

3.3.5

LOCAL ACTIONS AND APPROVALS

July 2018

NORTHEAST METROPOLITAN REGIONAL VOCATIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

100 HEMLOCK ROAD • WAKEFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01880-3597

781-246-0810 • FAX 781-246-4919



12/23/2020

Ms. Mary Pichetti
Director of Capital Planning
40 Broad Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Dear Ms. Pichetti:

The Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational School District School Building Committee ("SBC") has completed its review of the Feasibility Study *Preferred Schematic Report* for the Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational High school project (the "Project"), and on 12/10/2020, the SBC voted to approve and authorize the Owner's Project Manager to submit the Feasibility Study related materials to the MSBA for its consideration. A certified copy of the SBC meeting minutes, which includes the specific language of the vote and the number of votes in favor, opposed, and abstained, will follow this submission. A draft version of the 12/10/2020 SBC minutes have been attached for reference.

Since the MSBA's Board of Directors invited the District to conduct a Feasibility Study on April 10th, 2019 the SBC has held nine meetings regarding the proposed project, in compliance with the state Open Meeting Law. Notice of these meetings is posted at the main entrance of the existing High School (100 Hemlock Rd, Wakefield MA 01880). Notice is typically posted well in advance of 48 hours prior to each meeting. Notice of the SBC meetings along with any handouts, presentations, previous meeting minutes, etc. are also posted at the project's website: www.northeastbuildingproject.com. This website also enables residents to be able to ask questions and/or provide direct feedback to the District and project team. The nine SBC meetings are as follows:

- 1) May 9th, 2019 – 5:00 P.M. at the existing High School's Library
- 2) August 8th, 2019 – 5:00 P.M. at the existing High School's Library
- 3) May 21st, 2020 – 5:00 P.M. held virtually via Zoom.us (due to COVID-19)
- 4) June 25th, 2020 – 5:00 P.M. held virtually via Zoom.us (due to COVID-19)
- 5) August 13th, 2020 – 6:00 P.M. held virtually via Zoom.us (due to COVID-19)
- 6) September 10th, 2020 – 5:30 P.M. held at the existing High School's Library and virtually via Zoom.us (due to COVID-19 Pandemic)

July 2018

- 7) October 8th, 2020 – 5:30 P.M. held at the existing High School’s Library and virtually via Zoom.us (due to COVID-19 Pandemic)
- 8) November 12th, 2020 – 5:30 P.M. held at the existing High School’s Library and virtually via Zoom.us (due to COVID-19 Pandemic)
- 9) December 10th, 2020 – 5:30 P.M. held at the existing High School’s Library and virtually via Zoom.us (due to COVID-19 Pandemic)

Northeast Metro Tech School Building Committee Meetings:

May 9, 2019- 5:00 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
Dawn Armistead	Joseph Capraro	<i>Vincent Carisella</i>	Patricia Cronin	Deborah Davis
David DiBarri	<i>Judith Dymont</i>	<i>Jeanne Feeley</i>	Henry Hooton	Ronald Jannino
<i>Grant Leung</i>	Stephen Maio	Robert McCarthy	Larry Means	Ted Nickole (Chair)
<i>Joseph Papagni</i>	James Picone	Peter Rossetti, Jr.	Carla Scuzzarella	Michael T. Wall

Chairman Ted Nickole and Superintendent David DiBarri presented to the SBC the purpose of the meeting and provide updates regarding the MSBA process as well as potential ideas for the construction project (call to order at 5:00 P.M.)

Mr. DiBarri noted to the committee that the District had been officially invited into the Feasibility Study and is on schedule. From here, Mr. DiBarri noted to the committee that the next 3 months would involve forming a selection team to select the Owner’s Project Manager (OPM), which would involve proposal review and interviews to determine the best qualified candidate. From there, a selection team will be formed to select the Designer for the project. Mr. James Picone then began to present a full explanation on the requirements of the MSBA process for the next phase.

Mr. Picone informed the SBC that the OPM will oversee the entirety of the building operation and is a crucial party between the SBC and contractors. The process will involve the selection team approving the “Request for Services” (RFS) that will outline the project and scope of services. Mr. Picone noted the advertisement for the RFS for OPM Services would be listed on the Central Register as well as an advertisement in the Wakefield Item, hoping to be posted on May 15th, 2019. Mr. Picone noted once applications are received and reviewed, a short list of applicants will have to be determined by the selection committee to interview and ask a similar set of questions. Mr. Picone said once a firm is chosen that salary negotiations would begin and noted \$200,000 a year would be an approximate guess to the cost. Mr. Picone ended the discussion noting the goal is to have the final selection signed off from the MSBA by August 5th.

Mr. Picone informed the SBC that the subcommittee should encompass the Chair, himself as the certified purchasing agent, and three other members form the SBC. The commitment would be from early June 2019- August 9th 2019 (anticipated OPM contract

July 2018

execution date). The other members joining the subcommittee were Pat Cronin, Judy Dymment, and Ron Jannino (members would have to confirm within 24hrs to finalize).

Chairman Ted Nickole informed the SBC he and Superintendent DiBarri reviewed the current access road conditions to view potential planning for a secondary access road to the site during construction and that an overlay with findings will be created for mapping purposes. Mr. Nickole also informed the SBC that a potential new school building could be built in the lower practice fields, and it would be beneficial for SBC members to walk the area the next nice day to review this potential location. A consideration of land swapping was discussed with the SBC as well for the back area in which shops could be built on the lower level and upwards in the building would be offices and classrooms.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

VOTE: Ms. Armistead nominated Ms. Davis as Chairman of OPM Selection/Hiring Subcommittee. Ms. Cronin seconded the nomination. The motion passed unanimously. 15-0-0

VOTE: Ms. Davis motioned for the SBC to approve the authorization of the appointment of the OPM Selection Committee as listed above (Deborah David, James Picone, Patricia Cronin, Judy Dymment, and Ron Jannino). Ms. Armistead seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. 15-0-0

VOTE: Ms. Nickole motioned for the SBC to approve the RFS for OPM Services and authorize the advertisement of the RFS for OPM Services as listed above. Mr. Maio seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. 15-0-0

VOTE: Ms. Davis motioned for the SBC to authorize the Superintendent as the governmental officer who has the full legal authority under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and all applicable local charters, ordinances, and by-laws to execute and deliver the Feasibility Study Agreement, and any amendments thereto, on behalf of the Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational School District and to bind Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational School District to its terms and conditions as presented. Mr. Maio seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. 15-0-0

VOTE: Ms. Davis motioned the SBC to authorize the Superintendent as appointed governmental officer who has the full legal authority under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and all applicable local charters, ordinances, and bylaws to make final, binding decisions on behalf of the NEMRVS District with respect to the proposed project described in the Feasibility Study Agreement, and any amendment thereto, as presented. Ms. Cronin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. 15-0-0

July 2018

August 8th, 2019 – 5:00 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
<i>Dawn Armistead</i>	Joseph Capraro	Vincent Carisella	<i>Patricia Cronin</i>	Deborah Davis
David DiBarri	Judith Dymont	<i>Jeanne Feeley</i>	<i>Henry Hooton</i>	Ronald Jannino
<i>Grant Leung</i>	Stephen Maio	Robert McCarthy	Larry Means	Ted Nickole (Chair)
<i>Joseph Papagni</i>	James Picone	Peter Rossetti, Jr.	Carla Scuzzarella	Michael T. Wall
PMA Consultants				
Kevin Nigro	Joseph DeSantis	Anthony LoPresti		

Chairman Nickole opened the meeting by thanking all for attending and informed the SBC that PMA Consultants, LLC. was chosen by the OPM RFS subcommittee to be the OPM for the project. Chairman Nickole then handed over the floor to PMA Consultants representatives to introduce themselves and next steps in a PowerPoint presentation.

