

**Joint Meeting of the Gerry School Building Committee  
and the Marblehead School Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
August 23, 2018  
Veterans Middle School – 217 Pleasant Street – 7:00PM**

**Building Committee Members Present:** Emily Barron, Jackie Belf-Becker (non-voting), Eileen D'Amour, Sarah Fox, Dave Harris, Ken Lord, Amanda Maniaci, Maryann Perry, Jeremy Pollender, Cindy Schieffer, Jason Silva, Ralph Wallace, Donna Zaeske and Jim Zisson. *Mr. Blair Nelson of the Finance Committee sat in for Mr. Berman, who was absent.*

**Building Committee Members Absent:** Ben Berman, Kelly Lyons, Catherine Martin, Richard Matthews, Elizabeth Rudzinski, Sean Satterfield, Aimee Sheppard, Ben Szalewicz and Erik Weibust.

**School Committee Members Present:** Dave Harris, Maryann Perry, Meredith Tedford and Sarah Gold.

**School Committee Members Absent:** Jennifer Schaeffner and Meghan Taylor.

**Guests:** David Saindon, Jim Rogers and Brian Dakin (Leftfield)

**1. Call to order**

Mr. Harris called the Building Committee meeting to order at 7:03pm.

Ms. Tedford called the School Committee meeting to order at 7:03PM.

**2. Approval of Building Committee Minutes from 08/09/18 Meeting**

Mr. Wallace made a Building Committee motion to approve the meeting minutes for the 08/09/18 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Zaeske and passed unanimously by those Building Committee present tonight and on August 9<sup>th</sup>, 9-0-9-4.

*Ms. Baron, Ms. D'Amour, Ms. Maniaci and Ms. Schieffer abstained, as they were absent from the August 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.*

**3. Approval of Building Committee Invoices and Commitments**

Mr. Saindon noted there are no invoices for approval tonight.

**4. BRR Approvals**

Mr. Saindon explained that Budget Revision Request #2 ("BRR-2") is a document that aligns the project budget with the previous Building Committee decision to authorize GGD to perform a photovoltaic ("PV") study and analysis of the Bell site and fund it from Owner's contingency. He noted that the study is complete and that the next time RDA is in attendance they will present an update. He summarized that BRR-2 totals \$1,980 and is a standard MSBA form that needs to be signed by certain members after presentation and approval by the Building Committee. Mr. Pollender noted that at the original meeting when this study was discussed, the Light Department noted that it could reimburse the School Committee for the expenditure. Mr. Harris responded that he is in the process of scheduling a meeting

**Joint Meeting of the Gerry School Building Committee  
and the Marblehead School Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
August 23, 2018  
Veterans Middle School – 217 Pleasant Street – 7:00PM**

with the General Manager of Marblehead Light and other key participants including RDA and Leftfield, hopefully before the next Building Committee meeting on September 6<sup>th</sup> to review the PV study, the potential for financing and reimbursement as well as some other items the Light Department would like to discuss such as onsite solar carports and electric vehicle chargers.

Mr. Saindon presented BRR-3 for \$2,750, which would authorize and fund an updated PSR estimate for inclusion in the final PSR submission and incorporate recent decisions such as the L-shaped layout, displacement HVAC with full cooling and the flat roof. This work would be funded by remaining Owner's Contingency. Mr. Harris explained that MSBA noted concerns about the cost of the project at the Facilities Assessment Sub-Committee ("FAS") meeting and noted the previous Building Committee discussion that many of the recent decisions will reduce the cost of the previous PSR and show the MSBA that the project is responsive to their concerns and actively working to balance what is educationally appropriate with cost efficiency. Mr. Nelson asked what total order of magnitude that the PSR budget might be reduced by considering all of these decisions. Mr. Harris noted that if the individual estimated savings for each item were simply added together, a reduction of building/site costs of approximately \$1.1m is possible.

Ms. Schieffer made a Building Committee motion to approve BRR-2 and BRR-3 as presented tonight. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wallace and approved unanimously by those Building Committee members present, 13-0-9-0.

