do two different designs? Would there be additional cost?

Court Booth asked if the two MIAA courts operate as an enterprise fund for community use?

Charlie Parker asked if it is possible to have an additional vote at Town Meeting for a separate article to request funding for the larger gym? Can this be done in parallel when asking for additional funding for the school itself?

Matt Johnson asked about the change order process and scope risk. What does the change order process and scope risk related to change orders look like in DBB and CMAR? Matt expressed concern about net zero ready and the special requirements, capabilities and quality of results should the project be delivered via DBB.

Matt Root asked about cost analysis of 5%-9% risk to the overall cost of the project when going CMAR. For CMAR other than preconstruction costs, what other risks are there to be considered that would make up the 5-9% premium? What are the potential savings with CMAR? Would going CMAR provide additional guidance on cost in relation to larger gym and auditorium? And volatility on construction material cost? Is there more flexibility in the subcontractor selection?

Jonathan Harris noted that with DBB there is a competitive process but how is the GMP decided for CMAR? Is it by the contractor and does the Designer/OPM/Town have input on the cost?

Chris Popov asked which process is easier for Hill/SMMA to manage and if the project were to go with DBB, how would the project team manage unforeseen conditions or mistakes?

Heather Bout noted CMAR is an insurance for the cost going up. Heather asked what is the potential risk for the town if the project chooses DBB? How high could the total project cost increase? There are a few towns (Lexington and Waltham) doing projects that are CMAR, is there a particular reason why? Does going CMAR better support sustainability?

Charlie Parker asked if the town were to choose DBB, does the town get interest from larger firms like Turner? Is the town better positioned to deal with risk going through the project if we go CMAR than DBB with respect to being on budget? Is the construction of the school 24 months or 18 months as currently shown accurate?

Court Booth asked if there are savings for going CMAR.

Public Comment

Jennifer Montbach, 45 Pine Street, is concerned with the projected size of the auditorium. Ms. Montbach noted the current Sanborn auditorium is already inadequate and with the new design being reduced in size, it is very concerning. A detailed letter was submitted to the committee with over 100 residents co-signing.

Louis Salemy, 68 Great Meadows Road, noted having submitted a letter to the committee outlining the benefits of CMAR. Mr. Salemy noted having Turner and going CMAR was beneficial for the High School project. Mr. Salemy noted when the project goes out to bid in 2023, there may be issues with getting subcontractors to bid on the project.

Dean Banfield, 72 Walden Terrace, noted for DBB if they bids come back high then the scope would have to be adjusted. Mr. Banfield asked during the CMAR process, when the scope adjustment would happen if costs are high.

Tracy Marano, 39 Partridge Lane, noted there is a lot of support for the building committee and getting the building right.

New Business

No New Business.

Upcoming Meetings

The next School Building Committee is April 15, 2021 at 7:30 am.

Adjournment

Dawn Guarriello requested the meeting to be adjourned at 10:00 AM. Heather Bout made the motion to adjourn, Stephen Crane seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Details of this meeting can be found on the YouTube link below:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qwpXIysUWFA>