

PICKERING MIDDLE SCHOOL – Lynn, MA		MEETING MINUTES
SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING NO. 7		June 28, 2016
Location:	City Hall, ISD Conference Room	
Time:	11:00 AM	

Attendees:

Attended	Name	Association	Email
N	Judith F. Kennedy	Mayor, City of Lynn; SBC	Mayor@lynnma.gov
N	Rachel M. Allaire	Parent Representative; SBC	Rachel.Allaire@comcast.net
Y	Peter M. Caron	CFO, City of Lynn; SBC	PCaron@lynnma.gov
Y	Edward T. Calnan	Experienced Community Member; SBC	edcalnan@gmail.com
Y	Jaime L. Cerulli	Chief Of Staff; SBC Chair	JCerulli@lynnma.gov
Y	Dianna Chakoutis	Ward 5 Councilor; SBC	Dianna.Chakoutis@lynnma.gov
Y	Kathleen Collins	ISD Administrator	KCollins@lynnma.gov
N	Donna Coppola	Lynn School Committee: SBC	DonnaCoppola@mail.com
Y	Michael Donovan	ISD Chief; Building Commissioner; SBC	MDonovan@lynnma.gov
N	John E. Ford	Lynn School Committee: SBC	J.E.Ford@verizon.net
Y	Andrew Hall	Lynn DPW Commissioner; SBC	AHall@lynnma.gov
Y	Catherine C. Latham	Superintendent of Schools; SBC	LathamC@lynnschools.org
N	Wayne Lozzi	Ward 1 Councilor; SBC	WLozzi@hotmail.com
Y	James L. Ridley	Retired LPS Principal; SBC	RidleyJL@verizon.net
Y	Kevin Rittershaus	PMS Principal; SBC	RittershausK@lynnschools.org
Y	Joseph Smart	Dir. Buildings & Grounds ISD; SBC	JSmart@lynnma.gov
N	Patrick Tutwiler	Deputy Superintendent of Schools; SBC	TutwilerP@lynnschools.org
Y	Gene Raymond	Raymond Design Associates	graymond@rda-design.com
N	Steve Lamothe	Raymond Design Associates	slamothe@rda-design.com
Y	John Bartecchi	Raymond Design Associates	jbartecchi@rda-design.com
Y	Paul Gransauil	LeftField Project Management	PGransauil@leftfieldpm.com
N	Jim Rogers	LeftField Project Management	JRogers@leftfieldpm.com
Y	Lynn Stapleton	LeftField Project Management	LStapleton@leftfieldpm.com

A Pickering Middle School Building Committee Meeting was held to review the status of the project. A quorum of the School Building Committee was present. J. Cerulli, SBC Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:14 AM.

I. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Approval of June 28, 2016 Meeting Minutes

1. The following motion and vote were made:

MOTION: E. Calnan moved, seconded by C. Latham, that the School Building Committee approve the June 8, 20 16 SBC Meeting Minutes.

The PMS School Building Committee voted unanimously to approve the June 8, 2016 SBC Meeting Minutes. For: 10 - Opposed: 0

Approval of Budget Revision Request for Feasibility Study

2. It was noted that a Budget Revision Request (BRR) for the Feasibility Study budget is not needed because the budget remains as presented and agreed to in the Feasibility Study Agreement.

II. Preliminary Design Program (PDP) Submission

Discuss Outcome of Conference Call with MSBA

3. Chris Alles was introduced as the new MSBA Project Manager taking Caulen Finch's place.
4. It was explained to MSBA that the Two-School option was the best solution both from an educational and a geographical perspective. It was further noted that the City has a maximum budget of between \$55M and \$60M. Given the fiscal parameters, it was noted that the Two-School option may be out of reach unless the MSBA is willing to contribute to the additional square footage that a Two-School option requires over a One-School option in that many common spaces such as Cafeteria, Kitchen, Gymnasium, Media Center, etc. need to be duplicated.
5. A matrix indicating the square footage required of a One-School and a Two-School option was presented to MSBA. It was noted that an additional approximately 30,000 SF would be needed for a Two-School based on the educational program of spaces and the MSBA space guidelines.
6. The MSBA made no commitment in terms of participation in the additional SF and indicated that they needed to review the Preliminary Program Submission and gain an understanding of the options and the supporting information first.

Review of Square Footage Required for 1- and 2-School Options

7. RDA indicated that a school for 1,660 students would be approximately 277,725 SF based on the Educational Program and the Space Summary developed. The MSBA base SF based on number of student is 268,800 SF.
8. RDA indicated that two schools for 1,660 students, based on the Educational Program and the Space Summaries developed, would be 125,910 SF for 660 students in the Pickering area and 181,847 SF for 1,000 students in the West Lynn area if the TMMS school model was used. This results in a total 307,757 SF which is 30,032 SF over the One-School option. RDA discussed where the additional SF was attributed.
9. There was discussion as to whether the educational program could be modified or if the utilization of academic spaces could be maximized to allow sharing of space to accommodate the desired educational program while allowing for a reduction in SF. The middle schools in Lynn use a "waterfall" scheduling method which makes sharing classroom/academic space difficult to accomplish.
10. RDA, LeftField, the Superintendent and the middle school principals will meet on Thursday, June 30, 2016 to review the middle school educational program and the SF of spaces to determine if SF can be reduced or if specific spaces could be shared.

