

**Town of Scituate
School Building Committee
Hatherly Elementary School Project
Wednesday, August 9, 2023
5:30 – 7:10 p.m.**

M I N U T E S

Committee Members Present: Nicole Brandolini (chair), Bruce Marshman, Gerard Kelly, Janice Lindblom, Kristine Sheahan, Maura Curran, Nancy Holt, Scott Williams, William Burkhead

Committee Members Absent: Andrew Scanzillo, Gregg Davey, James Boudreau, Jared Cianciolo, Jeff Halbig, Jonathan Burwood, Julie Ward, Kevin Kelly, Matt Marino, Stephen Shea, Tom Raab

Others Present: Jon Lemieux and Eric Rubin, Vertex; Don Walter, Tom Hengelsberg, Jason Boone, Dore & Whittier; Chris Cataldo, Facilities

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Nicole Brandolini called the meeting to order at 5:32PM. Nancy Holt made a motion to accept the agenda. Janice Lindblom seconded.

2. Public Comment

None.

3. Meeting Minutes

Nancy Holt made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the July 19th, 2023 School Building Committee meeting. Janice Lindblom seconded. All were in favor on a roll call vote.

4. Review of Upcoming Dates and Meeting Content

Dore & Whittier gave a presentation to the Committee. The Design Team reviewed the project timeline and gave an overview of the schedule for the Preferred Schematic Phase (PSR) of the project.

- Public Meeting August 16th – Scituate Town Library
- Working Group Meeting August 21st
- SBC Meeting August 23rd – VOTE to submit PSR Submission to MSBA
- Submit PSR to MSBA – August 31st
- FAS Meeting – September 13th Virtual Meeting
- FAS Meeting – September 27th Virtual Meeting (tentative, if required)
- MSBA Board Mtg – October 25th
- Public Meeting November 29th – TBD

- Public Meeting February 7th – TBD
- 4 Public Meetings prior to April 8th meeting
- Scituate Town Meeting April 8th
- MSBA Board Meeting April 24th
- Debt Exclusion Vote May 18th

Vertex reviewed the purpose and structure of the FAS meetings on September 13th and (potentially) September 27th.

Vertex reviewed the purpose and structure of the MSBA Board Meeting on October 25th, the concept of eligible costs, for example, building square footage.

The Committee discussed the requirement of the Debt Exclusion Vote and ballot timing requirements.

Vertex explained the expected/estimated timeline for understanding the total project budget amount, anticipating late March.

The Design Team reviewed the August 16th Public Meeting agenda.

The Design Team presented the SBC Meeting Dates for the SD Phase. The Building Committee will meet once per month moving forward through SD Phase.

5. Review design progress and cost estimates for New Construction, Add-Reno, and Repair-Only Options

The Design Team reviewed PSR Cost Estimates. This discussion involved relative cost between design options, with and without MSBA reimbursement costs. Numbers presented include baseline sustainability with CM-at-Risk delivery option. Vertex explained the volatility of the numbers depending on additional constraints, including MSBA grant reduction, Energy Source Selection and LEED points.

The Design Team presented a cost estimate comparison between PDP and PSR. The team explained the loss of 2 MSBA grant points at “base option”, with the potential 4-point gain from energy efficient options.

The Committee discussed the influence of outside sources (i.e. existing relationship with National Grid) in the decision of Energy Source Selection. A discussion should be had with the utility companies sooner rather than later prior to Energy Source Selection.

Gerard questioned the effect of selecting a diesel generator in LEED point calculation. The Design Team assured the Committee that a diesel generator would not result in loss of LEED points.

The Design Team reviewed the change in market over the last couple months, escalation has decreased.

The Design Team reviewed the change in effective reimbursement rate: reduction in base rate of 2 points and increase in Green School incentive by 2 points.

Vertex and the Design Team explained the calculations and considerations involved in the effective reimbursement rate calculation. To note, the reimbursement rate is effective for “eligible costs”, determined by the MSBA. Eligible costs such as sitework are dependent on the site selected for the construction project.

Bruce noted that an excessive amount of numbers presented to the public could become a turn off, resulting in individuals tuning out. The Design Team reassured the Committee that we will have the 3011 form from the MSBA to present to the public that should be easier to follow than the discussion tonight.

6. Review of Preferred Option Selection Criteria

The Design Team presented the selection criteria matrix. The matrix includes criteria with sub-criteria breakdown. The matrix includes 3 criteria items for Site, 4 for Building, and 1 for Cost, and the matrix includes total points for the 6 chosen design options, which serves as a ranking comparison.

The Committee discussed the value of the Pre-K inclusion, considering that the lack of would result in all schools being completely full. The inclusion of Pre-K would also provide a wider range of families that would immediately benefit from the new construction.

7. Preview of Content for August 16th Public Meeting and PSR Report Status

Maura asked for the following information:

- “What is PDP?”: Preliminary Design Program – the last report that was submitted.
- “What is PSR?”: Preferred Schematic Report – selection of design configuration which will exclude the Energy Source.
- “What was the Net Reimbursement for Gates?”: \$75.8 Million total cost, Max Facility Grant of \$21.2 Million, reimbursement rate of 44.06%, with an effective rate of about 28%.

Vertex explained that the schematic design estimate that will be submitted in February will be based on the single selected design configuration. This estimate will be tracked against the PDP and PSR cost estimates.

The Committee discussed the value of adding distinction to the project costs to be presented – “Eligible for Reimbursement – ‘YES’ or ‘NO’ (or ‘unlikely’)”, so the taxpayers will better understand that the repair-only option is a real effective total cost, while the rest are pre-

reimbursement totals. In addition, the cost per square foot value should not be presented – this number is confusing to the public. It should also be noted with the total cost estimates that CM-at-Risk delivery is included in the calculations of these cost totals.

The Committee needs to vote on construction delivery method within the next two months.

The Design Team proposed presenting options to the public in order of Ranking Score: least to most favorable.

Scott suggested a slide that breaks down acronyms, or “industry jargon”.

Maura suggested showing the meeting schedule again at the end of the next public meeting.

8. New Business

The next School Building Committee meeting is scheduled August 23rd @5:30PM.

9. Adjournment

Nancy Holt made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Maura Curran seconded. All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 7:10PM.

APPROVED 8/23/23