

4.1.2 - 19

LOCAL ACTIONS & APPROVALS

NORTHEAST METROPOLITAN REGIONAL VOCATIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

100 HEMLOCK ROAD • WAKEFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01880-3597

781-246-0810 • FAX 781-246-4919



07/01/2021

Ms. Diane Sullivan
Senior Capital Program Manager
40 Broad Street, Suite 500
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Dear Ms. Sullivan:

The Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational School District School Building Committee ("SBC") has completed its review of the Schematic Design *Submission Package* for the Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational High school project (the "Project"), and on 07/01/2021, the SBC voted to approve and authorize the Owner's Project Manager to submit the Schematic Design 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.

Since the MSBA's Board of Directors invited the District to conduct a Feasibility Study on April 10th, 2019 the SBC has held fifteen 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 fifteen 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)
- 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)
- 10) January 21st, 2021 – 5:30 P.M. held at the existing High School’s Library and virtually via Zoom.us (due to COVID-19 Pandemic)
- 11) February 11th, 2021 – 5:30 P.M. held at the existing High School’s Library and virtually via Zoom.us (due to COVID-19 Pandemic)
- 12) March 18th, 2021 – 5:30 P.M. held at the existing High School’s Library and virtually via Zoom.us (due to COVID-19 Pandemic)
- 13) April 8th, 2021 – 5:30 P.M. held at the existing High School’s Library and virtually via Zoom.us (due to COVID-19 Pandemic)
- 14) May 13th, 2021 – 5:30 P.M. held at the existing High School’s Library and virtually via Zoom.us (due to COVID-19 Pandemic)
- 15) July 1st, 2021 – 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 from the SBC. The commitment would be from early June 2019- August 9th 2019 (anticipated OPM contract execution date). The other members joining the subcommittee were Pat Cronin, Judy Dymont, 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 Dymont, 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

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

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.

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

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.

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 Dymont</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.

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.

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 Dymant	<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

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

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

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.

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

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.

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 Dymont	<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

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.

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

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.

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.

January 21st, 2021 – 5:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
David DiBarri	Ted Nickole (Chair)	Deborah Davis	Judith Dymont	Michael T. Wall
Brittany Carisella	Peter A. Rossetti	James J. Holland	Anthony Caggiano	Carla Scuzzarella
James Picone	Joseph Capraro	Robert O'Dwyer	Brant Snyder	<i>Patricia Cronin</i>
<i>Larry Means</i>	<i>Ward A. Hamilton</i>	<i>Robert S. McCarthy</i>	<i>Melissa Jannino-Elam</i>	<i>Stephen Maio</i>
<i>Joseph Papagni</i>				
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 and reported the agenda for the meeting.

Mr. Kevin Nigro from PMA took the floor and discussed design updates in regard to the PSR package submission, next steps with the MSBA, and what to expect in the next phase of the MSBA process- Schematic Design (SD). Mr. Nigro noted the MSBA facilities assessment subcommittee (FAS) meeting specifically and the positive reaction from the MSBA on the proposed school, specifically the updated education program and floor plans. For the SD phase, PMA/DRA noted architectural design ideas will progress with much more development focused on major interior spaces and shop spaces. Site design ideas including athletic fields, traffic flow and circulation, utility infrastructure, etc. would also be furthered. Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, and Fire Protection (MEPFP) systems would continue to be reviewed with the District and proposed systems with narratives and diagrams would be discussed. Mr. Nigro then discussed the project delivery options, design-bid-build (DBB) and construction manager at risk (CMR). Mr. LoPresti noted to the SBC that PMA has vast experience in both DBB and CMR with notable advantages and disadvantages for both methods as shown during the presentation. Mr. Franceschi noted the same for DRA and the floor was open for discussion.

Mr. Nigro then reiterated if CMR was the method chosen from the SBC, that a pre-qualification (pre-qual) subcommittee would need to be created and inclusive of 1 member from PMA, 1 member from DRA, and a minimum of 3 members from the Owner. Mr. Nigro suggested any experience in the CMR industry would be a benefit to include on this committee, but Mr. DeSantis of PMA also noted being on the pre-qual subcommittee would involve a great deal of work. Mr. Nickole then recommended for the SBC to vote on the construction delivery method, and the SBC voted to approve and accept CMR as the project delivery method.

