

West Elementary & Shawsheen Preschool Building Committee Minutes
Wednesday, February 3, 2021 – 7:00PM

Participating via remote

Access Voting Members: Chair-Paula Colby-Clements, Dr. Claudia Bach, Andrew Flanagan, Rick Almeida, Heather Eigen, Carol Green, Jennifer Hunt, Susan McCreedy, Janet Nicosia, Siggy Pfendler, Paul Rollins, Elizabeth Roos, Donna Walsh

Non-Voting Members: Steve Nembirkow, APS Chief Operations Officer, Mark Johnson, Tracey Spruce

PMA Consultants (remote): Brian DeFilippis, Karina Pena; Kevin Weeks; Steve Rusteika

SMMA Architects (remote): Lorraine Finnegan; Matt Rice;

Community Members: Steve Fink;

West Elementary School Building Committee Chair (SBC), Paula Colby Clements, opened the meeting at 7PM. Because of the emergency state of government due to Covid-19, all SBC members are participating via WebEx. All votes will be taken by roll call at this meeting.

The Chair announced there are no minutes to approve and will be tabled until the February 17th meeting.

Approval of November Invoices. Vote Expected.

The Chair submitted for payment approval- Invoice from SMMA #0054341-00 dated Jan. 29, 2021 for services covering the period of Dec. 26, 2020 - Jan. 29, 2021 for the amount of \$30,203.50.

On a Motion made by Susan McCreedy and seconded by Jennifer Hunt, the West Elementary School Building Committee approved the SMMA invoice read by the Chair today. The motion was approved on a roll call vote 13-0.

Update on February 10th Public Forum

The Forum flyer was distributed thru Connect Blackboard, thru the library and also thru the Town list servs. The Chair asked to meet with a few key people to review the Forum details this week. She also stated there is a core group (Yes to WESP!) across the Community who have really started to pull together and send messages thru social media, etc. about the project to the Community. This vote will be coming to Town Meet. The Chair and Dr. Bach will be presenting to the Townwide PTO this month. There will also a presentation to the West El and Shawsheen PTO at the end of the month. Dr. Bach inquired about her role in advocating for the West El/Shawsheen project. The Chair stated that you can promote the project but can't politically campaign for the project. If you are a public employee, you can't use any public/district resources so as not to look like we campaign for the project e.g.: fundraise for the project. Public employees are permitted to make personal donations to a ballot question committee..

Dedicated teacher space in the Shawsheen building area

Mr. Rice from SMMA shared his screen with the 3 floor plans but primarily pointing out the teacher space on the 1st floor. Ms. Green, Shawsheen Preschool Coordinator, was initially concerned about sharing this space with the West Elem faculty. Just in terms of how much time staff has to eat lunch and how often things come up, having the Shawsheen staff technically leave the building to get to the West wing 1st floor teacher space may present a problem. Up on the 2nd floor was intended as a roof area, so there's no program space there. This could be used as a location for teacher space which would be paid out of the project. Mr. Rollins asked if the teacher space could be moved closer. Mr. Rice stated there is a nursing office in the area, so it wouldn't be optimal. All 3 floors have teachers' space that are about the same. Ms. Green said she would need space for 20-30 staff, but it's not so much about space as much as location. She stated that it was important to see if we could figure out a way to keep the Shawsheen teachers in their wing to save time. The Chair countered with the thought that she didn't want it to come across as an after thought but believed it would be nice for both Shawsheen and West El teachers to share teacher space. Ms. Eigen said the Shawsheen teachers may not feel that it's feasible for them to walk over to the other wing and may opt to stay in their classrooms to eat lunch.

The added raw costs would be a minimum of \$287,000 to add space. A request was to put the square footage of each floor on these presentations so we can see it with the total square footage of the building. The Committee will come back to the item later in the evening.

Review of estimates and decide on potential valued engineered (VE) Items. Vote Expected to approve construction costs.

Cost Estimate Update Presentation – 2-3-21

Ms. Finnegan noted the differences in the Schematic Design (SD) estimates – the OPM (PM&C) is lower than the Designer (A.M.Fogarty) is lower than for the PSR. You use the designer's estimate because this what MSBA sees until the CM comes on board. There were large discrepancies originally, but closer now in costs.

Alternate A: Visual vs. Acoustic Roof Screening

Substitute acoustic screening with visual screen at rooftop – this will be monitored, but aren't small numbers, important to show. Credit: \$289.9K They can take it out of the project later and the SBC will see the credit. Mass DEP states decibel levels so that is what is taken into consideration. The acoustic screen would be 3 sides of the unit. The recommendation is to leave in the acoustical screens in at the rooftop.

On a Motion made by Siggy Pfendler and seconded by Susan McCreedy, the West Elementary School Building Committee vote to instruct the architects to leave in the acoustic screening in the project. On a roll call vote, the motion was approved on a 13-0 vote.

