

Concord Middle School Building Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 15, 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, Lorraine Finnegan, Philip Poinelli, William 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

Court Booth made a motion to defer the minutes of March 18 and April 8, 2021 to the next Concord School Building Committee meeting. Seconded by Chris Popov. Motion carried unanimously.

Correspondence

Heather Bout provided an update on Correspondence. The Committee received 18 emails since last meeting. The topics of the emails were the auditorium, construction delivery method and gymnasium. Heather noted one of the correspondence items received was a letter with about 109 signatures and now with 174 signatures as of this morning asking for a larger auditorium. The Committee received correspondence with extra analysis on the survey trying to break out different constituencies.

Public Comment

Louis Salemy, 68 Great Meadows Road, former vice chair of the CCH project stated if the cost of going Construction Manager At Risk (CMAR) is a 5-9% increase to total project cost then why would the MSBA allow it. Mr. Salemy noted the high school project saved \$20M going CMAR and when looking at the MSBA website, the majority of the large projects that are over \$80M is going CMAR while the smaller projects are going DBB. Today's bid environment will change when the project goes out to bid in 2023 and not going CMAR will put the project cost at risk. Mr. Salemy states the reason to go CMAR is for their pre-construction services which eliminates the potential for change orders that allows for greater pricing. At CCHS project, there was close to zero change orders.

Elisabeth Winterkorn, 800 Main Street, notes if the town is going to build a building that would last another 50 years that the town is not short sighted and forget the large population that does drama, music, art or theater. The current auditorium design of 270 seats isn't adequate.

Scott Bates, 52 Indian Spring Road, former building committee member with Willard Building Committee questions the information presented to the committee regarding CMAR and DBB. Mr. Bates notes limited quality firms will be interested in this project and for the committee to review the responses.

Todd Benjamin, 33 Sudbury Road, had comments regarding auditorium and gym. Mr. Benjamin noted if the decision to increase the gym or auditorium should be done within the approved budget. The middle school is 1 of 3 or 4 capital projects anticipated and expressed concerns with the burden of the tax payers. Mr. Benjamin also expressed concern with holding CMSBC at 7:30 am noting it excludes parents with kids in the school system and working parents. Mr. Benjamin asked if it's possible to have a staggered schedule, where some meetings are in the morning and some in the evening.

Melissa Liazos, 325 The Valley Road, expressed support for both a larger auditorium and new middle school with a larger gymnasium. Ms. Liazos noted as a parent who have been to many band and orchestra performances, parent meetings and other musicals, the auditorium is always filled to capacity. Ms. Liazos understands there are costs associated and would support the cost for a larger gym and auditorium that would fit the needs of the community.

Presentation and Discussion (Project Scope and Budget)

Kristen Olsen of SMMA presented a recap to the School Building Committee on the work that was done the last few months. Ms. Olsen stated the Project Goals, Article 14, Building Committee charge, project schedule, proposed educational plan and visual representation of space summary and program. The design team provided updates to concept drawings to include the gym considerations, developed a site plan to represent fields program and impervious lot area and reviewed above budget scope. The design team then again revisited the scope in 2021 of the auditorium and provided preliminary costs of the above budget scope.

Lorraine Finnegan of SMMA spoke to the project delivery method. Ms. Finnegan noted CMAR does add value but at an additional cost including additional staffing for design reviews, estimating and logistics. When establishing an initial GMP, there are holds, allowances and construction contingency in addition to owner's construction that does not exist in DBB. Ms. Finnegan notes the project is straight forward and not the type that SMMA would recommend for CMAR, requiring no early package and having no complex phasing requirements, construction operations can be separated from school operations and the new middle school is not an occupied renovation project.

Discussion on Project Budget and Scope and Construction Delivery Method. Court Booth asked if the 7-9% escalation should be constant. Court asked why the MSBA website notes 2-5% instead of 7-9% initial cost. Ms. Finnegan responded with the concern with cost of steel. Ms. Finnegan noted with the concern with cost of materials the town can consider having a bidding contingency just for the escalation with the cost of materials and noted that this had been done on prior Concord school projects. Mr. Johnson asked what the overall building would look like with the increase size of the auditorium. Ms. Olsen responded there is some room on the west side and noted the design for parking is based on typical usage of school, not for specific or the largest events. Mr. Fischelis asked what the risk going with a design for both the base space summary of approximately 143,000 gsf and Option D or just Option D and then changing the plan if the cost is too high or community support isn't present. Ms. Olsen responded there is additional design fee

and additional time required if redesign is required. Ms. Olsen noted value engineering is usually around materials.