PMA team members present introduced themselves and Kevin Nigro reiterated PMA personnel on their proposal who were not present for the meeting. Kevin noted the PMA staffing plan involves the key members present at the meeting, the core project managers, and other key staff in an advisory role regarding vocational aspects. Kevin noted PMA also has Peter Bradley from PM&C who will perform cost estimates on behalf of the Owner.

PMA presented to the SBC their previous experience highlighting previous vocational school project experience (Essex Tech, Somerville High School) along with complex project sites with challenging aspects that are present at Northeast. Kevin then let Joe DeSantis highlight the next steps for the District as they progress through the MSBA process.

Joe DeSantis noted the MSBA process has 8 modules, in which the District is currently in Module 2- Forming the Project Team. Joe noted the next step for the District is to develop an RFS for Designer Services in which similar to the OPM selection, the District will receive multiple proposals from numerous firms and have to interview a short list of companies before ultimately choosing the Designer of the project in conjunction with MSBA Designer Selection Panel (DSP) members. PMA noted to the District to anticipate roughly 7 designer firms to submit for the project as Vocational School projects are highly sought after. Kevin highlighted that PMA has worked with numerous architects that are anticipated to submit a proposal for this project and how this is a huge benefit to the District as it lets the project team hit the ground running.

After questions regarding the MSBA process were answered, Kevin noted the goal for the District was to advertise for designers in early October and ultimately choosing a designer soon thereafter. PMA noted once a designer is chosen and a fee structure is negotiated, the District will enter in Module 3- Feasibility Study in which the District/project team will study existing conditions of the School and project site, and

July 2018

review three different project scenarios; renovation only, addition/renovation, and new construction. PMA noted the Feasibility Study consists of two major milestone submissions, the Preliminary Design Plan (PDP) and the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR). PMA highlighted that the PDP will eliminate design options that do not meet education or project goals, and the PSR will ultimately be the submission to the MSBA from the District that show's the preferred project option. PMA noted down the road once a design option is chosen from the District the two construction methods with be Mass General Law 149 and 149a, General Contractor or Construction Manager @ Risk. PMA ended the presentation noting the project timeline to progress through all MSBA modules should run from 2019 to 2025.

Chairman Nickole noted the designer selection process is a lengthy process and will need a subcommittee just like the OPM selection process to home in on District specifics when reviewing designer proposals. Chairman Nickole also noted the subcommittee will have to attend in person interviews with the MSBA DSP to develop a shortlist of designers for the project, and further attend in person interviews of the shortlist of designers with the MSBA DSP to ultimately choose a designer for the project. The subcommittee for the District was decided to be 3 members from the SBC; Superintendent David DiBarri, Deborah Davis, and Judy Dymment.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:52 P.M.

July 2018

May 21st, 2020 – 5:00 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
Dawn Armistead	Joseph Capraro	<i>Vincent Carisella</i>	Patricia Cronin	Deborah Davis
David DiBarri	Judith Dymont	<i>Jeanne Feeley</i>	<i>Henry Hooton</i>	Ronald Jannino
Grant Leung	Stephen Maio	<i>Robert McCarthy</i>	Larry Means	Ted Nickole (Chair)
Joseph Papagni	James Picone	Peter Rossetti, Jr.	Carla Scuzzarella	<i>Michael T. Wall</i>
PMA Consultants				
Kevin Nigro	Joseph DeSantis	Anthony LoPresti		
DRA Architects				
Carl Franceschi	Vladimir Lyubetsky			
Other				
James Comeau- DCR				

Chairman Nickole opened the meeting by thanking all for attending. Superintendent DiBarri noted the project is continuing despite COVID-19 impacts to the state and country, noting that the project is over a year away from any voting to take place for funding. Superintendent DiBarri explained that the project team decided to extend the PDP submission by two months in order to maximize public/SBC outreach prior to conclusion of the Feasibility Study.

Joe DeSantis of PMA noted that MSBA Module 2 (Forming the Project Team) was complete the beginning of January 2020 when the District officially contracted with DRA and the project has moved onto MSBA Module 3 (Feasibility Study). Mr. DeSantis noted the Feasibility Study consists of two design submissions to the MSBA, the PDP and PSR. Mr. DeSantis noted PMA, DRA, and the District will work together through the Feasibility Study process to narrow down the project options through extensive studies of existing conditions and District goals. The PDP outlines all potential options and begins to eliminate options that are less advantageous. The PSR further eliminates options for the District and concludes with the recommendation for one single preferred project option for MSBA review/approval. Mr. DeSantis noted the preliminary timeline to anticipate a project funding vote is November/December 2021. Mr. DeSantis noted the project website was currently under development and stated it will be a great tool for the public to stay up to date on the project.

Carl Franceschi and Vladimir Lyubetsky introduced themselves and immediately began discussing PDP deliverables, notably the Educational Plan, Space Summaries, Existing Conditions, and Preliminary Options. Mr. Franceschi noted the Educational Plan that will be included in the PDP submission to the MSBA will highlight the current limitations at the existing High School and the future goals/vision for the District. Mr. Franceschi noted that educational visioning sessions were held with a great cross section of people put forth within the District/High School to note these deficiencies/future goals, including promoting project based learning, creating small learning career clusters, placement of

July 2018

shops in close proximity to related academic classrooms, etc. Mr. Franceschi and Mr. Lyubetsky then gave a rundown of preliminary site options including renovating the existing high school to code, renovating/adding onto the existing High School, and new construction options on the north/west/and south side of the property (options C1, C2/C2a, and C3). Mr. Franceschi expressed the importance of improving access to the existing school along with secondary/emergency access out of the property, for each option this secondary access road would be reviewed extensively. Mr. Anthony LoPresti furthered on option C.3, noting the potentially large extent of blasting required to build on the southern portion of the site. Mr. Franceschi noted the key takeaway regarding these options is that they are very preliminary, and many iterations will be reviewed/presented with changes as the feasibility study progresses. A preliminary evaluation tool was presented and discussed by Mr. Franceschi. Mr. Franceschi requested that the SBC review the criteria and provide feedback for the next meeting.

Chairman Nickole also noted before the floor was opened to questions that the District and the project team would have to coordinate with DCR as the Breakheart Reservation begin right next to the property would potentially be affected by a construction project. Mr. Nickole noted a DCR subcommittee for coordination was going to be reviewed further but the project team had already reached out to DCR to kick off conversations and to assist the design team as they investigate each preliminary option. SBC members inquired on incorporation of an auditorium into the new building, and Mr. DeSantis noted that in order for reimbursement from the MSBA, the District needs to justify the Auditorium via the Educational Plan.

Chairman Nickole inquired if all new building options would be the same square footage regardless of location on the project site. Mr. Franceschi noted certain new building options are only possible within certain locations, and each option will have a limit as to what enrollment they can support. Mr. Franceschi noted the square footage will change drastically with what eventual enrollment option is put forth to the MSBA but the existing school is not big enough for the existing student enrollment (1250). Mr. Franceschi reminded the SBC that all current estimates of square footage are preliminary and are based on the MSBA's space summary template.

