

Whitman Middle School Building Committee

Meeting Minutes

Time: 4:30 PM

Place: Whitman-Hanson Regional High School

Date: Monday, August 28, 2023

Members Present:

Frederick Small, *Chair*

Kathleen Ottina, *Vice Chair*

Mary Beth Carter

Beth Stafford

Robert Curran

George Ferro

Brandon Frost

Rich Pulkinen

Justin Evans

John Stanbrook

Jeffrey Szymaniak

Josh MacNeil

John Galvin

Christopher Scriven (on phone)

Absent: Don Esson, Crystal Regan

Building Team Present: Mike Carroll, OPM – Colliers Project Leaders (CPL), Alisa Santos, OPM – Colliers Project Leaders (CPL), Troy Randall, Principal Architect – Ai3 Architects (Ai3), Julie Rahilly, Architect – (Ai3)

Call to Order:

Fred Small, The Committee Chair opened the meeting by calling it to order.

Pledge of Allegiance

Ms. Stafford entertained a motion to take Agenda Item #2 out of order and have it placed in front of Agenda Item #1 because if it is not rescinded, the Committee would not need to hear options available.

The Chair explained that he was inclined to go in the order of the Agenda.

Mr. Ferro seconded the motion to take Agenda Item #2 out of order.

The Chair allowed to have a second for discussion to take Agenda Item #2 out of order.

Ms. Stafford explained to go through all of Agenda Item #1, some of it would not be necessary if the Committee doesn't rescind. Ms. Stafford also explained that it would be a faster way of doing things, which doesn't mean that the Committee wouldn't talk about how things are going to be bonded or how things are going to be done.

The Chair asked the Committee for further discussion.

Mr. Galvin explained that he'd be concerned about having that vote without hearing what the Committee's other options are.

The Chair asked the Committee for further discussion.

Mr. Evans explained in discussion for Agenda Item #2, he would probably ask half of the questions that would probably be covered in Agenda Item #1 item, so he didn't know that it would be faster.

The Chair asked the Committee for further discussion.

The Chair called for a roll call vote to consider Agenda Item #2 before Agenda Item #1.

With 7 nos and 8 yeses, the Committee voted to take Agenda Item #2, out of order to the top of the list.

I. Public Comment Review and comparison of Schematic Design/Preliminary Schematic Design, Budget Comparison in depth between Preliminary Schematic Design and Schematic Design, Budgetary Breakdown and Discuss Options Available

The Chair asked Mr. Carroll and Ai3, what would happen if the Committee rescinded the vote? What would the Committee be looking at for options with the MSBA, etc.? Mr. Carroll explained that if the Committee rescinds the vote, it would depend ultimately on if the Committee voted for another course of action tonight. Option 1 would be to rescind the vote, to do another vote and allow the team to continue to submit their package this week on August 31st and go to the October 25th board meeting. Option 2 might be to delay and submit later which would mean we would potentially go to a later board meeting either the next meeting in December or the meeting after that which has not yet been set. We can anticipate one in January or March, which is based on what the MSBA did last year.

Ms. Stafford explained that she knew the Committee requested information from their lawyer about rescinding the vote, and asked Mr. Ferro and Mr. Szymaniak to speak to that.

Mr. Szymaniak read aloud the Committee's Legal Counsel response.

Comparison of Base Repair vs. New Construction

Troy Randall, Principal Architect – Ai3 Architects

- a) There are a lot of ADA compliance issues (i.e., Door openings, pull swings, clearances, bathrooms, drinking fountains, etc.) that have a domino effect.
- b) All entries to classrooms will need to be reconstructed, the lockers adjacent to them, due to space, will need to be reconstructed, the ceiling, the floors related to that, bathrooms need to be reconstructed based on the fixture and pipe locations, ramps, stairs are too narrow, handrails, guardrails, etc. continues to domino.
- c) Sprinkler systems, because of electrical & mechanical updates, ceilings need to come down & get reconstructed. The list goes on and on.
- d) That's why identifying, at a minimum, the \$60 million approximate value for that in a 3-year timeframe if projects don't get completed in 3 years, phasing & escalation comes into play, \$60 million every year will increase as projects move up. Those are some of the factors of base repair.

Beth Stafford

- a) Children will need to be displaced. Portables will be needed and that will add in an additional cost.

Fred Small, Chair

- a) If you present the numbers to the town the way these are presented, you're not showing them apples to apples. You should be showing 1st year payment & letting them know it would decline from there so people are prepared for impact.

Mary Beth Carter, Town Administrator

- a) It's better to compare the 30-year Base Repair to the 30-year New Construction because they are the same terms. That Delta would be \$335.15, not \$122.87.
- b) The difference between 20 and 30 is the 74 to 84. After 20 years, you have another 10 years of \$84.79/month that you don't have on 20. So, it does say "Compare to Base Repair Whitman would have a new school for \$122.87 more per year." That would be the price for the 1st 20 years and the last 10 years would be \$1017.53 on average a year.

John Galvin

- a) All agree that Base Repair is not an option, in my opinion the town won't pass it, it's not a sound investment.
- b) Keep making it sound like it's either base repair or new construction & I don't think the town will vote for either. In my opinion, we need an option that could pass & we aren't at that point right now.

II. Discussion of Rescinding Schematic Design Approval Vote from August 15, 2023 (Vote if needed)

- a) Presentation and discussion of Tiered Saving options.
 - i. Tier 1 – Reduce scope with minimal to no impact on schedule.
 - ii. Tier 2 – Meet MSBA standards for square footages.
 - 1. Redesign - with impacts due to cost escalation and extended schedule
 - 2. Refinement - with no anticipated impacts to cost escalation and extended schedule.
 - iii. Tier 3 – Similar to Tier 2, with the exception that the MSBA will have increased influence / involvement.
- b) Tier 1 Option(s)
 - i. Adjust total contingency from 9% to 7%
 - ii. FFE adjustment back to MSB standards
 - iii. Reconsideration of stage area from ineligible to eligible
 - iv. Total estimated savings to Town \$3.6 million
- c) Tier 2 Option(s)
 - i. Eliminate auditorium, create cafetorium
 - ii. Reduce PE Space to MSBA standard size
 - iii. Reduce Teacher Planning Space to MSBA standard size
 - iv. Eliminate outdoor storage (MSBA Standard)
 - v. Total estimated savings to Town \$13.9 million
- d) Tier 3 Options(s)
 - i. Target construction VE of \$1,000,000
 - ii. Grade configuration adjusted from 5-8 to 6-8 (enrollment from 675 to 515)
 - iii. Total estimated savings to Town \$12.9 million

e) VOTE

- i. John Galvin makes motion to rescind vote from 8/15/2023, seconded by Josh MacNeil – 4 Yes Votes, 10 No Votes – Motion does not carry.

III. Next Steps/Timeline in detail

- a) Proceed with submitting SD Documents

IV. Article Wording/Ballot Vote Wording and Timing

- a) Handout containing the Wording distributed and reviewed with comments:
 - i. Clarify MSBA reimbursement rate for eligible costs – 63.31%
 - ii. Remove ‘blue line.’
- b) VOTE
 - i. Mary Beth Carter makes motion to approve the article with revisions, seconded by Justin Evans – Unanimous Yes vote, with exception of 1 abstention, Mr Galvin.

V. Other Business

- a) Committee Member John Galvin announces his resignation from the committee.

VI. Next Meeting Date – 9/19/2023

Adjournment

The Chair entertained a motion to adjourn.

Motion made by Josh MacNeil, seconded by Justin Evans

Vote was unanimous to adjourn.

To view the full recording of this meeting please visit: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Flmh4iDGnnE>