



RECEIVED  
 CITY CLERK'S OFFICE  
 CHELSEA, MA  
 2014 JUL 31 A 8:28

**BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**Clark Middle School, Chelsea, MA**  
**DATE OF MEETING: 29 July 2014**

Gerry McCue, Executive Director for Administration and Finance	X	gmccue@chelseama.gov
Ned Keefe, Assistant City Manager	X	nkeefe@chelseama.gov
Joe Foti, Director of Public Works	X	jfoti@chelseama.gov
Jay Ash, City Manager		jash@chelseama.gov
John DePriest, Director of Planning & Community Development	X	idepriest@chelseama.gov
Ed Dunn, City Auditor	X	edunn@chelseama.gov
Mary Bourque, Superintendent of Schools		bourquem@chelseaschools.com
Mary Leverone, School Principal	X	leveronem@chelseaschools.com
Peter Kambour, Director of Facilities Management	X	kambourp@chelseaschools.com
Jeanny Velez, School Committee		velez.jeanny@gmail.com
Clifford Cunningham, City Councilor, School Committee Delegate		councilorccunningham@yahoo.com
Marilyn Garcia, Chelsea Restoration Corporation		mgarcia@chelsearestoration.org
Sara Bego, Student Representative	X	sarab527@yahoo.com
Anthony Simboli, Commercial Developer	X	ais@simboli.com
Margaret Wood, Project Director, Pinck & Co. Inc. (PCI)	X	mwood@pinck-co.com
Andraya Lombardi, Project Manager, Pinck & Co. Inc.	X	alombardi@pinck-co.com
Melissa Martinez, Assistant Project Manager, Pinck & Co. Inc.	X	mmartinez@pinck-co.com
George Metzger, Principal, HMFH		gmetzger@hmfh.com
Lori Cowles, Project Manager, HMFH		lcowles@hmfh.com
Arthur Duffy, Project Architect, HMFH	X	aduffy@hmfh.com
Chris Vance, Designer, HMFH		cvance@hmfh.com
Jon Rich, WT Rich & Company	X	jonrich@wtrich.com

x = attending; distribution to all

**I. Advisory Committee Update**

**A. Meeting Summary**

Pinck provided an update on the topics discussed during the last Advisory Committee meeting (7/15), which included; a presentation from HMFH, WT Rich and an update on the status of the construction cost estimates. Pinck distributed the meeting materials to the committee members who were unable to attend the last meeting.

Pinck also discussed the activities that have occurred since the meeting on 15<sup>th</sup>. The construction cost estimates were received on 7/18. The project team has held several meetings and has been working to reconcile the estimates that were prepared by the Designer's consultant and the Construction Manager, with the City's budget.

CHELSEA, SUFFOLK, MA  
 JUL 31 2014

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

*Debrah A. Clayman*  
 CITY CLERK

VALID ONLY IF STAMPED WITH CITY SEAL

**B. Impacts on Budget**

A few developments have occurred since the Preferred Schematic Report's completion that have an impact on the project budget; 6 months of escalation; and the mass of the building has been lowered into the ground to reduce building height, to accommodate two main entrances on Clark Ave and Tudor Street creating a academic first floor, and provide workable space for the Community Schools program.

**C. Project Budget**

Pinck provided a brief explanation of the project budget and the components of the project that are included in each line. The impact of the MSBA's reimbursement caps on the City's share of the project costs and the MSBA budget approval process was also covered in the explanation. A summary of the current project budget was distributed for discussion.

**Summary of Project Budget**

Soft Costs	Feasibility	\$731,455
	Remainder	\$5,911,000
<b>Construction</b>		<b>\$45,957,808</b>
Furnishings		\$804,000
Technology		\$804,000
Construction Contingency		\$1,378,734
Owner's Contingency		\$1,503,800
<b>Total Project Cost</b>		<b>\$57,090,797</b>

Estimated cost to City\* \$18,798,617

\* Assumes full reimbursement on eligible contingency

**D. Next Steps with the MSBA**

- Schematic Design Submittal – 8/7
- MSBA Review and Comment Period – Apx. 6 week period
- MSBA Board Meeting – 9/24
- MSBA Negotiations on Total Project Budget – October – Pinck explained this the point in time the budget is finalized for the reimbursement of the project. This budget remains constant for the duration of the project regardless of escalation and actual construction costs.
- MSBA Board Vote – November on final Total Project Budget

Pinck recommended that the City and District authorize the project team, including HMFH, to move forward with Design Development phase prior to receiving final approval from the MSBA to ensure the project schedule can be maintained.

**II. Project Estimates & Budget**

WT Rich provided a summary on the updated project estimates. The current reconciled construction costs represent the value engineering (VE) options that the team and City have agreed to, in an effort to reduce the estimates to align with the project budget. Pinck explained the VE decisions have design and operation impacts on the school so the team has been very careful during the evaluation process of each cost item. This process is still ongoing, but the team is now comfortable with the options that have been ranked.

#### **A. VE Items**

WT Rich distributed the current VE list. All items listed as 1 and 2s were selected, items listed, as 3-5 require further evaluation. A few items were selected for discussion and input from the Advisory Committee. The VE items that received the greatest concern were associated with the HVAC system. The project HVAC \$/SF are very high in comparison with similar buildings, therefore the proposal is to provide a two pipe dehumidification system in lieu of a four pipe fully air conditioned (AC) building.

The project team has worked with a number of schools and communities that have used dehumidification system rather than full AC building. The project team is proposing to provide AC to specific spaces that are used all year around and or will be used for community schools program. The current design has three units that can be run independently that can help address the temperature differentiation in different areas of the school. Pinck will arrange site visits to other schools were a similar dehumidification system is installed an in operation for comparison.

#### **B. VE Recommendation**

Pinck recommended that the schematic design documents be submitted with only the 1 and 2s items as deductions. This value is \$46,199,418, which is \$241,610 over the current \$45,957,808 budget.

#### **C. Other Funding Opportunities**

The only opportunity for additional funding are rebates from the utility companies. The project team will pursue these types of rebates, but it is difficult to incorporate into the budget at this time. The City is also exploring the possibility of placing solar panels on the school once it is complete.

### **III. Design**

HMFH explained a physical massing model of the building, site and adjacent neighborhood. The model helped illustrate the slope of the site and the grade changes at the entrances of Tudor Street and Clark Ave. HMFH also presented the building elevations to describe the massing and proposed material selections. The designers provided explanations of the proposed outdoor space, programmatic layout and historic elements that will be incorporated into the new school design.

### **IV. Schematic Design Submittal Vote**

The Advisory Committee voted and approved the use of the reconciled construction cost \$46,199,418 in place of the original \$45,957,808 budget for the Schematic Design Submittal to the MSBA on August 7<sup>th</sup>. All committee members voted in favor of the submittal.

### **V. Next Meeting**

The next building committee meeting will be held in the fall after the academic year has begun. The proposed agenda for the next meeting will be as follows:

- Project Update on Schematic Design Submittal approval

Meeting Minutes Prepared by: Melissa Martinez, Pinck & Co, Inc. Minutes will be considered record after five (5) days of issue unless otherwise notified.