Alternate B: Substitute Field Coconut Husk vs Coated Sand

Substitute Coated Sand infill with Coconut Husk at synthetic turf field; added costs \$162K average. Coconut Husk is more sustainable over time, more natural product. This is also something the Town of Andover has in another field already. Coated sand has an acrylic base to it.

On a Motion made by Janet Nicosia and seconded by Jennifer Hunt, the West Elementary School Building Committee voted to instruct the architects to add coconut husk in lieu of coated sand infill to the synthetic turf in the project.

Discussion: The Town Manager said the Town decided on using coconut husk infill vs. using rubber for Lovely Field back in 2015 as a result of community support. Ms. Nicosia stated that she is hearing that anything with synthetic that may be kicked up and ingested may be viewed as cancerous.

On a roll call vote, the motion was approved on a 12-1 vote.

Alternate C: Natural vs Synthetic Turf

Substitute synthetic turf field with natural grass field – credit \$1.926M average – in a natural turf field, there is a difference in grading and no underdrain system, no walls needed. In a synthetic turf field, there is an underdrain system, walls required on east and southeast sides. It does take 2 growing seasons to be able to use the field if a natural turf is chosen.

On a Motion made by Susan McCreedy and seconded by Rick Almeida, the West Elementary School Building Committee vote to instruct the architects to leave the synthetic turf field in the project. On a roll call vote, the motion was approved on a 13-0 vote.

There are 3 different options Mr. Rice noted and explained to the Committee below.

Alternate D: Gym & Café Motorized Dividers

Substitute vertical folding operable partition with side folding operable partitions at gym in two locations. Credit \$490.8K average. Mr. Rice explained the differences. One provides a clean opening flooring – the preferred operable solution by the educational group. However, higher costs are a factor in considering the vertical folding partition.

On a Motion made by Susan McCreedy and seconded by Liz Roos, the West Elementary School Building Committee to instruct the architects to adopt Alternate D for the project. On a roll call vote, the motion was approved on a 13-0 vote.

Alternate E: Gym & Café Motorized Divider

Substitute vertical folding operable partition at Gym/Café transition with side folding operable partition
Substitute vertical folding operable partition at gym midpoint with traditional overhead rolling divider curtain. Credit \$687.5K average.

Mr. Rice explained this is a solid divider to a traditional overhead divider – Physical Education staff didn't feel it would be ideal for them because of the lack of acoustical conditions between the cafeteria and gym. These divider curtains are used in many schools including at Bancroft.

Alternate F: Fitness & Multipurpose Divider

Substitute vertical folding operable partition with side folding motorized operable partition between fitness and multipurpose room. Credit \$88K average. The vertical folding partition maximizing the space vs. the horizontal

folding partition. The acoustics can be specified to meet the same for both divider options. There are more structural costs to support a vertical vs. horizontal divider. Both are not bearing on the wall, so it would be small incremental costs difference.

The connection of the two spaces is a critical design aspect (cafeteria and gym). Having more connected will make the audience feel part of the performance when choosing a vertical folding partition. The side folding folds to one side – between 2-3 feet deep. Ms. Nicosia said that the folding wall at Bancroft if not motorized, so retraining needs to be done, this would be different. Ms. Hunt said that the folding partition at Bancroft which is not motorized is time consuming. However, all the options shown on the presentation are motorized. Recommendation would be to use the same operable partition for all options just to keep it consistent. The facility is rented out by various groups during the week. Acoustics are to be taken into consideration especially during the school day when classrooms are held simultaneously next to each other in these areas.

On a Motion made by Susan McCready and seconded by Heather Eigen, the West Elementary School Building Committee vote to instruct the architects to adopt Alternate F (substitute vertical folding operable partition with side folding motorized operable partition between fitness and multipurpose room) for the project. On a roll call vote, the motion was approved on a 13-0 vote.

Savings with these motions come close to \$400,000.

Review Project Budget – Discussion and Review of MSBA form 3011

Mr. DeFilippis stated that both numbers did go down from PSR estimate to SD estimate – Construction Costs \$122,915,784 to \$119,771,289 and the Total Project Budget is \$155,602,365 to now \$152,387,437 (this includes the coconut husk). The \$155,602,365 was the PSR (option 3) which was submitted to the MSBA (after the penthouses was taken out) – 204,903 sq. ft and now it is at 191,028 sq. footage.

Mr. DeFilippis stated that adding all electric and Site work number went up for 3 generators contribute to costs. The escalation also drove up costs. Ms. McCready asked for a list of costs for have an explanation to the Community. All costs discussed are always prefaced with the adjective of “estimates” but not everyone will remember this.

The PMA, PM&C Estimated SD RECON Budget and AM Fogarty Estimated SD RECON Budget reconciled estimates were roughly within 1% of each other. They must be within 5% of the line item which is required.