Mr. Franceschi then took the floor to reiterate the project is finishing Module 3 the Feasibility Study and heading into Module 4 Schematic Design. Mr. Franceschi reiterated what PMA noted earlier regarding the MSBA's perception of the design of the school at the FAS meeting and there were a few items for DRA to follow up on formally. Mr. Franceschi noted the major goal of the SD module is to refine the project parameters (scope, budget, and schedule) and have a refined cost estimate later this year for the District and the MSBA to agree to on a budget and reimbursement for that budget. Mr. Franceschi noted essentially every aspect of the preferred option gets further refined, including but not limited to architectural items and layout of spaces, building massing, site design, athletic fields, hardscape, utilities, structural systems, MEPFP systems, security strategies and equipment, etc.

Mr. Franceschi noted this process will be a team effort, noting the various meetings that will take place from January to July including weekly project team meetings, bi-weekly working group meetings, monthly building committee meetings, faculty and departmental meetings, shop instructor meetings, community outreach meetings, etc. Mr. Franceschi noted the costs for the SD will be estimated in the end of May, finalizing in June. From here, the SBC will be expected to vote on the entire package of the school itself including project scope and budget for an SD submission to the MSBA in July and the MSBA Board of Directors meeting for approval in August.

Mr. DeSantis noted an additional 1.58% of reimbursement points are anticipated to be added to the District reimbursement from planned preventative maintenance items the design will incorporate into the project. Mr. DeSantis noted the project had officially locked in option C.3 with an enrollment of 1600 students with the MSBA. Mr. DeSantis also noted the project team had met with DCR/Breakheart representatives on 01/15/2021 to discuss the project and gather their input on the proposed design to best try to be open-minded neighbors. Mr. DeSantis noted DCR/Breakheart was very receptive of the preferred option and were willing to work cooperatively with the project during construction. Mr. Wall ended the discussion of the meeting with compliments to the administration, PMA, and DRA for the professional transparency and excited about the project continuing into the next phase.

VOTE: Judith Dymont motioned for the SBC to approve the 12/10/2020 minutes of the Building Committee Meeting, as presented. Deborah Davis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 14-0-0.

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to approve and accept Construction Manager at Risk (CM-at-Risk) as the Project Delivery method, as presented. Peter A. Rossetti, Jr. seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 14-0-0.

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to adjourn the meeting. Michael T. Wall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 14-0-0, meeting adjourned at 6:23 P.M.

February 11th, 2021 – 5:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
David DiBarri	Ted Nickole (Chair)	Deborah Davis	Judith Dymont	Michael T. Wall
Brittany Carisella	Peter A. Rossetti	James J. Holland	Anthony Caggiano	Carla Scuzzarella
James Picone	Joseph Capraro	Robert O'Dwyer	Brant Snyder	Patricia Cronin
Larry Means	Ward A. Hamilton	Robert S. McCarthy	Melissa Jannino-Elam	Stephen Maio
Joseph Papagni				
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 and reported the agenda for the meeting.

Mr. Kevin Nigro of PMA Consultants opened the meeting noting the presentation will be posted on the project website in detail for review afterwards and for any members not able to attend the meeting. Mr. Anthony LoPresti of PMA Consultants noted that the project is right on schedule, specifically still targeting the MSBA Board of Directors August 25th, 2021 meeting date for project scope and budget approval. Mr. LoPresti then reviewed the budget with contracts to date and invoices paid to date, reimbursement received to date from the MSBA, and that there were no issues with any of the above.

Mr. Carl Franceschi took the floor and began explaining what scope DRA will be undertaking over the next few months in the SD phase. Architectural meetings will continue with the District, as well as meetings with staff to go over their proposed spaces with proposed layouts and requested equipment and technology to be put in place. DRA and their subconsultants will also continue review of current traffic counts for future design of parking lots and roadways, geotechnical investigations across the proposed site. DRA and their subconsultants will also begin designing actual mechanical and electrical systems for the new building, and that working group sessions will occur over the course of the next few months to provide input on all aspects related to the project. Mr. Franceschi also reiterated input from the SBC and design ideas were always welcome for review.