Ms. Fox asked if the remaining contingency value is adequate, and Mr. Wallace asked if it would last the project until the pending Town vote. Mr. Saindon indicated he felt while the remaining contingency is lean, it can be adequate if cost-efficient decisions are made.

**5. Chairman Update(s):**

Mr. Harris noted that he forwarded both the MSBA's PSR comments and the project's responses to the Building Committee and noted that some of the responses indicated that information would be provided via the final PSR submission to the MSBA on September 12<sup>th</sup>. He continued that one such item is a redlined educational plan from the School (which he understood to be underway) and a second is the question of capacity within the school system to absorb the Bell students during constriction. He asked Ms. Perry for an update.

Ms. Perry indicated that she felt the question of capacity is related to the Glover School and continued by explaining that originally, MSBA noted that Glover was to house 2 collaborative rooms and other District-wide SPED rooms. However, the collaborative rooms have since been relocated, PreK has moved from Bell to Glover, and more SPED spaces have opened throughout the system due to demand. She noted that SPED is not 23 students from class, that is would be 5-8 students max, and that when building Glover the SPED rooms were required to be sized based on

**Joint Meeting of the Gerry School Building Committee  
and the Marblehead School Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
August 23, 2018  
Veterans Middle School – 217 Pleasant Street – 7:00PM**

them being “regular classrooms” with 20+ students. She explained that on paper, these “large” rooms might look to house many more SPED students than the MSBA realizes and noted that this is likely at the core of the confusion about why this project is looking for the SPED spaces that it is. If MSBA thinks that there is space available at Glover (which she noted there isn’t), then she could understand them questioning additional space beyond the current guidelines. However, based on how the spaces are used, and all rooms being full and Glover being at capacity, the additional square footage currently in the ISS is required. She continued, explaining that an additional question is if students can be housed somewhat comfortably throughout the system after Bell is closed for construction, then why does the new building need to be the size it is. She noted that the response will show that the system can temporarily sustain the added population but that it will be very tight and will be completed by having most programs occur inside the classroom as opposed to in dedicated rooms such as art and music. She reiterated that there is no extra space within the existing schools and that the new 450 student building, complete with the SPED rooms above the MSBA template, is required for the effective and proper delivery of education and that the response to the MSBA will look to clearly explain and confirm this. She indicated she feels that the design of this new facility is efficient and without unnecessary bells and whistles or unneeded spaces. Mr. Robert Bellucci, the Director of Special Education in Marblehead, noted that the last time students were brought into the Village School to allow for work to happen at another site, the program lost 3 students because parents felt that squeezing the programs in via larger student counts and classroom dividers negatively impacted their children’s education to the degree that they took them elsewhere. He also noted that since the Glover was built various regulation and laws regarding restraint, discipline and autism awareness have been created or changed. Mr. Bellucci summarized that special services and programs have increased and will continue to, and that he felt that DESE and MSBA ultimately will agree with this assessment.

The Building Committee discussed enrollment, the distribution of students in various programs and buildings, and the various facilities that would be taken offline and possibly re-purposed or turned over to the Town. Ms. Perry noted that this would all be summarized and included in the explanation to the MSBA. Mr. Harris noted that the analysis will show that modular classrooms are not needed, which would be a major cost impact to the project and therefore of particular interest of the MSBA. Mr. Zisson requested the Mr. Lord or the School Department check enrollment for this new school year to compare it to the last projection. Ms. Fox asked whether it’s possible that the MSBA would require the school enrollment or size to be made smaller despite the fact that the Building Committee has spent a few years making the determination that this 450 student school was the most appropriate option. Mr. Saindon responded that while it’s very unlikely the MSBA would require a smaller enrollment, their standard process of reviewing the

**Joint Meeting of the Gerry School Building Committee  
and the Marblehead School Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
August 23, 2018  
Veterans Middle School – 217 Pleasant Street – 7:00PM**

project's space summary, and square footage, could result in them not offering reimbursement for certain spaces that the project would nevertheless be able to build (these spaces would just need to be 100% funded by Marblehead). Mr. Saindon noted that this process of marking certain spaces as "ineligible" is common to all MSBA projects and that he has never experienced a project where the MSBA reduced enrollment mid-process or reduced square footage beyond the usual eligible/ineligible review. The Building Committee further discussed the process of determining whether spaces are eligible or ineligible for reimbursement. Mr. Wallace noted that the MSBA's determinations are based on their standards, and the DESE's approval, and noted that this process should not be thought of as a reduction of enrollment, rather a determination of what areas are beyond the MSBA's standards and therefor ineligible for reimbursement.