Ms. Bout asked why Hill and SMMA are recommending DBB and if it is in relation to cost savings. Ms. Finnegan responded noted the additional services offered by going CMAR are not needed for this project. Mr. Martini added that those additional services provided by the CM are also provided by either the Architect or OPM. Matt Root stated by choosing CMAR, the CM would offer risk management and he would like feedback from the team the town is taking on more risk if choosing DBB. Ms. Hunter noted in her last district, the project was CMAR and when construction started, there were unforeseen conditions which affected school operations and the budget. There is no such thing as no risk even for CMAR. Ms. Finnegan added there is risk no matter which delivery method is chosen and the risk is on the town either way. The CM mitigates risk by having holds and allowances in their GMP but in DBB the cost/risk is carried outside of the construction cost.

Vote

Project Delivery Method (DBB vs CMaR). Stephen Crane made a motion to select Design-Bid-Build as the construction delivery method. Heather Bout seconded. Discussion ensued. Mr. Parker noted in the slides previously sent, 8 of 10 projects over \$90 are CMaR and going CMaR would add value like risk mitigation. Mr. Fischelis asked will going CMaR benefit in a competitive bidding environment where they may have relationships with subcontractors and during the bidding process if there are design changes or if the cost is close to the budget, would going CMaR benefit the project. Mr. Crane made a motion to withdraw the motion of selection Design-Bid-Build as the construction delivery method. Heather seconded. Motion withdrawn. Heather Bout made a motion to adopt Chapter 149 (Design-Bid-Build) as the construction delivery method. Frank Cannon seconded. The motion passed with 11 vote in favor and 6 opposed.

Project Budget and Scope. Peter Fischelis made a motion to design toward Option D with a projected cost of \$110M. Frank Cannon seconded. Discussion ensued and Mrs. Bout questioned the need to make an amendment to create a not-to-exceed amount. She added that expectations set at Town Meeting are important to align with and recommended a motion for a not-to-exceed amount to create a cap on the budget. She also communicated support for Option A. Mr. Crane added that \$108M is consistent with what was presented at Town Meeting. He stated that he would vote against \$110M. Mr. Parker inquired if the vote is for scope changes or a definitive budget. He added that the community survey information related to the project was inconclusive and recommended a conservative approach to approving a budget at this time. He spoke of a desire to increase scope to Option A, amended to have a 42x74 cross court size in lieu of 46x74 cross court size. Mrs. Bout clarified that CCYB communicated needs include both middle school students and community/adult use as well. Mrs. Guarriello communicated support of Option A. Mrs. Hanley raised concerns with option D going over the 15% impervious surface limits for the site and the associated burden of the variance process. Mr. Popov agreed with impervious surface concerns and added concerns for parking demands for Option D. He inquired about the acoustic aspects of the auditorium at a 550 person capacity. Mrs. Guarriello clarified that SMMA has acoustical engineers on their team that will study and recommend acoustic design elements for any size auditorium. Mr. Fischelis made a motion to amend the motion on the floor to a not-to-exceed amount of \$110M for Option D and not-to-exceed the 15% impervious surface limit. Frank Cannon seconded. Mr. Cannon questioned the desire to make the NTE amount \$108M. Mr. Fischelis directed this question to Stephen Crane. Mr. Crane clarified that \$108M was

the initial budget cap and stated that there is “truth in advertising” this amount from the start. Mr. Fischelis then withdrew the amended motion and created a new motion to have SMMA design toward Option D with a NTE amount of \$108M and also not-to-exceed the 15% impervious surface limit. Frank Cannon seconded. Mr. Parker inquired about the incremental cost of the (2) MIAA cross-courts versus the (2) 46x74 cross-courts, which was clarified as \$2.4M. He noted no indication of outside funding sources and added risk to the project. He reiterated that CCYB needs are met with the (2) 46x74 cross-courts. Pat Nelson moved to amend the motion to a not-to-exceed total project budget of \$108M, not-to-exceed 15% impervious surface coverage, and to further consider parameters driving the size of the gym/auditorium. Heather Bout seconded. The amendment passed with 16 votes in favor and 1 opposed. Stephen Crane then moved to vote on the main motion. The main motion for not-to-exceed total project budget of \$108M, not-to-exceed 15% impervious lot coverage, and to further consider parameters driving the size of the gym/auditorium passed with 16 votes in favor and 1 opposed.

Next Steps

The next School Building Committee is April 29, 2021.

New Business

No New Business.

Upcoming Meetings

The next School Building Committee is April 29, 2021 at 7:30 am.

Adjournment

Dawn Guarriello requested the meeting to be adjourned at 11:00 AM. Stephen Crane made the motion to adjourn, Court Booth 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=vzv7J2Te-3A>