

## West Elementary School Building Committee Minutes

Thursday, February 6, 2020 – 7:30AM

SC Room – 2<sup>nd</sup> floor – School Admin Building

### Present:

Voting Members: Andrew Flanagan, Sheldon Berman, Janet Nicosia, Siggy Pfendler, Paul Rollins, Rick Almeida, Susan McCready, Paula Colby-Clements, Donna Walsh, Heather Eigen

Non-Voting Members: Mark Johnson, Esq., Tracey Spruce, Esq., Paul Szymanski

PMA Consultants: Brian DeFilippis, Steve Rusteika

SMMA Architects: Lorraine Finnegan, Matt Rice

CBA Landscape Architect: Megan Tomkins

---

West Elementary School Building Committee Chair (SBC), Paula Colby-Clements Johnson, opened the meeting at 7:35AM.

### ***Approval of Minutes, Vote Expected. Invoices and Change Orders.***

Mo – Sue/Heather for Jan 9 minutes. Mo – Sue/Andrew for Jan 23<sup>rd</sup>.

*On a Motion* made by Susan McCready and seconded by Heather Eigen, the West Elementary School Building Committee approved the Jan 9, 2019 meeting minutes. *On a Motion* made by Susan McCready and seconded by Andrew Flanagan, the West Elementary School Building Committee approved the Jan. 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting minutes. Both motions were approved on a 10-0 vote.

### ***Approval of Invoices and Change Orders.***

Invoice from SMMA Architects #0052236 dated Jan. 31, 2020 was submitted for payment. Paula Colby-Clements read the amount on the invoice for \$77,481.75 for professional services from Dec 28, 2019-Jan 31, 2020.

*On a Motion* made by Susan McCready and seconded by Paul Rollins, the West Elementary School Building Committee approved the invoices read by Paula today. The motion was approved on a 10-0 vote

Invoice from PMA Feb 5 #04303-9 dated Feb.5, 2020 was submitted for payment. Ms. Colby-Clements read the amount on the invoice for \$14,626.50 for visioning and programming services from Jan. 1-Jan. 31, 2020.

*On a Motion* made by Janet Nicosia and seconded by Paul Rollins, the West Elementary School Building Committee approved the invoices read by Paula today. The motion was approved on a 10-0 vote.

### ***Overview of where we are in the process - SMMA***

Lorraine Finnegan gave an overview of what has happened up to this point from the last meeting. The power point was displayed at this time: [West Elem Feb 6 Update](#)

Matt Rice stated that he spoke of the meeting with Bancroft and the facility/mission of the school and how amazing that this and this is a dedicated program.

Square Footage: The Shawsheen Pre K Existing Program was displayed and reviewed on how it stands now. There are some similarities between schools – the kitchen would be the only space to be shared between West Elem and Shawsheen. Ms. Colby asked if the buildings need to be looked at whether or not they can be attached. The response that this still need to be further studied.

Lorraine Finnegan pointed out the numbers are different gross square footage (GSF) comparison with Massachusetts School Building Association (MSBA) Requirements because we are now including Shawsheen. We have made an assumption that MSBA will reimburse for the 10 classrooms – but this is

the worst case scenario at this time until we know for sure what MSBA will reimburse. Through the Preliminary Design Plan (PDP), MSBA will let SMMA know what they will support. Shelley asked for a possible summary if SMMA could give them an idea of what the possible reimbursements may be – Lorraine said that they could run those calculations (one with just the Special Ed first and one with the West Elem program) and give him a definite number. If the Dept. of Ed (DESE) comes back and supports the whole West Elem program, then MSBA will also reimburse that amount. MSBA will respond within 21 days of PDP submittal around March/April.

In the first scenario; the GSF comparison with MSBA requirements for a new building was shown on the architect's chart. In some cases, there were some major differences vs what is West Elem's existing conditions. To include the total square footage of what Shawsheen is now would add about another 36,000 sq. feet to these numbers.

There is a difference between GSF (gross space footage) and (non-program space) NSF – toilets, custodial closets equal non program space must be accounted in any building.

Lorraine also ran through the next scenario of GSF comparison with MSBA's requirements for an addition/renovation type of building/project. The difference is evident, auditorium is included and the addition of a PreK is shown on this chart.