Mr. Jannino inquired if there had been discussions or investigation to see if Breakheart would have a separate entrance rather than through the School property. Mr. Franceschi noted that this will be added to the preliminary evaluation matrix as a criteria for option evaluation. Mr. Nigro noted the project team reached out to DCR to introduce them to the project and that the District was studying preliminary options. Superintendent DiBarri asked Chairman Nickole to appoint a few SBC members as liaisons between the District/DCR and schedule a formal kick off meeting to continue proper coordination.

Mr. Franceschi noted the importance of keeping all communities informed of project updates for their input and how the SBC is a great tool in assisting in reaching out to their home communities for engagement in the project. Mr. Franceschi noted normally the design team and OPM would hold community workshops to gather input but with current COVID-19 restrictions this is not possible.
Meeting was adjourned at 6:17 P.M.

July 2018

June 25th, 2020 – 5:00 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
<i>Dawn Armistead</i>	<i>Joseph Capraro</i>	<i>Vincent Carisella</i>	<i>Patricia Cronin</i>	<i>Deborah Davis</i>
<i>David DiBarri</i>	<i>Michael T. Wall</i>	<i>Judith Dymant</i>	<i>Jeanne Feeley</i>	<i>Henry Hooton</i>
<i>Ronald Jannino</i>	<i>Grant Leung</i>	<i>Stephen Maio</i>	<i>Robert McCarthy</i>	<i>Larry Means</i>
<i>Ted Nickole (Chair)</i>	<i>Joseph Papagni</i>	<i>James Picone</i>	<i>Peter Rossetti, Jr.</i>	<i>Carla Scuzzarella</i>
PMA Consultants				
<i>Kevin Nigro</i>	<i>Joseph DeSantis</i>	<i>Anthony LoPresti</i>		
DRA Architects				
<i>Carl Franceschi</i>	<i>Vladimir Lyubetsky</i>			
Other				
<i>James Comeau- DCR</i>	<i>Sean Grant- DCR</i>			

Chairman Nickole opened the meeting at 5:02 P.M. noting the unfortunate passing of SBC Member Ron Jannino, and that most SBC members were attending Mr. Jannino's services. The District/project team agreed to move forward with the meeting although there was not a quorum present.

Joe DeSantis presented to the SBC regarding the current project timeline and MSBA reimbursement process. Mr. DeSantis noted the project remained on track for PDP submission in August, and multiple SBC votes would be required at the meeting before PDP submission including elimination of options and a vote to allow the project team to submit the PDP package to the MSBA. The PSR is still on track to be submitted to the MSBA the end of 2020/early 2021 which is dependent upon the MSBA's 2021 Board Meeting Schedule. Mr. DeSantis noted the MSBA provides a percentage-based reimbursement for eligible project costs, noting each District starts at 31% plus 3 socioeconomic factors (community income factor, community property wealth factor, and community poverty factor) along with potential additional points via incentive options into the new project. Mr. DeSantis noted the incentive points that make sense for this project to target include High Efficiency Green School Program (up to 2 points) and Best Practices for Routine and Capital Maintenances (up to 2 points). Mr. DeSantis noted for renovation projects up to 5 additional reimbursement points are possible but is calculated based of the ratio of addition vs. renovated spaces.

Chairman Nickole inquired on the different levels of LEED rating, specifically targeting a higher LEED rated project but weighing the cost benefit of this. PMA noted this varies for each project, and the team will need to determine the feasibility once the preferred option is selected.

Mr. DeSantis noted the District's current reimbursement rate (including 0 incentive points) is 63.34%, but the District is not locked into this current rate until the MSBA Board of Directors Project Scope and Budget Approval, which is currently targeted for

August 2021. PMA then further discussed how the MSBA reimbursement rate is applied to eligible project costs, and noted the following major cost caps:

- PMA noted construction costs exceeding \$333 per eligible SF (along with eligible demo/abatement) will not be deemed eligible for reimbursement. A slide was shown of MSBA cost data to demonstrate the current gap between this \$333/SF cap and the current average MSBA project's construction cost.
- FF&E/Technology costs over \$2400/student are ineligible for reimbursement
- Soft costs exceeding 20% of construction costs will not be eligible for reimbursement.
- Costs related to sitework that exceed 8% of direct building costs will not be eligible for reimbursement.
- Eligibility of owner's construction contingency is capped at 1% of construction costs.

Mr. Anthony LoPresti noted for the Somerville High School project, the total project cost is \$255,982,704 and the MSBA reimbursement rate is 75.29% but the maximum potential MSBA grant was determined to be \$123,963,307 (48.4% of the total project cost is all budgeted eligible costs are incurred and eligibility is maintained). Mr. LoPresti spoke to the many advantages within the MSBA reimbursement process, including the ability to submit monthly reimbursement requests to assist Districts with cashflow throughout the life of the project. Mr. LoPresti also spoke to the monthly MSBA reports required to be submitted each month which help keep the MSBA coordinators up to date on the project as it progresses.

Carl Franceschi of DRA continued the PowerPoint presentation speaking to the progression of the District's Educational plan and reminded the SBC this is included within the PDP submission. Mr. Franceschi noted per the MSBA space summary a 1250 student enrollment would result in a 352,000 SF building, 1600 would result in 393,000 SF building, and 1722 would result in 416,000 SF building. An SBC member inquired if it is too late to add a fifth student enrollment option between the two upper ranges, and the project team agreed to add a fifth student enrollment option of 1660 students. Mr. Franceschi proceeded to discuss preliminary design options along with a matrix to demonstrate the feasibility of each conceptual option to accommodate each student enrollment option being studied.

DRA noted the base repair option does not address current educational deficiencies of the current school enrollment. Option A involving renovation only can similarly not accommodate any current educational deficiencies of the current student enrollment due to the existing building's size. Options B.1 and B.2 are addition/renovation options and B.2 was created due to the fact B.1 cannot support higher ranges of the student enrollment. Options C.1, C.2, and C.3 are new construction options on site. Option C.1 cannot accommodate the higher student enrollment options. Option C.2A involves acquiring a small parcel adjacent to the site and slightly adjusting Option C.2; however, the parcel in question was deemed to be largely unbuildable. Option D.1 involving new construction off site was discussed, and when reviewing the viability of off-site construction options, the project team and SBC did not find it feasible.

July 2018

DRA provided displayed updated preliminary floor plans by each level along with site plans, section views, and phasing plans for each option. Mr. Franceschi noted that Option B.1 and B.2 would seem to directly contrast goals of the educational plan vs. new construction options which would enable goals of the educational program to come to fruition. The final slide of the presentation discussed by DRA included a draft evaluation matrix of each option along with key criteria including: educational plan accommodation, project cost/long term value, disruption/phasing, flexibility/enrollment accommodation, site access/safety/circulation, and final site layout.

DRA noted while all new construction options appear to be favorable to the project team/District members, Option C.3 appears to be the most advantageous due to optimal layout, distance from the existing school, and site opportunities. The SBC members agreed Option C.3 appears to be the preferred option at this point in time. Chairman Nickole noted he has been in conversations with DCR representatives, and when reviewing preliminary options, they too agreed Option C.3 appeared to be the most advantageous.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:14 P.M.