Review Cost of Options Prepared by Independent Cost Estimator

11. Independent estimates were performed for each option by PM&C.
12. PM&C's estimates were compared to the estimates prepared by RDA. It was noted that RDA was previously using an average of \$400/SF and that PM&C's estimates averaged \$425/SF based on current projections for construction costs in the next few years.

13. RDA reviewed the construction costs of each option including the various variations:

Option 1 – 660 Student Repair Only of Pickering:	\$29,079,922
Option 1.1 – 1,000 Student New West Lynn MS:	\$77,600,142
Option A – Reconfigure Breed MS for Parity:	\$25,782,123
Option 2 – 1,660 Student Renovation/Addition of Pickering:	\$137,332,573
Option 3.1 – 1,000 Student New West Lynn MS:	\$77,003,442
Option 3.2 – 660 Student Renovation/Addition of Pickering:	\$30,083,758
Option 4.1 – 1,000 Student New Pickering MS:	\$76,453,959
Option 4.2 – +660 Student Breed MS Renovation/Addition:	\$59,922,348
Option 5 – 1,660 Student New Pickering MS:	\$112,675,500
Option 6.1 - 1,000 Student New West Lynn MS:	\$77,003,442
Option 6.2 - 660 Student New Pickering MS:	\$56,948,070

14. It was noted that the Total Project Costs were being calculated at 26.5% of the construction costs.

15. It was noted that MSBA currently participates in \$312/SF which was recently increased from \$299/SF. For reference, MSBA's participation in the TMMS project was \$275/SF.

16. It was decided that the best case scenario for the City would be a Two-School option with MSBA participating in the additional SF. This scenario with put the City's share at approximately \$64.5M without contingencies. It was noted that with contingencies, the City share would at approximately \$69M.

Review Overall Budgets and Assumptions Included for Each Option

17. It was noted that costs were carried for, as appropriate to each option, property takings, ledge removal, specialized foundation systems, abatement, minimal soils contamination, phasing, site logistics and permitting issues.

18. The debt service analyzes for a \$55M, \$60M and \$70M project was discussed and it was reiterated that the City wants to be between \$55M and \$60M to avoid a debt exclusion. It was confirmed that the City would not want to do a partial debt exclusion.

19. With a Two-School option, the City even with MSBA participation in the additional SF is higher than where the City would like to be for their share. It is therefore necessary to more thoroughly review the other options and have a back-up plan.

20. A Two-School option with the second school deferred two years was discussed. RDA indicated that there would be a 10% increase in cost to defer.

21. The One-School option at the Reservoir site is achievable. It could be split into two schools sharing the common spaces. It would require re-districting to move West Lynn students to the closer Breed MS and moving students from Breed MS to the new school to avoid the transportation issues. This option could get the City where they need to be with their share.

22. It was noted that a One-School option at Gallagher Park, while it would fit, would be difficult for the tight streets and dense residential neighborhood. No other sites could accommodate the One-School option.

23. RDA will look at what could be accommodated in the Two-School option if the City's budget was set at \$60M and determine what the reduction in SF would need to be and how the Educational Program would be affected.
24. Direction is needed from the Mayor's Office and the City Council. J. Cerulli will reach out to the Mayor and the City Council President to set up a meeting for July 8th or 11th.

Confirm PDP Submission Date

25. It was noted that July 20th was the latest date that the PDP Submission could be submitted to make the November 9, 2016 MSBA Board Meeting for the Preferred Schematic Report. Therefore, it was decided that the PDP would be submitted on July 20, 2016 to allow time to meet with the Mayor and City Council President and to schedule another SBC Meeting to review and vote on the submission.

Vote to Submit PDP Submission

26. The vote to submit the PDP will be taken at the July 14, 2016 SBC Meeting.

III. Public Forum Preparation

Confirm Date for next Public Forum

27. The date of Public Forum #2 will be decided at the July 14th SBC Meeting. Mid-September was discussed as a potential timeframe as it would be prior to the submission of the Preferred Schematic Report.
28. There was a reminder that the next Public Forum is to be held in the Thurgood Marshall Middle School and that there will be tours after.
29. It was noted that a time capsule was found at the old TMMS which will be opened at the Ribbon Cutting. It was questioned if the Pickering had a time capsule but no one knew.

IV. Schedule Update

Review Schedule

30. The Project Schedule was updated to include dates of all scheduled meetings and some dates for proposed meetings were confirmed.

V. Budget Update

Review Project Budget

31. The Project Budget was attached to the meeting minutes which included all expenditures to date.

VI. Other Business/Discussions

32. No other business was discussed.

VII. Next Meeting

33. The next PMSBC meeting will be scheduled for July 14, 2016 at 11:00 AM in Room 402. LeftField will send out the meeting packet in advance of the meeting.
34. A Meeting to discuss the Education Program and SF was scheduled for June 30, 2016 at 11:00 AM in the Superintendent's Office.
35. A Finance Meeting will be scheduled for either July 8th or July 11th at 11:00 AM in the Mayor's Office.

VIII. Adjournment

1. The following motion and vote were made:

MOTION: M. Donovan moved, seconded by P. Caron, that the School Building Committee vote to adjourn the meeting at 12:16 PM.

The PMS School Building Committee voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 12:16 PM.

For: 10 - Opposed: 0

These meeting minutes represent what is presumed to be a complete and accurate account of the items reviewed, discussed, directions given and conclusions drawn unless notification to the contrary is received by the next regular construction meeting. If no notification is received, these minutes will be deemed an accurate account of the meeting.

Prepared by,
Lynn Stapleton
LeftField Project Management, Inc.