Mr. Harris summarized that RDA is finalizing the L-shaped building layout and getting pricing updates for inclusion in the final PSR and that Ms. Perry is working on redline space plan and the capacity explanation as discussed tonight. He indicated that this is why there is a proposed September 6<sup>th</sup> joint Building and School Committee meeting so that the final PSR can be approved for submission to the MSBA by September 12<sup>th</sup>.

**6. OPM/Designer Update(s)**

Mr. Harris noted there was no update tonight.

**CR-R VS. Design-Bid-Build Methodology**

Mr. Saindon noted that this topic was presented at length at the July 12<sup>th</sup> Building Committee meeting and felt there likely was a consensus that CM-R was the preference, however that no motions were fielded at that meeting. He explained that it would be advantageous if this decision was made as soon as possible so that it can be included in the final PSR. He explained that estimators include a CM contingency on a CM-R project and that changes the construction estimate. Mr. Pollender asked how the decision affects the construction estimate and total budget. Mr. Saindon explained that such a contingency would still be in the total project budget either way, but in a CM-R process it's carried within the construction estimate. Mr. Pollender asked what happens to any unspent contingency in the CM-R process, and Mr. Saindon responded that all unspent contingency money is returned to the Owner. Mr. Pollender asked whether the CM needs permission to use the CM contingency, and Mr. Saindon explained that a protocol would be put in place that all parties, including the Committee, are comfortable with. Mr. Lord noted that he felt the ability to involve a CM earlier in design and the ability to start construction faster were major benefits of the CM-R option. Ms. Schieffer noted that she felt hearing that higher caliber contractors typically work in the CM-R realm is a major benefit as well. Mr. Wallace noted that benefits to CM-R also include CM-R

**Joint Meeting of the Gerry School Building Committee  
and the Marblehead School Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
August 23, 2018  
Veterans Middle School – 217 Pleasant Street – 7:00PM**

contractors being general of a higher skill and quality level and more control over the firm selection via a qualifications-based selection process. Mr. Pollender asked whether the same fixed sub-bid rules apply to CM-R and Mr. Dakin and Mr. Saindon explained that while the same procurement laws and processes apply, a CM-R project is able to plug each contractors budget line with with holds with allowances where necessary to minimize change orders.

Mr. Lord made a motion for the project to proceed with procurement of contractor services via usage of the Chapter 149A CM-At-Risk process. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pollender and passed unanimously by those present, 13-0-9-0.

**Educational Space Summary, Building Square Footage and MSBA Eligibility Review (Drivers – Price, Size, Parity to Glover?)**

Mr. Harris noted that there was no vote on this matter intended for tonight and recapped that the basis of this discussion is about MSBA comments about the eligibility of certain spaces which are over their guidelines. Mr. Saindon presented a category-by-category breakdown the net square footage (“NSF”) titled “Bell-Coffin-Gerry Space Summary Analysis, August 22, 2018” and showed how the project related to the MSBA guidelines in each. He noted that per MSBA comment, the PreK NSF was moved to the core academic category and will be considered eligible but the size must be capped at the MSBA guideline limit. Mr. Saindon noted that SPED was 2,825 over and that this overage is what the Committee has been discussing tonight and at previous meeting and noted the 900 sqft overage in Admin & Guidance that represented the Multi-Purpose room. Ms. Perry noted that most categories were not over the MSBA guidelines and discussed that this program is subject to DESE approval. Ms. Maniaci asked if DESE approves the proposed space summary, whether the overages in those categories would then be considered eligible. Mr. Saindon responded that his opinion is that if the DESE provided approval the spaces might be considered eligible, but that final DESE approval would not come until the conclusion of Schematic Design. Mr. Saindon completed review of the NSF breakdown and also revisited a slide from a previous June 28<sup>th</sup> Building Committee meeting showing that this project provides parity to Glover. The Committees further discussed the data, agreeing that it will be important to be able to clearly and succinctly explain this to voters. Mr. Saindon indicated that such analysis has been started by Leftfield and will be ready for review in the coming weeks. Ms. Tedford noted that this space summary analysis and parity comparison to Glover should be presented at a future School Committee meeting to help spread the word, Mr. Harris agreed.

**Schedule Review for Delivery of PSR**

Mr. Saindon noted that the revised/final PSR was due to the MSBA on September 12<sup>th</sup> and that deliverables are targeted for completion a week or so before that

**Joint Meeting of the Gerry School Building Committee  
and the Marblehead School Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
August 23, 2018  
Veterans Middle School – 217 Pleasant Street – 7:00PM**

deadline so that they could be packaged, checked and sent to MSBA. He explained that he views a September 6<sup>th</sup> joint Building and School Committee as required to approve the updated PSR. Ms. Tedford noted that there is already a full agenda for the September 6<sup>th</sup> School Committee meeting, but that something could be worked out. The Committees discussed what items need review and approval from which Committee, agreeing that approval of the L-shaped option by the Building Committee was important, and completed, and that details related to the capacity of the school system during construction were details that can be worked out by the school administration. It was also agreed that overall approval to submit the updated PSR was required by both Committees on September 6<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Perry noted that some items would still be in progress at that point, as there is a meeting scheduled with RDA for September 7<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Nelson and Ms. Schieffer noted that a clear explanation of the administrations plan for where to locate programs during construction would benefit the public and parents. Mr. Saindon noted that items that will be new or updated in the PSR which is to be approved by both Committees on September 6<sup>th</sup> include the redline ISS, the capacity question response, the L-shaped plans, flat roof, displacement HVAC with full AC clarification, revised site plan with less parking, CM-R methodology for contractor procurement and an updated project schedule and construction cost estimate. It was agreed that the PSR will be submitted at the 82,331 gross square footage. The Committee further discussed the capacity issue, noting the importance to communicate that while the temporary burden placed on other schools and students is manageable, it is not an acceptable mid or long term solution as there is not proper capacity in those buildings to house the added students beyond the few years required to demolish and re-build at the Bell site.

**Schematic Design Phase Look-Ahead**

Mr. Saindon highlighted upcoming target dates including the September 6<sup>th</sup> joint BC and SC meeting, September 12<sup>th</sup> submission of the revised/final PSR, September 26<sup>th</sup> attendance of a second MSBA FAS meeting, October 31<sup>st</sup> MSA BOD meeting, and a +/- target of December 20<sup>th</sup> to submit the final Schematic Design package to the MSBA. This would lead to a February 13<sup>th</sup> MSBA BOD final approval meeting.

**7. Schematic Design Update(s):**

Provided above.

**8. New Business**

Mr. Saindon briefly reviewed an updated site plan that was sent by RDA and noted that it would be presented and discussed in more detail at an upcoming meeting.

**Joint Meeting of the Gerry School Building Committee  
and the Marblehead School Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
August 23, 2018  
Veterans Middle School – 217 Pleasant Street – 7:00PM**

**9. Public Comment**

Pat Franklin – Asked if the MSBA-requested redline ed spec relates directly to square footage discussion, and Ms. Perry and Mr. Harris clarified that it does not.

**10. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn the Building Committee meeting was made by Ms. Zaeske and seconded by Mr. Wallace. The motion was approved unanimously by those Building Committee members present, 13-0-9-0. The meeting adjourned at 8:56pm.

A motion to adjourn the School Committee meeting was made by Mr. Harris and seconded by Ms. Gold. The motion was approved unanimously by those School Committee members present, 4-0-2-0. The meeting adjourned at 8:56pm.