July 2018

August 13th, 2020 – 6:00 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
Dawn Armistead	Joseph Capraro	Vincent Carisella	<i>Patricia Cronin</i>	Deborah Davis
David DiBarri	<i>Michael T. Wall</i>	Judith Dymont	<i>Jeanne Feeley</i>	<i>Henry Hooton</i>
Melissa Jannino-Elam	<i>Grant Leung</i>	Stephen Maio	Robert McCarthy	Larry Means
Ted Nickole (Chair)	Joseph Papagni	James Picone	Peter Rossetti, Jr.	Carla Scuzzarella
PMA Consultants				
Kevin Nigro	Joseph DeSantis	Anthony LoPresti		
DRA Architects				
Carl Franceschi	Vladimir Lyubetsky			
Other				
<i>James Comeau- DCR</i>	<i>Sean Grant- DCR</i>			

Chairman Nickole opened the meeting by thanking all for attending. Superintendent DiBarri noted the project is continuing despite COVID-19 impacts to the state and country, noting that the project is over a year away from any voting to take place for funding. Superintendent DiBarri explained that the project team decided to extend the PDP submission by two months in order to maximize public/SBC outreach prior to conclusion of the Feasibility Study.

Mr. DeSantis noted the agenda for the presentation for the meeting regarding required SBC votes, OPM update, and Designer update/review of PDP content. Mr. DeSantis noted the general status update for the project, noting the goal for the feasibility study is for the District to present the most advantageous project for the goals of the District and seek MSBA approval. Mr. DeSantis noted the major sections of the PDP criteria, noting various construction options along with different enrollment scenarios. Mr. DeSantis the goal after the PDP submission is to further study the options presented in the PDP as feasible and narrow down to 1 preferred option, this phase being the PSR. Mr. DeSantis reiterated on the OPM handout there is a milestone schedule to follow along with where the District is within the MSBA process for reference even after the meeting.

Mr. DeSantis then presented on MSBA reimbursement, noting it is percentage based on eligible costs only. Mr. DeSantis noted the District's current rate is 63.34% with no incentive points included but is most likely to increase prior to being locked into Project Scope & Budget Approval which is being targeted approximately 1 year from now. Mr. DeSantis noted typical caps on reimbursement include \$333/SF, site work costs over 8% of the direct building costs, and \$2400/student cap on FF&E / Technology. Mr. DeSantis ended the OPM update noting an example of MSBA reimbursement from another PMA

project, Somerville High School (75.29% reimbursement rate, cost caps /ineligible costs reducing that rate to just under 50%).

Mr. Carl Franceschi thanked everyone for attending and noted the 3 key parts of the PDP; Educational Plan, Existing Conditions Assessment, and Preliminary Conceptual Options. Mr. Franceschi noted the Educational Plan sets the goals for how the District would like to teach in the future regardless of the future project. Mr. Franceschi noted the existing conditions assessment notes the deficiencies present at the school and more than likely do not meet the goals of the District, and lastly how the preliminary options try to envision how a new project (reno, add/reno, new) try to fix these deficiencies. Mr. Franceschi noted the District's key points for the Educational Plan: Project-Based Learning, 21st Century Learning Environments, Small Learning Communities, Shops in Close Proximity to Academic Classrooms, Safety and Secure Access, and increase from 16 to 19 Career Tech Programs. Mr. Franceschi then explored with the SBC the space summaries and how the different enrollments adjust the size of the future school along with how the template used is for standard high schools and has to be adjusted for vocational school which the MSBA considers.

Mr. Franceschi then ran through the matrix of options that reviews the different preliminary options for renovation, add/reno, new construction on site, and new construction off site to accommodate each study enrollment while also trying to also achieve the goal of the Educational Plan. Mr. Franceschi noted how a pure renovation cannot support additional enrollments currently being studied for the District and how off-site new construction options were not a viable option for the District. Mr. Franceschi noted also some of the add/reno options are also not viable in meeting the higher enrollments being studied but good to know could enable some expansion for the District. Mr. Franceschi ended the matrix of options studies noting the new construction options on site generally could support most enrollment studies while also supporting the goals of the Educational Plan.

Mr. Franceschi then reviewed the add/reno options B.1 and B.2 along with options C.1-C.3 noting the hardships of the site while trying to increase secondary access to the site, reviewing emergency access options, etc. From here, DRA began to present on all options listed above showing potential layouts for the new school, how many stories / locations of administration/shop spaces, the complexities each option could present when actually performing the construction, and how the layouts addressed the deficiencies currently faced from the District with the current building. Mr. Franceschi noted while presenting on each option listed above generally the add/reno options could not support the higher enrollment studies especially with some key aspects of the Educational Plan while most new construction options could indeed support all enrollment studies with the goals of the Educational Plan. DRA then presented noting to the SBC a summary of costs for each option including base repair renovation, add/reno, and new construction with costs ranging from \$115M (base repair), \$195M-\$335M (add/reno-new construction). After reviewing costs, a matrix of the preliminary options against the evaluation criteria was reviewed and most notably, the new construction options best address the goals of the Educational Plan along with optimal layout for the District. The most ideal preliminary option discussed from Chairman Nickole, Judy

July 2018

Dyment, and other SBC members when evaluating the educational/ site logistics needs of the facility was Option C.3.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:56 P.M.

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to approve all prior SBC meeting minutes to date since being invited into the MSBA Feasibility Study. Judy Dyment seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. 15-0-0

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to approve preliminary Options B.2, C.1, C.2, and C.3 for Further Study. Judy Dyment seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. 15-0-0

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to eliminate the 1250 Student Enrollment Option from Further Study. Judy Dyment seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. 15-0-0

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to approve the PDP Package as Compiled, including the Educational Program, Space Summaries, Local Actions & Approvals, and Project's Work Plan, and to Authorize PMA/DRA to Submit the PDP to the MSBA. Judy Dyment seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. 15-0-0

July 2018

September 10th, 2020 – 5:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
Dawn Armitstead	Joseph Capraro	Vincent Carisella	<i>Patricia Cronin</i>	Deborah Davis
David DiBarri	<i>Michael T. Wall</i>	<i>Judith Dymont</i>	<i>Jeanne Feeley</i>	<i>Henry Hooton</i>
Melissa Jannino-Elam	<i>Grant Leung</i>	Stephen Maio	Robert McCarthy	Larry Means
Ted Nickole (Chair)	Joseph Papagni	James Picone	Peter Rossetti, Jr.	Carla Scuzzarella
PMA Consultants				
Kevin Nigro	Joseph DeSantis	Anthony LoPresti		
DRA Architects				
Carl Franceschi	<i>Vladimir Lyubetsky</i>			
Other				
<i>James Comeau- DCR</i>	<i>Sean Grant- DCR</i>	Patty Dulong- Clerk		

Chairman Nickole opened the meeting by thanking all for attending at 5:30 P.M.

Mr. Joe DeSantis of PMA took the floor and gave an update to the SBC on where the District is at in the MSBA process and next steps, specifically the Preferred Schematic Report ("PSR") phase of the project being the next key milestone submission for the District to submit to the MSBA in December 2020, which is essentially the District choosing the best option for the project as reviewed by the District. Mr. DeSantis noted that following the December 2020 submission of the PSR, the District will meet with the MSBA at a Facilities Assessment Subcommittee ("FAS") meeting in January 2021 and then meet with the MSBA Board of Directors in February 2021 for hopeful approval of the PSR.