Schematic Design Trade Cost Estimate Breakdown – summary of the trade costs – total \$86,674,765 – this slide includes the coconut husks. These costs are the brick and mortar costs (physical building).

Schematic Design – non-trade cost estimate breakdown – total \$33,096,524. Total Construction Budget - \$119,771,289; Anticipated Soft Costs: \$32,616,148 which totals project budget: \$152,387,437. These are all the other markups and components to build the building. CM contingency is anything else that is needed to bid the project. It is the CM costs of the GMP (guarantee maximum costs) to collectively have the building built.

Ms. Finnegan explained the 4 contingencies on a CM project:

Owners – soft costs, consultant fees, etc; Owners Construction Contingency – change orders that are owner construction requests, unknown site condition; CM contingency is within the total construction budget – money that is accessible- can be used without owners’ approval. This comes out of the owner’s costs; Design contingency – at SD, no design yet, there is a long way to go.

General Conditions are the costs of the CM staff. General Requirements are the trailer, portable toilets, snow removal, tangibles – not usually labor. Escalation – currently are bidding under budget. There is labor shortage, based on schedule and staffing, but costs of material are going up in every category. What is the cost going to be PreCovid. Forecasting is escalation are going up. These are good until May 2022. But there’s no guarantee costs won’t go up they won’t go up over the 6%. When the job is bided on, you always estimate from the date of Town Meeting to the midpoint of the construction – per MSBA requirements and hope that it will balance itself off. The article vote at the Town Meeting will be the total project budget costs but you won’t have a CM signed up for the project by then. The GMP is when you locked in the price and this won’t be until February 2022. But there are still too many variables unknown.

Anticipated Eligible Cost – the costs show enrollment, building size, MBA reimbursement rate, effective reimbursement rate, total project budget (SD estimate); anticipated MSBA grant (min) and anticipated district share. This shows the potential district share of total project budget and the potential grant (\$37,244,117). Anticipated district share at this point is \$115,143,320.

A separate slide showed the list that lists all the ineligible costs 963 CMR Ineligible costs.

Form 3011 –this is the budget submitted by PMA to MSBA –first slide showed a summary of OPM and architecture services – what was approved thus far (\$1.2M). Ms. Finnegan pointed out that \$152,387,437 includes the \$1.2M. The second section are legal fees -ineligible fees not paid by MSBA (\$10,000). The 3rd section shows OPM services, based on square feet, this square footage is ineligible costs. The next section is the architecture services based on square footage \$29,000. Next area are reimbursables. Some reimbursable may be deemed ineligible – per the MSBA. Ms. Nicosia said that the SBC will find out before what's eligible and ineligible so there aren't many surprises.

Mr. DeFilippis further explained the construction costs show that site costs in excess of 8% is ineligible (\$6.5M) and the building costs in excess of \$333/SF are ineligible (\$47M). The miscellaneous costs, construction and owner contingency all are in the cumulative. Typically, preschools are part of the grant program, but MSBA is allowing some of the construction of the building reimbursable (925 population used vs using the total population of the two schools). The district share calculation may change after MSBA review of the 3011 form; construction contingency 1% of total construction cost that are eligible and owner's contingency 4% of eligible soft cost. A total project budget will need to be voted at the next meeting.

Circling back to the discussion on the shared teacher space between Shawsheen and West Elementary, the Chair asked the SBC to decide tonight if there was to be a change. Ms. Finnegan added that the total square feet (TSF) per floor was the following: 830SF/1st floor; 900SF/2nd floor; 800SF/3rd floor. If an additional teacher space in the 2nd floor there would be about \$350,000 added to the project. Ms. Green stated the issue was about the location and time and not about sharing space with the elementary teachers. Ms. Hunt felt the collaboration between the elementary and preschool teachers would be special. The decision was not to change anything on the design plan. The Chair said even though no vote was needed she stated the Committee made the decision to keep the teacher meeting space as designed.

Feedback on Comments on the DRAFT SD report

Minimal comment was made to date. Ms. Finnegan asked for any comments to be sent to over by the end of the weekend – Feb. 7, 2020.

Selection of next SBC meeting date.

Reminder: Forum is on Wed, February 10th with a prep meeting sometime during the next few days. Also, a vote will need to be taken on February 17th on the estimate report because another submission to MSBA is due on February 24, 2020.

On a Motion made by Susan McCready and seconded by Claudia Bach, the West Elementary School Building Committee voted to adjourn the February 3rd meeting. The motion was approved on a roll call vote 13-0. The meeting was adjourned at 9:50PM.

Respectfully,
Alison Phelan, Recorder

CERTIFICATION
Town Clerk and Chief Strategy Officer
Austin Simko

Date:

Town Stamp: