

PROJECT MINUTES

Project: W. Edward Balmer Elementary School Feasibility Study
 Prepared by: Joel Seeley
 Re: School Building Committee Meeting
 Location: High School Media Center
 Distribution: School Building Committee Members, Attendees (MF)

Project No.: 17020
 Meeting Date: 11/21/2017
 Meeting No: 15
 Time: 6:30pm

Attendees:

PRESENT	NAME	AFFILIATION	VOTING MEMBER
	Joseph Strazzulla	Chairman, School Building Committee	Voting Member
✓	Melissa Walker	School Business Manager	Voting Member
✓	James Marzec	Representative of the Board of Selectmen	Voting Member
✓	Michael LeBrasseur	Chairman, School Committee	Voting Member
✓	Paul Bedigian	Representative of the Building, Planning, Construction Committee	Voting Member
✓	Steven Gogolinski	Representative of the Finance Committee	Voting Member
	Jeffrey Tubbs	Community Member with building design and/or construction experience	Voting Member
✓	Peter L'Hommedieu	Community Member with building design and/or construction experience	Voting Member
✓	Jeff Lundquist	Community Member with building design and/or construction experience	Voting Member
	Andrew Chagnon	Community Member with building design and/or construction experience	Voting Member
✓	Spencer Pollock	Parent Representative	Voting Member
✓	Adam Gaudette	Town Manager	Non-Voting Member
✓	Dr. Catherine Stickney	Superintendent of Schools	Non-Voting Member
✓	Steve Von Borgen	Building Maintenance Local Official	Non-Voting Member
✓	Karlene Ross	Principal, W. Edward Balmer Elementary School	Non-Voting Member
✓	Jill Healy	Principal, Northbridge Elementary School	Non-Voting Member
✓	Kathleen Perry	Director of Pupil Personnel Services	Non-Voting Member
✓	Lee Dore	D & W, Architect	
	Thomas Hengelsberg	D & W, Architect	
✓	Joel Seeley	SMMA, OPM	

NORTHBRIDGE TOWN CLERK
BORECH A. CEDRONE

18 JUN 14 AM 10:47

RECEIVED

Item #	Action	Discussion
15.1	Record	Call to Order, 6:37 PM, meeting opened.
15.2	Record	M. LeBrasseur announced the meeting will be video and audio recorded with live broadcast and future re-broadcast.
15.3	T. Hengelsberg	T. Hengelsberg will provide direction to the Committee on which three intersections the traffic consultant will be collecting counts at.
15.4	L. Dore	L. Dore will calculate of the energy cost to operate the new facility as compared to the energy cost to operate the existing Balmer and NES in the Schematic Design Phase.
15.5	T. Hengelsberg	T. Hengelsberg to develop a 5 year total cost of ownership to maintain the Balmer and NES as compared to the cost of a new building estimate, for Committee review, at the completion of the PSR Phase.
15.6	T. Hengelsberg	T. Hengelsberg to develop a cost estimate to maintain both Balmer and NES for the additional period between a new building construction duration and a phased renovation construction duration for Committee review, at the completion of the PSR phase.
15.7	T. Hengelsberg	T. Hengelsberg to provide direction to the Committee on the appropriate parent vehicle queue length for the PreK-5 Options recommended by the traffic consultant, based on the parent survey of those parents that drop-off/pick-up at Balmer and NES.
15.8	Committee	Committee members to develop a list of possible outcomes for the disposition of NES should a Grade PreK-5 option be the selected option.
15.9	T. Hengelsberg	T. Hengelsberg to incorporate the key take-aways of the Middle School Capacity Analysis, into the Community Forum No. 5 presentation.
15.10	J. Seeley	J. Seeley distributed and reviewed the list of acronyms and definitions. J. Seeley to post on the Project Website.
15.11	J. Strazzulla J. Seeley	J. Strazzulla and J. Seeley to review the questions from Community Forum Nos. 1-4 that should be added to the FAQ sheet.
15.12	T. Hengelsberg	T. Hengelsberg to provide direction to the Committee if the structural engineer and D&W would consider prefabricated panel systems.
15.13	T. Hengelsberg	T. Hengelsberg to provide direction to the Committee if the Fire Alarm Audio message will be through the PA System or the FA speakers.
15.14	C. Stickney L. Dore J. Seeley	J. Seeley distributed and reviewed the MSBA comments to the PDP Submission, dated 11/16/2017, attached. The Response Document is due back to MSBA by 11/30/2017.
15.15	L. Dore Committee	<p>L. Dore presented and reviewed the updated Design Options and Phasing Plans, and distributed and reviewed the Evaluation Matrix and Criteria, attached</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Option B2 – Grade 2-4 New Construction – Back/Side 2. Option C2 – Grade PK-5 Renovation/Addition – Exist CR Wing 3. Option C3.1a – Grade PK-5 New Construction – Back/Side/Overlap 4. Option C3.1b – Grade PK-5 New Construction – Back/Side 5. Option C3.2 – Grade PK-5 New Construction – Back/Side 6. Option C3.3 – Grade PK-5 New Construction – Back/Side 7. Option C5 - Grade PK-5 New Construction - Front