Mr. Carl Franceschi of DRA then took the floor to explain the process of what will be happening with the project's design aspect over the next few months leading up to the PSR submission, noting the District will narrow down all options as submitted in the Preliminary Design Program ("PDP") to one, single preferred schematic option. Mr. Franceschi noted the Educational Plan will continued to be updated after comments are received by the MSBA through the PDP review process as well as spaces and options get further refined with continued review from the District. Mr. Franceschi noted the space summaries and assigned spaces will have to be finalized as well as an approved enrollment for the potential new school. Mr. Franceschi reiterated these updates will have to occur for all options that were presented as plausible in the PDP submission and then from there the District will analyze and set forth which option is best believed to fulfill the goals of the District.

Mr. DeSantis began to explain the preliminary evaluation of options sheet to the SBC members noting the District should review against their own goals to compare each project option appropriately. Mr. DeSantis noted the evaluation criteria as is currently is project cost, disruption on current schooling, flexibility (enrollment accommodations and

July 2018

expansion potential), operating costs, site accessibility, and final building/site layout. Mr. DeSantis reiterated full feedback on any option, review criteria, etc. is wanted to help the project team best set forth the desired option for the District. Mr. DeSantis also reiterated all options are highly preliminary and nothing is set in stone for any option yet.

Numerous SBC members reiterated the option preference at this point when reviewing the evaluation criteria as is stands today would be C.3, noting is address accessibility concerns from having a new site entrance, site layout, potential for future expansion/flexible spaces, security from Breakheart Reservation visitors, etc.

Mr. Nigro of PMA informed the SBC members National Grid ("NGRID") informed the District a major repair of power lines and towers is expected to occur starting in June 2024 and coordination between this project/NGRID will be needed as well as continued meetings with Breakheart/DCR to keep them up to speed on the latest project developments. Mr. DeSantis ended the presentation noting the District is 3 months way from selecting a preferred option.

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to approve the 08/13/2020 minutes of the Building Committee Meeting, as presented. David DiBarri seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 14-0-0.

VOTE: Peter Rossetti, Jr. motioned for the SBC to adjourn the meeting. Robert McCarthy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 14-0-0, meeting adjourned at 6:20 P.M.

July 2018

October 8th, 2020 – 5:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
Dawn Armitstead	Joseph Capraro	<i>Vincent Carisella</i>	<i>Patricia Cronin</i>	Deborah Davis
David DiBarri	<i>Michael T. Wall</i>	<i>Judith Dymont</i>	<i>Jeanne Feeley</i>	<i>Henry Hooton</i>
Melissa Jannino-Elam	<i>Grant Leung</i>	Stephen Maio	Robert McCarthy	Larry Means
Ted Nickole (Chair)	Joseph Papagni	James Picone	Peter Rossetti, Jr.	Carla Scuzzarella
PMA Consultants				
Kevin Nigro	Joseph DeSantis	Anthony LoPresti		
DRA Architects				
Carl Franceschi	Vladimir Lyubetsky			
Other				
<i>James Comeau- DCR</i>	<i>Sean Grant- DCR</i>	Patty Dulong- Clerk		

Chairman Nickole opened the meeting by thanking all for attending at 5:30 P.M.

Mr. DeSantis of PMA took the floor and gave an overview of the MSBA process, noting the District is in Module 3 of 8- Feasibility Study with the PSR submission being the last step of Module 3. Mr. DeSantis noted the next step after Module 3 is Module 4- Schematic Design in which the preferred option set forth in the PSR is further refined and developed for future MSBA project scope and budget approval which is being targeted for the District in August of 2021. Mr. DeSantis noted from here, the high level schedule items would be funding of the project (voter approval), detailed design, construction document design, bidding, construction, and closeout. Mr. DeSantis noted the District was still awaiting PDP submission comments from the MSBA but noted through some emails that there appears to be no major concerns from the MSBA on the submission.

Mr. Franceschi of DRA noted the next two major steps for the PSR submission will be to 1) Summarize to the SVA the evaluation criteria for the PSR submission and conclusions the District made from the evaluation criteria and 2) Substantiate and Document the recommendation to the MSBA following the proper guidelines. Mr. Franceschi then provided an update on existing conditions, evaluation of alternatives (most notably B.2-C.1-C.2-C.3) including site layouts, building design/layouts, grading, etc. Options C1 and C2 were noted to limit footprint as well as not being able to accommodate best the larger enrollments being studied. For Option C.3 the new accessible road from Farm. Street was reviewed, noting this would be the new primary access for the District while also having Hemlock Road as secondary access out of the site. Mr. Franceschi also noted if preferred, Option C.3 would leave numerous options for future athletic fields in the locations of the existing fields/the location of the current high school. For all options, educational plan incorporation, costs, construction disruption during the school year, flexibility of the option for space use/future expansion, operating costs, etc. were all

July 2018

reviewed and to the SBC members Option C.3 looked to best accommodate against the evaluation criteria.

Mr. Franceschi ended the presentation highlighting upcoming meetings for the project team, and Mr. DeSantis noted even though a higher enrollment option is preferred the project team will carry forward lower enrollment options for comparison purposes regarding building size, cost, etc. Mr. DeSantis reiterated once again come December 202 the SBC will need to vote on one enrollment/design option.

VOTE: David DiBarri motioned for the SBC to approve the 09/10/2020 minutes of the Building Committee Meeting, as presented. Deborah Davis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 13-0-0.

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to adjourn the meeting. Peter Rossetti, Jr. seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 13-0-0, meeting adjourned at 6:10 P.M.

July 2018

November 12th, 2020 – 5:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
Dawn Armitstead	Joseph Capraro	Vincent Carisella	Patricia Cronin	Deborah Davis
David DiBarri	Michael T. Wall	Judith Dymant	<i>Jeanne Feeley</i>	<i>Henry Hooton</i>
Melissa Jannino-Elam	<i>Grant Leung</i>	Stephen Maio	Robert McCarthy	<i>Larry Means</i>
Ted Nickole (Chair)	Joseph Papagni	James Picone	Peter Rossetti, Jr.	Carla Scuzzarella
PMA Consultants				
Kevin Nigro	Joseph DeSantis	Anthony LoPresti		
DRA Architects				
Carl Franceschi	Vladimir Lyubetsky			
Other				
<i>James Comeau- DCR</i>	<i>Sean Grant- DCR</i>	Patty Dulong- Clerk		

Chairman Nickole opened the meeting by thanking all for attending.

Mr. DeSantis of PMA took the floor and provided a progress update on the District's progression during the PSR phase. Mr. DeSantis noted there were dozens of meetings with the project team and faculty leaders regarding project options, individual shop space allotment, existing vs. proposed square footage against current guidelines, furniture/equipment needs, etc. Mr. DeSantis/Mr. LoPresti noted throughout these meetings Northeast staff reiterated option C.3 was the option most liked and reminded the SBC that the SBC must select one preferred construction-student enrollment option that the District wants to move forward with. Mr. LoPresti noted to the SBC that key project milestones were still on track and the next major activity regarding the schedule would be the PSR submission to the MSBA next month. Mr. DeSantis noted to the SBC members that the District had received the MSBA's PDP comments and responded accordingly, noting there were no major comments or atypical comments at this point in the MSBA process.

