

Concord Middle School Building Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 20, 2021
Revision June 3, 2021

PRESENT: Laurie Hunter, Dawn Guarriello, Court Booth, Pat Nelson, Matt Root, Charles Parker, Stephen Crane, Frank Cannon, Jared Stanton, Chris Popov, Jon 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

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

Matt Johnson requested revisions to the April 29 meeting minutes as follows:

- 1.) Clarification between Dean Banfield GSF number and Kristen NSF response.
- 2.) Mary Hartman noted \$108 was not presented at Town Meeting.

Matt Johnson made a motion to approve the April 15, 2021 minutes as distributed on April 28, 2021. Seconded by Heather Bout. Motion carried unanimously.

The minutes of April 29 and May 6, 2021 to be approved at the next meeting.

Correspondence

Ms. Guarriello noted emails of support and thankfulness of the committee's continued efforts.

Ms. Bout communicated consideration of hard-wiring the building and suggestions for space planning. The next public forum is June 7th at 7:00pm. The new website (<https://www.cmsbuildingproject.org/>) and Q&A is almost complete and will be launched soon.

Ms. Guarriello thanked the team for their transparency, openness and willingness to share.

Schematic Design Overview

Ms. Guarriello noted that a huge milestone was met with the completion of the feasibility study and movement into the schematic design.

Mr. Johnson noted that the committee needs a revised space summary/template to close the loop on the Feasibility Study. Other items to be studied in Schematic Design includes the square footage of the gym, auditorium and simplification of design.

Charlie Parker reiterated that the target budget is \$100M given the feedback from the Finance Committee and Select Board.

Ms. Guarriello stated that she is not comfortable cutting more space. Charlie Parker agreed that the space summary is final.

Kristen Olsen of SMMA presented on the Schematic Design Overview noting the committee did achieve the earlier release of Schematic Design. There was a desire to follow the MSBA process which includes expansion potential and locations. The important Schematic Design Phase decisions include many different building design elements like programmatic adjacencies, entrances and exits. For site plan, the parking count, drive ways and circulation. Exterior and interior design, includes life cycle cost analysis, materials and aesthetics. SMMA will continue to look into the EZ code goals set forth by the sustainability subcommittee and will be looking at VRF as the baseline. Lastly, a deeper dive into safety and security measures with Fire and Police department.

Review of SD Deliverables

The floor plans for schematic designs are just floor plans, that captures space and systems decisions. The goal is to have sufficient detail in the drawings, specifications and Schematic Design report to give the estimators information for a good road map for Design Development. SMMA will also be working with the committee on a Value Engineering (VE) list and will have adds and deducts. Ms. Guarriello noted it is typical for MSBA to have a VE list as part of the process. VE list is constantly changing and throughout all the phases.

Matt Root asked when the next estimate will be published to the committee. Kristen noted that the full estimate would happen in October 2021.

Court Booth questioned the \$555/sqf. Ms. Olsen noted that the \$555/sqf will expand and contract until October 2021 when the budget and scope is finalized for SBC acceptance and Town Vote.

Kristen and Ian clarified that \$559 is the actual cost estimate per SF and \$555 is the target SF.

Feasibility study design contingency is 12% and the SD contingency may drop to 10% or less depending on the comfortability of the estimators with the defined scope.

Mr. Parker questioned if the VE includes large design features such as the bridge. Ms. Olsen noted it is usually not included because it cause program impacts. The floor plan development and re-massing of the building will be completed in early SD and should not be included in the VE list.

Work Plan and Focus Groups

Phil Poinelli will be conducting outreach through questionnaires and teach meeting to better flush out and define the educational programming. Room data sheets will be utilized for this type of design development as well.

Mr. Johnson asked what space summary will be shown to the public in June. Ms. Olsen noted the space summary will include all the items discussed in March and the removal of the maker spaces and alt PE as well as increase in auditorium and gym sizes.

Mr. Johnson reiterated that feasibility deliverables need to be completed and issued at this time. Ms. Guarriello noted currently SMMA is carry 12 sqf/seat for auditorium and for the gym is between 9-10k net. Kristen Olsen noted this is an evolving process and SMMA will present a range and work with the committee on cost and budget.

Ms. Olsen noted SMMA typically collects additional information with focus groups based on area of expertise for the SD phase. The suggested groups include the site design, exterior and interior design, FF&E & technology, MEP & Sustainability, and Safety & Security (typically only 2 meetings). The exterior and interior design focus group rhythm meets every three weeks.

Educational Programming

Ms. Olsen noted the Educational Programming was discussed in length previously.

The School Building Committee should continue to meet monthly.

Ms. Guarriello noted that the focus groups do not have a chair. The design team facilitates the meetings, gathers information, discussed options, and helps to arrive at decisions. Hill and SMMA will partner to ensure that requests are reasonable.

Discussion ensued.

Pat noted there is interest from the community on hardwire technology vs wireless. SMMA will review the comments and would look into the town and school policies to ensure there is consensus around the approach. These decisions will be made by the committee. This would be in the FFE and technology focus group.

Kristen Olsen noted planning board liaison involvement is very helpful.

Matt Root asked to talk more about the difference between focus groups and subcommittees. If a subcommittee makes a recommendation, does the subcommittee attend the focus groups. Kristen noted many of the subcommittee members may be involved in the working group. Working groups are usually not public meetings and working through design details. The focus groups are usually town and/or school employees. The focus groups would be posted. SMMA will work with Dr. Hunter and Stephen Crane on who the core group is and who should be involved in the focus groups.

Court Booth expressed concern with transparency and open meeting law noting everything the committee does is transparent.

Dr. Hunter asked if there is a way to keep the committee updated without slowing down the process.

Ian Parks of Hill noted during the feasibility phase, it is looking at the big picture of the project. As the project moves into Schematic Design, SMMA be bringing their expertise and facilitating the focus groups.

Stephen Crane commented on town staffing involvement. Wastewater management/septic system discussion will include CPW or waste water management team but are not part of the committee is an example of focus group discussion.

Chris Popov questioned if other towns have concerns about what is discussed and decided in focus groups.

Stephen Crane noted security focus group may not be public with specific details of the system but there could be community input.

Charlie Parker asked about governance.

Matt Johnson mentioned about open meeting law.

Frank Cannon believes the architects are responsible for the design and the committee should not be in designing the building.

Matt Johnson stated it makes sense for SMMA to lead the process and meet with the experts. The safest process would be following the subcommittee structure with the understanding that the agenda item would be interviewing focus various groups.

Jon Harris noted the focus groups seem to be fact finding and any decisions that need to be made should be brought to the subcommittees to vote on.

Kristen would like to entertain a motion for the focus groups to comprise a volunteers and experts, as required by each of their subject matters. The focus groups will be posted publically, recorded and the minutes will be made public as appropriate for safety and security. This will occur over the court of Schematic Design. School Building Committee meetings will take place monthly with updates from all of the focus group meetings At the conclusion of Schematic Design before estimating set is put out for estimating, the subcommittees will meet and review the process and recommendations and ensure if it is consistent with the direction at end of feasibility and the goals. Heather Bout moves the motion. Dr. Hunter seconded. No discussion. Motion passed with 15 vote in favor and 1 opposed, Stephen Crane abstained.

Next Steps

Next meeting will be Thursday, June 3rd.

New Business

No new business.

Public Comment

Dean Banfield, 73 Walden Terrace, noted sending an email to the committee that the administrators is sacrificing two important spaces and suggests if other work or alternatives could be done to manipulate the space summary to save the two spaces with the designers.

Dorrie Kehoe is concerned about clarity from Finance and Select Board to the committee that \$100M is the goal. At the Public Forum in June, the committee should have nailed down what you want and what the gym looks like as it will be an on-going topic.

Adjournment

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

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

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sbkE75Q_PbU&list=PL1TTzrWEKOOkQSCY4ADcNvk7hoJ9_lrH8&index=1