Item #	Action	Discussion
		<p>Committee Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. T. Hengelsberg to confirm if building height is exempted by the Dover Amendment. 2. S. Pollock asked (prior meeting) if MA Natural Species has been contacted to confirm there are no impacts? <i>T. Hengelsberg indicated the environmental permitting consultant reviewed their on-line documents and found no impacts, but he will confirm that they will contact MA natural Species to confirm the findings.</i> 3. The Educational Working Group provided commentary in support of the Option C3.1 Floor Plan. 4. The Educational Working Group provided commentary in support of the Option C3.1b Site Plan. 5. L. Dore to correct the duration of Option C3.1b to 3 years. 6. M. LeBrasseur asked how far was the building encroaching within the 100 foot wetland buffer? <i>L. Dore indicated the building encroaches to the 50 foot no disturb zone.</i> 7. J. Lundquist asked if the Option C3.1b Floor Plan could be split level at the hillside to reduce the impact of regrading? <i>L. Dore indicated D&W reviewed, but the grade groupings were impacted. D&W will review again of the costs for the regrading are excessive.</i> 8. Committee to fill out the Evaluation Matrix for the next Committee meeting. <p>D&W to develop the cost estimates for the Options for review.</p>
15.16	J. Seeley	<p>J. Seeley summarized the Committee's discussion at the 11/7/2017 meeting relative to the Design-Bid-Build (DBB) and Construction Manager-at-Risk (CMAR) construction delivery method and distributed and reviewed a draft CMAR Selection Schedule to retain the CM by mid-March 2018, attached.</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. P. Bedigian asked if the CM would perform Value Engineering in the SD phase? <i>P. L'Hommedieu indicated they would likely be pricing a set of alternatives in the SD Phase.</i> 2. A. Gaudette asked if the CM cost was included in the budget? <i>J. Seeley indicated the CM cost would be funded out of the Other (Owner's Contingency) Budget and any balance to the Environmental and Site Budget, which have a combined balance of \$147,020.06.</i> <p>A Motion was made by J. Lundquist and seconded by J. Marzec to approve Construction Manager-at-Risk (CMAR) construction delivery method. No discussion, vote passed unanimous.</p> <p>A Motion was made by J. Lundquist and seconded by P. Bedigian to approve draft CMAR Selection Schedule to retain the CM by mid-March 2018. No discussion, vote passed unanimous.</p>

Item #	Action	Discussion
		A Motion was made by J. Marzec and seconded by J. Lundquist to appoint J. Lundquist, P. Bedigian, C. Stickney and A. Chagnon to the CM Prequalification and Selection Subcommittee. No discussion, vote passed unanimous.
15.17	Educational Working Group J. Seeley M. LeBrasseur	<p>J. Seeley distributed and reviewed the draft Community-Wide Survey No. 2 for Committee review, attached. The survey will be released 12/6/2017 and close 12/15/2017.</p> <p>Committee Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. M. LeBrasseur asked if Question 3 can have the respondents choose "strongly support", "somewhat support", "do not support" in lieu of ranking the options. 2. J. Lundquist asked if a question can be added to have the respondents write in why they chose to support a certain option? 3. Question 2 to be deleted. 4. A. Gaudette asked if a description of each option with pros and cons can be provided for Question 3? <i>The Educational Working Group will provide a description and a listing of the pros and cons.</i> 3. M. LeBrasseur asked if a question could be added to ask respondents if they have "attended a Community Forum", "viewed a Community Forum on Video", "viewed a SBC meeting on Video" and "reviewed documents on the Project Website". <p>J. Seeley to work with M. LeBrasseur to finalize the survey for the 12/5/2017 Committee meeting.</p>
15.18	M. LeBrasseur	<p>The PR subcommittee update:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Committee presented to the Safety Committee on 11/8/2017. 2. The Committee presented to the Council on Aging on 11/14/2017. 3. J. Strazzulla to review next steps in raising the Seniors Tax Abatement to the maximum level. 4. J. Strazzulla to develop a generic calendar for press release issuances. 5. Census Mailing – M. LeBrasseur to provide direction on what options and costs to show, since the mailer has to be finalized prior to the PSR costs being developed.
15.19	Record	Public Comments - None
15.20	Record	Old or New Business - None
15.21	Record	Next SBC Meeting: December 5, 2017 at 6:30 pm at the High School Media Center.
15.22	Record	A Motion was made by J. Lundquist and seconded by P. Bedigian to adjourn the meeting. No discussion, voted unanimously.

Attachments: Agenda, List of Acronyms and Definitions, MSBA comments to the PDP Submission, Updated Design Options and Phasing Plans, Evaluation Matrix and Criteria, draft CMAR Selection Schedule to retain the CM by mid-March 2018, draft Community-Wide Survey No. 2, Powerpoint

The information herein reflects the understanding reached. Please contact the author if you have any questions or are not in agreement with these Project Minutes