Mr. Franceschi also gave a quick recap regarding the MSBA Board of Directors meeting that occurred for the project earlier that day regarding the PSR submission. The reaction from the MSBA was generally positive, noting they appreciated the location, updated educational program, floor plans, etc. The project team needs to follow up with the

MSBA on a few items, most notably parking locations and their proximity to Breakheart Reservation and site drainage items.

Mr. Franceschi ended DRA's portion of the meeting once again noting the reiterations of meetings to come including the following: weekly project team meetings, bi-weekly working group meetings, monthly building committee meetings, staff/department head meetings, community outreach meetings, conservation commission, local officials including Wakefield police and fire, etc.

Mr. Nigro from PMA ended PMA's portion of the meeting requesting any SBC members with architectural insight to help finish the CM@R application and be a member on the review team. Mr. Nickole ended the meeting opening the floor to questions and comments, and noting himself, Mr. DiBarri, and Mrs. Scuzzarella got to visit Saugus Middle-High School and Somerville High School for informative tours as the District heads continue in the SD phase.

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to approve the 01/21/2021 minutes of the Building Committee Meeting, as presented. Michael T. Wall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 21-0-0.

VOTE: Michael T. Wall motioned for the SBC to adjourn the meeting. David DiBarri seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 21-0-0, meeting adjourned at 6:24 P.M.

March 18th, 2021 – 5:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
David DiBarri	Ted Nickole (Chair)	Deborah Davis	Judith Dymont	Michael T. Wall
Brittany Carisella	Peter A. Rossetti	James J. Holland	Anthony Caggiano	Carla Scuzzarella
James Picone	Joseph Capraro	Robert O'Dwyer	Brant Snyder	Patricia Cronin
Larry Means	Ward A. Hamilton	Robert S. McCarthy	Melissa Jannino-Elam	Stephen Maio
Joseph Papagni				
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 and reported the agenda for the meeting.

PMA representatives took the floor to discuss budget, schedule, and CM@R procurement updates. Mr. Anthony LoPresti noted the project is once again on schedule, and that the full presentation will be available for review as PMA would run through the items quickly to give more time to discuss CM@R updates and DRA more time to present on updates. Mr. LoPresti reminded the District members to continue to spread the word on the project to community members and the project website for those who cannot attend this meeting. Mr. LoPresti noted contract amounts against billings to date and reimbursement received noting the District is up to speed and has received full reimbursement per it's current agreed upon rate with the MSBA.

Mr. DeSantis noted the SD design will wrap up end of June/early July and that is when the project team will be seeking SBC approval of the Schematic Design package for submission to the MSBA with the project cost estimate while also projecting the maximum grant to be received from the state. Mr. Nigro noted the application for the CM@R had been submitted to the office of the inspector general and PMA would check in Monday on an update on the application. Mr. Nigro once again noted the preselection and prequalification committee will consist of 5 members: Joseph DeSantis from PMA, Vladimir Lyubetsky from DRA, David DiBarri from the District, Ted Nickole from the District, and Jay Picone from the District. Mr. Nigro noted there will be a site visit for interested firms on 04/19/2021, and currently 4 firms have pulled the package from the advertising software. Mr. Nigro noted by the end of April the District will have to shortlist 2-3 firms and interview these firms and make a final decision by mid-May for who the CM@R firm will be for the project. The floor was opened for questions and answered in detail by the project team. Mr. LoPresti ended PMA's portion of the meeting noting the cost for the CM@R firm is strictly for them, and not for the full project cost.

Mr. Franceschi from DRA then took the floor to update the SBC on numerous items, including but not limited to updates to building massing, materials to be used to build the building, site layout, shop layouts, etc. Mr. Franceschi then touched upon the changes in floor layouts with the building essentially flipping on the top two floors, and on sustainable choices the District was studying for inclusion into the design. Mr. Franceschi then began to present on inspirations from the project to date, noting suggestions of material for the building façade to be stone/wood/copper to give a natural look to the building as it was being built next to Breakheart Reservation. Mr. Franceschi then further noted the vocational spaces, specifically the locations of the public spaces and how student drop off would flow. Mr. Franceschi showed multiple renderings of the inside of the building for what it conceptually would look like at the moment in key spaces such as the main lobby, library/media center, vegetative roofs, etc. Mr. Franceschi then wrapped up DRA's portion of the meeting noting the planned development of athletic fields and access around the site, and that DRA was exploring various ways to limit the amount of blasting on site with gradings that meet code. Mr. Franceschi reiterated the number of meetings occurring behind the scenes with all parties and asked for the SBC to review the slides after the presentation for their comment and input into the building design.

Superintendent DiBarri concluded the meeting reiterating the importance for the input from all SBC members as well as outreach to the communities to make sure the District ends up with a diverse/cultural design with historic and special pieces from all 12 member communities. Mr. Nigro noted the project team is very excited to see an engaged owner and is looking forward to the next few months of design for this project.

VOTE: Peter Rossetti motioned for the SBC to approve the 02/11/2021 minutes of the Building Committee Meeting, as presented. Theodore Nickole seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 21-0-0.

VOTE: Michael T. Wall motioned for the SBC to adjourn the meeting. David DiBarri seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 21-0-0, meeting adjourned at 6:26 P.M.

April 8th, 2021 – 5:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
David DiBarri	Ted Nickole (Chair)	Deborah Davis	Judith Dymont	Michael T. Wall
<i>Brittany Carisella</i>	Peter A. Rossetti	James J. Holland	Anthony Caggiano	Carla Scuzzarella
James Picone	Joseph Capraro	Robert O'Dwyer	Brant Snyder	Patricia Cronin
Larry Means	<i>Ward A. Hamilton</i>	Robert S. McCarthy	Melissa Jannino-Elam	<i>Stephen Maio</i>
Joseph Papagni				
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 and reported the agenda for the meeting.

Mr. LoPresti of PMA Consultants took the floor and noted the goal of the meeting tonight would be to receive feedback from the SBC on the building itself, and their thoughts on how best to incorporate their community into the design. Mr. LoPresti wrapped up his portion once again discussing the latest updates on budget, invoices, payments to date, and reimbursement from the MSBA received to date. Mr. LoPresti also noted the project was on track per the schedule and continuing along in MSBA Module #004 Schematic Design.

Mr. DeSantis and Mr. Nigro from PMA updated the SBC on the procurement updates regarding the CM@R. 5 statement of qualifications were received, and 4 of the 5 firms will be prequalified to submit a proposal for the project. Mr. DeSantis thanked the pre-qualification committee for their hard work and noted the goal is to have the preferred firm on board by the end of May. Mr. DeSantis also noted that the District along with the project team created a Facebook page with the goal of increasing outreach and engagement to all communities that are a part of the NEMT District.

Mr. Franceschi took the floor noting the various meetings that occurred over the last month to further progress the SD. Mr. Franceschi noted the third round of meetings occurred with the department heads and shop staff, with hopes the team is providing the necessary equipment and layout as directed from the staff. Mr. Franceschi noted specifically updates on building massing, façade, interior spaces such as teacher planning and general classrooms, science labs, etc. Mr. Franceschi noted the design team is reviewing using materials such as terrazzo, wood, porcelain tile, linoleum, etc. as part of the finishes for the school. Mr. Franceschi noted there were continued meeting regarding design of the MEPFP systems and reiterated the importance of the overall goal

for the building to be a “green-school” and LEED silver at a minimum. Mr. Nickole then took over from DRA and noted the rest of the meeting would be spent on SBC member feedbacks for ideas for the project team to review in ways to try to incorporate into the design of the building.

Brant Snyder noted he was happy with the overall design and noted for the design team to review if the nonlinear design was to not take place how this would affect classroom limitations and shape. Jim Holland was very pleased with the design but noted for the design team to ensure each space will be easily managed and limited maintenance. Rob O’Dwyer complimented the design team for the amount of planning that has gone into the project and noted for the town of Winthrop an icon if the red/white/blue water tower and for ways to include this in the new school. Anthony Caggiano noted for the team to consider future installation of solar panels and where they could go, as well as Revere Beach with the grandstand being an icon for Revere to consider incorporation somewhere in the school. Mike Wall stressed the importance of Chelsea being the Tobin Bridge/Chelsea Clock being reviewed for inclusion into the school. Deborah Davis inquired for the design team to review the shape of the building and look into a more natural shape with incorporation of Breakheart elements. Judy Dymant expressed slight disappointment with the shape of the building and suggested the team review North Reading MS/HS as something to peel ideas from. Larry Means noted the front entrance and esthetics of the renderings shown looked nice, and to ask the design team to review the Melrose MS Auditorium. Bob McCarthy was going to follow up after the meeting, and Pat Cronin/Joseph Capraro were very impressed with the design and asked DRA to review murals for each community incorporated into the interior of the building. Peter Rossetti was very impressed with all suggestions and noted for Saugus, the Iron Works and Breakheart Reservation were icons of Saugus to review. Joseph Papagni noted he was very impressed with the design, especially the flexibility of the space but asked the team to review the building shape and potentially make the building taller in lieu of longer.

Mr. Nickole ended the meeting appreciating every SBC members great ideas and input, and asked the SBC members to continue to send along any information or ideas to the project team for them to review for representation of the 12 communities into the new building design.

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to approve the 03/18/2021 minutes of the Building Committee Meeting, as presented. Theodore Nickole seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 17-0-1.

VOTE: Judith Dymant motioned for the SBC to adjourn the meeting. Theodore Nickole seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 18-0-0, meeting adjourned at 6:30 P.M.

May 13th, 2021 – 5:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
David DiBarri	Ted Nickole (Chair)	Deborah Davis	Judith Dymont	Michael T. Wall
Brittany Carisella	Peter A. Rossetti	James J. Holland	Anthony Caggiano	Carla Scuzzarella
James Picone	Joseph Capraro	Robert O'Dwyer	Brant Snyder	Patricia Cronin
Larry Means	Ward A. Hamilton	Robert S. McCarthy	Melissa Jannino-Elam	Stephen Maio
Joseph Papagni	Patty Dulong- Clerk			
PMA Consultants				
Kevin Nigro	Joseph DeSantis	<i>Anthony LoPresti</i>		
DRA Architects				
Carl Franceschi	Vladimir Lyubetsky			
Gilbane Building Company				
Walter Kincaid	Neil Benner	James Conley		

Chairman Nickole opened the meeting by thanking all for attending and reported the agenda for the meeting.

Larry Means requested a full print out of the new building design, and the team noted they will print and send out these documents over the next few days to all SBC members for their review and input.

Mr. Joseph DeSantis opened the floor and discussed the latest updates on budget, invoices, payments to date, and reimbursement from the MSBA received to date. Mr. DeSantis noted the SD phase was approaching the end and the submittal for the MSBA on the SD was slated for early July as it always has been planned. Mr. DeSantis noted that Gilbane Building Company was selected as the CM@R firm for the project who will assist the team in bringing the project on schedule and on budget. The process that occurred since last meeting was 4 submittals from 4 very qualified firms, price and non-price proposals, and interviews of each of the 4 firms. Mr. DeSantis once again thanked the prequalification and selection committee for their hard work over the past few months.

Mr. Carl Franceschi then took the floor and gave a synopsis of the new building design that was created inclusive of the input from the District administration and input from last SBC meeting. The design incorporates a more compact footprint and is now a four-story building with more advantages of implementing space on lower levels, and is closer to the proposed new fields by taking advantage of the existing slope on site which hopefully also results in less blasting to occur. Mr. Franceschi noted the library and media center would be stacked over the administration offices, and that the career clusters were still kept intact. The resulting new traffic pattern results in more parking in front, and that the overall changes are still well within code.

Superintendent DiBarri took the floor to discuss the design changes, and stressed the importance of staying transparent to all community members and abutters so all are up to speed. Steve Maio from Wakefield noted he was received immediate feedback regarding the design changes from abutters pleased with changes the project had taken and looked forward to continuing that relationship. Peter Rossetti also noted he was happy with the neighbors being reached out to based off his years of experience on planning board in Saugus and the issues that arose from lack of communication. Superintendent DiBarri noted he received an email from the neighbors to the site and the project team is working with Steve Maio to set up a meeting to continue dialog on the project sometime over the next two weeks, and then continue communication continuously thereafter.

Michael T. Wall noted he was confused on the amount of changes that occurred to the design since last meeting, and Mr. DeSantis noted it was a result of feedback from the SC/District administration and thanked DRA for their hard work changing the look of the building so quickly over the last few months. Superintendent DiBarri noted most likely more meetings will need to occur to keep the SBC members informed of changes of this magnitude in a quicker manner. Deborah Davis noted all opinions brought forth at last meeting gave direction for the new design, and again stressed the new design tries to best incorporate what was liked about the older design from some SBC members as well as some feedback from other SBC members. Deborah Davis once again thanked DRA for their hard work, and did note if the SBC felt it necessary the meetings could occur on a semi monthly basis as we move closer to the actuality of a building.

The floor was then opened for representatives from Gilbane Building Company to introduce themselves to the SBC. Chairman Nickole thanked all for attending thereafter to close the meeting.

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to approve the 04/08/2021 minutes of the Building Committee Meeting, as presented. Judith Dymont seconded the motion. The motion passed 17-1-3.

VOTE: Judith Dymont motioned for the SBC to adjourn the meeting. Deborah Davis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 21-0-0, meeting adjourned at 6:32 P.M.

July 1st, 2021 – 5:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES (<i>Absent in italics</i>)				
NEMT School Building Committee				
David DiBarri	Ted Nickole (Chair)	Deborah Davis	<i>Judith Dymont</i>	<i>Michael T. Wall</i>
<i>Brittany Carisella</i>	Peter A. Rossetti	James J. Holland	Anthony Caggiano	Carla Scuzzarella
James Picone	Joseph Capraro	<i>Robert O'Dwyer</i>	Brant Snyder	Patricia Cronin
Larry Means	<i>Ward A. Hamilton</i>	<i>Robert S. McCarthy</i>	Melissa Jannino-Elam	Stephen Maio
Joseph Papagni	<i>Patty Dulong- Clerk</i>			
PMA Consultants				
Kevin Nigro	Joseph DeSantis	Anthony LoPresti		
DRA Architects				
Carl Franceschi	Vladimir Lyubetsky			
Gilbane Building Company				
Walter Kincaid	<i>Neil Benner</i>	<i>James Conley</i>		
Other				
Bob Brooks				

Chairman Nickole opened the meeting by thanking all for attending and reported the agenda for the meeting.

Mr. LoPresti of PMA Consultants opened the meeting providing an update on the agenda, schedule, and budget. Mr. LoPresti noted the schedule is right on track for the District to end Module #4 Schematic Design in August of 2021, and that we are under budget. Mr. Nigro of PMA Consultants then took the floor to explain there has been a change in MSBA funding policies, explaining the increase from \$333/SQFT up to \$360/SQFT as well as the adjustments to the reimbursement of the architect and owner's project manager's fees and contingency policies. Mr. Nigro noted these will affect the budget, and PMA is actively reviewing the effects of these funding policy changes against our estimated total project budget, the MSBA provided total project budget worksheet, and reimbursement the District can expect to receive.

Mr. DeSantis of PMA Consultants then took the floor to explain where the District was at for total project cost, MSBA share, and District share at the Preferred Schematic stage in December 2020 vs. now at the end of the Schematic Design. Mr. DeSantis explained the cost estimating challenges that PMA, DRA, and Gilbane ran into a few weeks back but were able to work collaboratively to make design changes to get back onto budget. Mr. DeSantis noted the total project budget worksheet was complete from PMA and once submitted next week, will began a back and forth between the team and the MSBA on the respective shares of the cost for the project between the MSBA and the District. Mr. DeSantis noted the District shared since PSR has trended downward, but that the process with the MSBA to finalize will be a few weeks. The range of estimated District

share currently is \$172-177M but this also truly will never be fully known until a guaranteed maximum price is set but the District is trending in the right direction.

Mr. Franceschi took the floor to update the SBC members regarding the updates to the Schematic Design of the new building. Mr. Franceschi noted multiple meetings with school and local officials and community outreach efforts. Mr. Franceschi noted the design team has been active finalize the plans and systems going into the new building, currently in the vicinity of 300 drawings for all disciplines to date. Mr. Franceschi noted the 3 basic items in the SD package are the scope, the budget, and the schedule. Parts of this submission will also include DESE special education requirements. Mr. Franceschi showed the table of contents to reiterate the depth of the package, and that all of the listed elements are reviewed extensively just like a contract would with the MSBA.