Mr. Franceschi of DRA summarized the matrix of options to the SBC, highlighting the 5 different enrollments being studied against the numerous project options being considered addressing which project options best address the District's goals and needs. Mr. Franceschi then presented on numerous graphics with the various options highlighting building layout, final site layout with athletic field locations, potential future use areas for the District, etc. Mr. Franceschi noted when reviewing the project options against the evaluation criteria and inserted into the matrix of options tables, option C.3 seemed to best address the educational, cost, disruption, flexibility, maintenance, and final site layout goals of the District. Mr. Franceschi noted traffic will be separated from Breakheart Reservation in this option and general traffic on site will be much less due to multiple roadways into and out of the site. Mr. Franceschi noted the access to the shop spaces will be greatly improved in option C.3, and this option best opens the District's site up for future athletic fields and future expansion. Mr. Franceschi also noted shop

July 2018

spaces will all be in closer proximity to classrooms than today's current layout. Mr. Franceschi ended the presentation noting upcoming meetings and that the building will be built to a minimum of LEED silver to achieve 2 additional reimbursement points from the MSBA to reduce cost of the project for District shareholders.

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to approve the 10/08/2020 minutes of the Building Committee Meeting, as presented. Stephen Maio seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 16-0-0.

VOTE: Judith Dymont motioned for the SBC to adjourn the meeting. Deborah Davis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 16-0-0, meeting adjourned at 6:40 P.M.

July 2018

December 10th, 2020 – 5:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
Dawn Armitstead	Joseph Capraro	Vincent Carisella	Patricia Cronin	Deborah Davis
David DiBarri	Michael T. Wall	Judith Dymont	<i>Jeanne Feeley</i>	Henry Hooton
Melissa Jannino-Elam	<i>Grant Leung</i>	Stephen Maio	Robert McCarthy	Larry Means
Ted Nickole (Chair)	Joseph Papagni	James Picone	Peter Rossetti, Jr.	Carla Scuzzarella
PMA Consultants				
Kevin Nigro	Joseph DeSantis	Anthony LoPresti		
DRA Architects				
Carl Franceschi	Vladimir Lyubetsky			
Other				
<i>James Comeau- DCR</i>	<i>Sean Grant- DCR</i>	Patty Dulong- Clerk		

Chairman Nickole opened the meeting by thanking all for attending.

Mr. Joe DeSantis of PMA took the floor and thanked all for attending, noting today is a major milestone for the District and SBC in the MSBA process via voting on the preferred option with the preferred student enrollment as well as voting to authorize PMA/DRA to submit the PSR package to the MSBA. Mr. DeSantis covered a complete progress update from when the project hired PMA to where it stands today, and provided an overview of the preliminary schedule moving forward with key milestone dates as the District moves on from the Feasibility Study (Module #3) to the Schematic Design (Module #4) portion of the MSBA process. Mr. DeSantis noted the Schematic Design module essentially takes the preliminary conceptual drawings and make's the drawings more technical for how the school will actually look and function, cost estimates refined to be as accurate as possible, and eventually lock in the project scope and budget with the MSBA. Mr. DeSantis ran through the different options being studied against a cost estimate table from DRA's cost estimator and PMA's 3rd party consultant, noting that the costs fell into the preliminary ranges as shown during the PDP phase. Option C.3, the perceived preferred option to date, had a final cost estimate of \$317.4M. Mr. DeSantis and Mr. Nigro extended a thank you to the District and SBC for their hard work that has been done to get the project to this point and vote for the PSR to the MSBA.

Mr. Carl Franceschi of DRA presented updates on the PSR process, highlighting key achievements to get to the vote tonight for the preferred solution to be identified. Mr. Franceschi noted to the SBC that the District in conjunction with PMA/DRA continued to extensively refine the educational plan, review disruptions to the current school during construction, site access, flexibility and cost estimates since the last meeting. Mr. Franceschi noted that option C.3 would be the least disruptive to current functionality of the school due to the location the project would occur in on site when compared to the other options being studied, some being addition/renovation and others being built more

July 2018

closely to the current existing school. Mr. Franceschi highlighted when reviewing the matrix of options against the evaluation criteria, option C.3 best matched the goals of the District while also providing much more value to the District and shareholders by opening the site for future expansion. Mr. Franceschi noted to the SBC Option C.3 consisted of three floors with a basement area under the new gymnasium location, parking surrounding the new building, shops and classroom spaces designed to maximize the educational plan of the District, multiple future playing fields with space left over for future expansion, a complete new access road to help ease site traffic, security/congestion issues, a separate maintenance building, etc. Mr. Franceschi noted the building would be built to be a minimum of LEED Silver to also have the District receive 2 extra reimbursement points from the MSBA to help reduce local shareholder costs. Mr. Franceschi noted to the SBC that the submittal to the MSBA of the preferred option is still conceptual, and much more detail would be put into the drawings during the Schematic Design phase.

Mr. DeSantis reiterated to the SBC the cost estimate for Option C.3 was within the range of estimates provided in the PDP submission, noting construction costs in the current estimate was for \$243.5M and overall project cost to be \$317.4M. Mr. DeSantis and Mr. Franceschi noted with this option, early construction package options would be reviewed for work to potentially occur in the Summer-Winter of 2022 with the new construction of the building to begin Spring of 2023 and to be complete Spring/Summer 2025. Phase 3 Demolition would occur in the Summer of 2025 and the new fields being built would be complete by Summer 2026, with the project then closing out with the MSBA by the fall of 2027.

Mr. Franceschi highlighted key meetings that would be occurring over the next few months including weekly project meetings, local community meetings, conservation commission, geotechnical investigation meetings, fire, traffic, security, etc. Mr. DeSantis/Mr. Franceschi ended the presentation by highlighting the overall schedule again, noting the package for the Schematic Design gets submitted to the MSBA in June/July of 2021 and that community outreach would key to involve as much District shareholders as possible to make sure they are up to speed on the details of the project and what it would mean for their community.

Chairman Nickole informed the SBC the recommendation at this point is to vote and approve Option C.3 at the desired student enrollment of 1600 as well as vote to approve PMA/DRA to submit the PSR to the MSA (see votes below and in draft minutes attached to the end of this document).

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to approve the 11/12/2020 minutes of the Building Committee Meeting, as presented. David DiBarri seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 18-0-0.

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to approve the selection of Option C.3 as the preferred construction option with 1,600 students as the desired student enrollment, as presented. David DiBarri seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 18-0-0.

July 2018

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to approve the PSR and all documents included, and to authorize PMA/DRA to submit the PSR to the MSBA, as presented. David DiBarri seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 18-0-0.

VOTE: Peter Rossetti, Jr. motioned for the SBC to adjourn the meeting. Vincent Carisella seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 18-0-0, meeting adjourned at 6:40 P.M.

In addition to the SBC meetings listed above, the District held (10) public meetings, which were posted in compliance with the state Open Meeting Law, at which the Project was discussed. These meetings include:

1. August 8th, 2019 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Conference Room at the High School: Discussion on OPM hiring process/hiring of PMA Consultants. Transfer of Funds from General Fund to the Capital Fund for the Feasibility Study of the School Building Project. Discussion also occurred relating to Saugus MS/HS project as PMA/Kevin Nigro were the OPMs for that project and committee noted to meet with Saugus team to go over school building process. **VOTE: Committee to approve stipulated transfer presented above of \$1,000,000 from the General Fund to the Capital Fund. Unanimous. Motion Carried.**
2. September 12, 2019 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Conference Room at the High School: Update on the building project/next steps including Designer Request for Services (RFS) development between the District/MSBA and main point noted District is tentatively scheduled to appear in front of the MSBA Designer Selection Panel (DSP) on 12/03/2019 to review all proposals and shortlist 3 applicants with interviews scheduled for 2 weeks after the initial DSP date.
3. October 10, 2019 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Conference Room at the High School: Discussion regrading process of looking into CH. 74 programs/new programs for the School Project and need for advisory committee. District also provided update regarding Designer RFS being on track for 12/03/2019 MSBA DSP meeting date with 12/17/2019 target date for interviews.
4. November 14, 2019 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Conference Room at the High School: District noted to the Committee that 3 potential applicants submitted a proposal for the School Project and communications are ongoing with MSBA regarding next steps.
5. January 9, 2020 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Conference Room at the High School: PMA Consultants/DRA presented to the School Committee regarding updates on hiring of the Architect, project milestones completed, and project team entering into the Feasibility Study portion of the project. DRA presented on introducing themselves/experience with vocational schools, key issues for Northeast Metro, and next steps to be discussed during Feasibility Study. Lastly, kick-off meeting with MSBA was discussed noting was to be held on 02/10/2020 at 1pm. **VOTE: That the Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational School District hereby additionally appropriates the amount of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) Dollars for the purpose of paying costs of the feasibility study for Northeast Metropolitan Regional**

Vocational School at 100 Hemlock Rd Wakefield, MA, including all costs incidental and related thereto (the "Study") said amount to be expended under the direction of The Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational School Building Committee. To meet this appropriation the District is authorized to transfer available funds to meet this appropriation. The District acknowledges that the Massachusetts School Building Authority's ("MSBA's") grant program is a non-entitlement, discretionary program based on need, as determined by the MSBA, and any costs the District incurs in excess of any grant approved by and received from the MSBA shall be the sole responsibility of the District; provided further, that the amount of borrowing authorized pursuant to this vote shall be reduced by any grant amount set forth in the Feasibility Study Agreement that may be executed between the District and the MSBA. Unanimous. Motion Carried.

6. May 14, 2020 held virtually via Zoom at 7:00 P.M. due to COVID-19 concerns: Updates regarding school project latest developments/schedule impacts from COVID-19. **VOTE: Committee to approve/recommend to SBC study design enrollment options between 1,250-1,722 students to account for current and future anticipated growth in existing programs, as well as approve the addition of Marketing, Medical Assisting, and Biotechnology CH. 74 programs as detailed in the CH 74. Viability Document and the included table as presented. Unanimous. Motion Carried.**
7. August 13, 2020 held virtually via in person at the Northeast Metro Tech School Library and Zoom at 7:00 P.M. due to COVID-19 concerns: Updates regarding school project moving from PDP phase into PSR phase.
8. September 10th, 2020 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Library at the High School and held virtually via Zoom.us due to the COVID-19 Pandemic: Mr. David DiBarri and Mr. Joe DeSantis of PMA reported to the School Committee on latest project updates as well as noting a vote to approve the Educational Plan set forth in the 08/14/2020 PDP submission to the MSBA. **VOTE: School Committee to approve the Educational Plan as submitted to the MSBA in the Preliminary Design Program on 08/14/2020. Unanimous. Motion Carried.**
9. October 8th, 2020 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Library at the High School and held virtually via Zoom.us due to the COVID-19 Pandemic: Mr. David DiBarri noted to the School Committee that PMA Consultants (owner's project manager) and DRA (architect) continued to provide updates to the SBC regarding project options, building locations, classroom/shop space layouts within new building options, etc. Mr. DiBarri noted to the School Committee the goal of the project team over the next month is to

July 2018

meet with faculty members to gather their input on the future locations/needs of each department. Mr. DiBarri ended the project section of the meeting noting the District continues to work in collaboration with the MSBA and the project is moving along very well.

10. December 10th, 2020 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Library at the High School and held virtually via Zoom.us due to the COVID-19 Pandemic: Updates regarding the school project and latest developments/PSR submission. **VOTE: Committee to approve the selection of Option C.3 as the preferred construction option with 1,600 students as the desired total student enrollment for submittal to the MSBA, as presented. Unanimous. Motion Carried.**

July 2018

The presentation materials for each meeting, meeting minutes, and summary materials related to the Project are available locally for public review at <http://www.northeastbuildingproject.com/> and School Committee meetings information is located at <https://northeastmetrotech.com/> as well as at the existing High School (100 Hemlock Rd, Wakefield MA 01880).

To the best of my knowledge and belief, each of the meetings listed above complied with the requirements of the Open Meeting Law, M.G.L. c. 30A, §§ 18-25 and 940 CMR 29 *et seq.*

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact Anthony LoPresti, Associate with PMA Consultants, at alopresti@pmaconsultants.com

By signing this Local Action and Approval Certification, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information supplied by the District in this Certification is true, complete, and accurate.

By signing this Local Action and Approval Certification, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information supplied by the District in this Certification is true, complete, and accurate.

By signing this Local Action and Approval Certification, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information supplied by the District in this Certification is true, complete, and accurate.



By: David DiBarri

Title: Chief Executive Officer

Date: 12/10/2020



By: David DiBarri

Title: Superintendent of Schools

Date: 12/10/2020



By: Deborah Davis

Title: Chair of the School Committee

Date: 12/10/2020

**NORTHEAST METROPOLITAN REGIONAL VOCATIONAL SCHOOL
DISTRICT SCHOOL COMMITTEE**

School Building Committee Meeting
5:30 P.M. [IN PERSON & VIRTUAL]

December 10, 2020

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Theodore Nickole called the School Building Committee to order at 5:30 p.m. in the Library.

Present

Theodore Nickole
David DiBarri
Deborah Davis
Judith Dymment
Patricia Cronin
Michael T. Wall
Larry Means
Vincent J. Carisella
Peter A. Rossetti
Henry S. Hooton
Melissa Jannino-Elam
Stephen Maio
Carla Scuzzarella
James Picone
Joseph Capraro
Dawn Armitstead
Joseph Papagni
Robert S. McCarthy
Patricia Dulong

Absent

Grant Leung
Jeanne M. Feeley

Others Present

Kevin Nigro,
Anthony LoPresti
Joseph DeSantis
Carl Franceschi
Vladimir Lyubetsky

PMA Consultants, LLC
PMA Consultants, LLC
PMA Consultants, LLC
DRA Architects
DRA Architects

Chairman Nickole opened the meeting by welcoming and thanking all for attending, noting he is very happy that all are well.

II. Prior Meeting Minutes-November 12, 2020 - Discussion & Vote to approve.

MOTION: Ms. Davis moved the Building Committee approve the November 12, 2020 Minutes of the Building Committee Meeting, as presented.

Mr. DiBarri seconded the motion,
By unanimous voice vote.

and the motion carried

SO ORDERED

III. Discussion Topics

a. OPM Update: PMA

Mr. Joe DeSantis of PMA took the floor and noted that one of the important steps to take today is to have the Building Committee approve the preferred option with the preferred student enrollment as well as to vote to authorize PMA and DRA to submit the PSR to the MSBA. Joe covered a complete progress update and overview encompassed on PowerPoint Presentation, reviewed preliminary schedule as well as informed on potential outcome challenges moving forward. Of important note this will bring us very close to the completion of key project milestone Module #3-Feasibility Study, once again reiterating we are 'on point' regarding schedule. When we move on to Module #4-Schematic Design which will be the first time that we take our preliminary drawings and print them for construction drawings with precise specifications. A full report ensued encompassing more specifics on dates and funding schedules.