#### ***Discussion of placement on site-SMMA***

First scenario: New School with PreK and Auditorium

A modular classroom proposal and pod incorporated on slide while the new building is being built. This is still a 3 story level – PreK would be on 2 levels w/elevator access. Paul Rollins did point out that with the playing fields in the front of the school, safety would be a concern and would need to be addressed as a concern. Matt said they were still reviewing all options at this time. Shelley pointed out that adding modulars aren't reimbursable so could there be a configuration of the building be done without having to use them. Balancing filling in the wetlands with the configuration and phasing, so all options still need to be considered in order for all this to happen.

Questions if the building is shifted west of the current site of the building what type of grounds are there. There is a fair amount of grade, so more work will be done to see what is there in the current weeks. The Geotech will be surveying soon on site to do borings -- before the spring. All options are now on the table for the PDP with no decisions expected at this time. For feasibility submission of May 6<sup>th</sup> – the Committee will need to make a decision.

#### ***Discussion of Order of magnitude of costs and potential district share - SMMA***

Brian DeFilippis talked about the cost per square foot which runs from \$550 to \$615 depending on when the actual day of bid takes place; the Cost Current is what it would cost at that time. MSBA will tell districts they are providing a grant; they will never match the construction rate costs. It is a challenge for communities because of the escalating costs. Paula stated that the Special Ed is mandated by the state. So, if the state isn't going to put more money to fund this, then this is where the problem becomes bigger for the district. Typically, the 5% escalation is what is used.

Brian continued to speak on the slide about the Conceptual Cost Models. These are the six options that are mandated for the project:

Code Upgrade – doesn't include any programmatic improvements, the least expensive – improves the building a little bit

Add-Reno – demolition and renovation of building – auditorium included here – this is more expensive because auditorium and preschool are included here.

New School – original program – no preschool no kindergarten

New w/auditorium – no preschool – leaves Shawsheen as it is, doesn't meet the Ed Plan

New w/Pre K – no auditorium

New w/auditorium, Preschool – largest building 212 sf – this has the largest building footprint for the site.

Building energy codes were discussed as well by Janet Nicosia. Janet also thought it might be a good idea to invite MSBA tour Shawsheen at this point. They had initially declined the invitation.

Lorraine stated the Add/Reno projects are done all the time - for example Winchester HS did this because their other options did not seem to work well. The architects have to show the pros and cons on doing the add/reno vs. building new. However, the district needs to weigh all their options whether it does meet end goals; the ultimate decision falls on School Building Committee not MSBA.

Cost Models-District Share slide: this is the worst case scenario not including their participation in Special Ed. If you add an auditorium is how it works with the stage square footage – which would be attached to the cafe/auditorium – this becomes non reimbursable. If you don't include auditorium, MSBA will increase reimbursements.

Tracey Spruce asked if the architects could create a list of what are reimbursable items vs. what's not eligible, etc. Lorraine – said there is a slide to show some of these items/costs so the Committee has an idea.

#### ***Review of schedule moving forward - SMMA***

Ms. Finnegan outlined the next scheduled steps and meetings. Next meeting is Feb. 27<sup>th</sup>. SMMA still feels the argument for having an auditorium is still light- this could use some more work. They would like to upload the Ed Plan next week so the Committee can review. This is the biggest portion of the PDP – it's very important to MSBA and they will make decisions on this. Shelley would like to schedule a conference call with SMMA during the school vacation week to finalize the Ed Plan.

By Feb 28<sup>th</sup> or sooner Lorraine said they would like to upload the Ed Plan to the SharePoint so that all can review it.

ANRAD: Delineations of wetland boundaries will be reviewed only between 4/1-12/1. (the wetlands – agreeing to the wetland limits – this is submitted to local conservation). They will target this for their March 17 meeting. On March 11<sup>th</sup>, SMMA will submit the PDP to MSBA.

Lorraine wanted to be sure that the Committee wanted them to continue with their plan and not to change anything. Andrew/Paula concurred, there hasn't been enough analysis done yet so nothing should be taken out at this time.

#### ***Selection of Next SBC Meeting date(s) and main subject.***

*On a Motion* made by Susan McCready and seconded by Paul Rollins, the West Elementary SBC voted to adjourn the meeting of Feb 6, 2020 at 8:45am. The Committee voted 10-0 to adjourn.

Respectfully,  
Alison Phelan, Recorder