Mr. Kevin Nigro of PMA noted at this point it is a very exciting project milestone for Building Committee, Northeast School Committee, Staff, Administrators, and all involved getting to take these votes tonight and move with approved PSR submittal to the MSBA. This will allow all of our hard work to leave this room and be able to go on-line to the MSBA; then with a very hopeful positive vote with the MSBA BOD to take us to the next phase Module #4 Schematic Design phase. Mr. Nigro extended a sincere thank you to all for the hard work that has been done.

Mr. DeSantis also reiterated his gratitude to the Committee, and all involved, for their hard work getting us to this important point. Joe then continued with a brief summary of Feasibility Study accomplishments to date.

C.3 continues as the standout option and is still the preferred. Preferences and pluses were noted on.

Summary of costs were covered as well.

The selecting and refining option C.3; approximately 30 meetings have been held to get us to this point allowing us to be ready to submit PSR to MSBA. Once again Mr. DeSantis extended 'thank you'.

III. Discussion Topics(Con't.)

b. Design Update: DRA

- 1.) DRA to present updates on Preferred Schematic Design process.
- 2.) SBC to vote to select option C.3 as the preferred construction option, with 1,600 students as the desired student enrollment.
- 3.) SBC to vote to approve the PSR and all documents included, and to authorize PMA/DRA to submit the PSR to the MSBA.

Mr. Carl Franceschi of DRA presented updates on Preferred Schematic Design process as well as summarized Goals which have been met and are to come.

Summarized/Table of Contents that will be included: Introduction/Education Program/Final Eval of Alternatives /Preferred Solution /Local Actions & Approvals.

Matrix of Options was noted on again.

Focused on 4-design options/C.3 has risen to the top—Value as well (consensus decision).

Options overview reiterated.

Criteria was worked on extensively. Educational-Plan Accommodations, Compliance w/Education/Costs-Project cost, reimburse, temp costs, long term/Disruption-impact, phasing construction disruption/Flexibility/Maintenance/Site.

Important not of C.3 construction option to be the least disruptive while being built. (2+ years of construction)

Carl informed that the submittal to the MSBA is really just a 'concept of C.3 option'---details and tweaks are to come with specifics-architecturally. Notes of exciting design were informed on; three floors w/basement level under gym area, parking on all sides, remotely placed compared to existing building, fields at all same elevation-possibly add tennis court, redo for better drainage/grass, possibly future ice hockey rink-which are all supported with parking/restrooms/maintenance

Many details were extended.

All Construction cost estimates, LEED score card and schedule will be submitted as well.

MSBA requires all new schools to be a 'Green School' and accommodations were noted on.

Northeast is in hopes for heading to what is referred to as a 'Silver Score School' which equals 2 additional reimbursement points from the MSBA.

Carl passed floor back to Joe in order to cover the Summary of the Costs. PDP estimates were in line. Opportunities for future savings was discussed. 1,600 Student Enrollment

Costs are extremely preliminary; Construction cost projected=\$243.5M and Project Cost=\$317.4M for C.3 Option.

Mr. Franceschi continued by reporting on the potential Construction Schedule; Phase 1 Enabling Work (Summer-Winter 2022, Phase 2 Construct New School (Spring/Summer 2023-Summer 2025, Phase 3 Demolish Existing School & Construct New Fields/Outbuildings (Summer 2025-Summer 2026, then MSBA Financial Closeout: Fall of 2027

Carl noted the process of the upcoming meetings: Weekly Project Team, Bi-Weekly Working Group, Monthly Building Committee, Community Meetings, Conservation Commission, Geotechnical Investigation, Local Officials-Building, Fire, Traffic, Security-Administration, First Responders, & MSBA-Facilities Assessment Subcommittee.

Plan is to go out to Communities for strategy of complete transparency from **now through next summer**.

Chairman Nickole informed that it is recommended to vote to select option C.3 as the preferred construction option, with 1,600 students as the desired student enrollment.

MOTION: Ms. Davis moved the Building Committee approve the selection of option C.3 as the preferred construction option with 1,600 students as the desired student enrollment, as presented.

Mr. DiBarri seconded the motion,
By unanimous voice vote.

and the motion carried

SO ORDERED

Chairman Nickole informed that it is recommended to vote to approve the PSR and all documents included, and to authorize PMA/DRA to submit the PSR to the MSBA.

MOTION: Ms. Davis moved the Building Committee approve the PSR (Preferred Schematic Report) and all documents included, and to authorize PMA/DRA to submit the PSR to the MSBA, as presented.

Mr. DiBarri seconded the motion,
By unanimous voice vote.

and the motion carried

SO ORDERED

Mr. DeSantis took the floor again and noted on Upcoming Challenges/Opportunities: Public Outreach/Support, MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (January 2021), MSBA BOD-PSR Approval (February 2021), Development of Schematic Design (SD) level plans & Specs, Submit Schematic Design & DESE Package to MSBA/DESE (June/July 2021), MSBA Project Scope & Budget Approval (August 2021)-Continue to justify as much square footage as possible and Work with MSBA grant program to maximize potential reimbursement, Secure Local Funding (December 2021 deadline), and Procure Construction Manager for Preconstruction Services. Many details were extended.

Floor was opened for questions. Questions were fielded.

- IV. New Business-Supt. DiBarri updated; Went to get Secured legislation to 'grandfather the reimbursement' which we had back in 2014 year (which was the highest that we ever had). Formula was changed within State and within a day 20% or so was lost. Back then, Ted Nickole (current NE Supt. at that time) and Charlie Lyons (Shawsheen Tech) went to MSBA and met with them to inform how much we had lost (20% funding [approx. \$60,000,000] with no change in student population).

IV. New Business (Con't.)

Supt. DiBarri continued explained that due to them approaching MSBA & DOE and then furthering on to approach for Legislation Vote. We were then accepted into initial round. Therefore, every year we have had to bring that legislation forward yet every year it has gotten tougher and tougher. Other school districts are basically trying to piggyback on what we have done to accomplish this. We were able to get in this year as well (which was very difficult). Full explanation ensued. This has since gotten approval in Conference as of last week. This should be the final one based on the dates and we should be all set with that piece. Of note, meetings were held with the Mayor of Revere, the Mayor of Malden and the Town Manager of Chelsea in the past two weeks—hoping to still bring down the full cost of this building project due to our responsibility to the individual taxpayers of our Communities in order to get their approval. Explanation ensued regarding costs. Next, we hope to reach out for Federal Infrastructure Funding and also to the MSBA as the Formula on the square footage is unfair. We need Committee to identify the ‘stake holders’ and reach out to them for help-this will be a lot of work. Of special note, it does not have to go out to Community/Town meetings for a vote.

V. Public Participation-none

VI. Schedule of next Meeting –

Will be held monthly prior to Regular School Committee Meeting the second Thursday every month at 5:30 pm-6:30 pm- January 14, 2021

VII. Vote to Adjourn

MOTION: Mr. Rossetti moved the School Building Committee meeting adjourn.

Mr. Carisella seconded the motion,
By unanimous voice vote.

and the motion carried

SO ORDERED

Chairman Nickole thanked all for joining.

CONCLUSION OF SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE

The Building Committee concluded @ 6:40 pm.

Notes recorded and submitted by Recording Secretary Patricia E. Dulong.