Mr. Franceschi showed the SBC multiple site renderings and layouts, noting some of the value management efforts that were taken to get the project under budget against some of these layouts and renderings. Mr. Franceschi noted the building massing has not changed, just some potential architectural elements. Mr. Nigro had Mr. Franceschi note the multiple times the team has met with the staff to refine and design these spaces over the past year. Deborah Davis inquired on the cafeteria size, and Mr. Franceschi noted the design accounts for the enrollment of 1600 students spread across 3 different lunch periods. Mr. Franceschi noted also the various breakout spaces in the building where students and staff could utilize in the building to mitigate congestion. Deborah Davis also inquired on seating capacity of culinary arts, and Mr. Franceschi noted it can take up to 40 or so people, as was requested from the staff. Mr. Franceschi reiterated the budget was essentially 10% over budget at the first round of estimating, and between value management efforts and fine tuning of assumptions, the team got back to budget that was set at PSR. Mr. Nigro reiterated reconciling costs and value management efforts were then run pass David and Ted, and the team still kept intact the design of the building against the educational programming plan. Mr. Franceschi noted this also will not be the last time the project has to be estimated and scope can be added back in later if estimates/bidding does well for the project.

Mr. Nigro then took the floor to discuss once again the range of cost estimates for the MSBA and the District, most notably that the changes in the MSBA funding policies should not hurt the District but PMA is vetting this now and will know exactly over the next few weeks as the back and forth with the MSBA occurs before the August 25th MSBA Board of Directors meeting.

Mr. DiBarri noted the project team is working in conjunction with Anthony Caggiano to set up a Revere community outreach meeting. Mr. DiBarri noted the Wakefield, Melrose, and Stoneham communities would also be targeted in the near future for community outreach. Mr. Nickole ended the meeting thanking all for coming

VOTE: Stephen Maio motioned for the SBC to approve the 04/08/2021 minutes of the Building Committee Meeting, as presented. Deborah Davis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 15-0-0.

VOTE: Deborah Davis motioned for the SBC to vote to approve the SD and DESE submission package and all documents included, and to authorize PMA/DRA to submit the SD and DESE submission package to the MSBA. The motion passed unanimously, 15-0-0.

VOTE: Peter Rossetti Jr. motioned for the SBC to adjourn the meeting. Deborah Davis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 15-0-0, meeting adjourned at 6:14 P.M.

In addition to the SBC meetings listed above, the District held **(19)** 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 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting 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 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting 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

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.**
11. February 11th, 2021 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 with progressing through the MSBA Module #4 Schematic Design.
12. February 25th, 2021 at the Town of Wakefield's Conservation Commission meeting held via Zoom.us at 7:00 P.M. to hold a public hearing regarding the Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation for 3,181 linear feet of BVW, 193 linear feet of Inland Bank, 921 linear feet of Riverfront, and 770 linear feet of isolated vegetated wetland at 100 Hemlock Road.
13. March 5th, 2021 at 100 Hemlock Road, Wakefield MA in the afternoon with the Wakefield Conservation Commission and neighborhood representatives to perform a walkthrough of wetlands delineation.
14. March 11th, 2021 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: Judith Dymont noted North Reading is very supportive of the new school project.
15. March 11th, 2021 at the Town of Wakefield's Conservation Commission meeting held via Zoom.us at 7:00 P.M. to hold a continued public hearing regarding the Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation for 3,181 linear feet of BVW, 193 linear feet of Inland Bank, 921 linear feet of Riverfront, and 770 linear feet of isolated vegetated wetland at 100 Hemlock Road.
16. May 13th, 2021 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: Discussion relating to the hiring of the CM@R, Gilbane Building Company, and the latest updates on the project design and timeline.
17. May 13th, 2021 at the Town of Wakefield's Conservation Commission meeting held via Zoom.us at 7:00 P.M. to hold a continued public hearing regarding the Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation for 3,181 linear feet of BVW,

- 193 linear feet of Inland Bank, 921 linear feet of Riverfront, and 770 linear feet of isolated vegetated wetland at 100 Hemlock Road.
18. May 16th, 2021 at 100 Hemlock Road, Wakefield MA at 8:00 A.M. with the Wakefield Conservation Commission and neighborhood representatives to perform a walkthrough of wetlands delineation.
 19. May 27th, 2021 at the Town of Wakefield's Conservation Commission meeting held via Zoom.us at 7:00 P.M. to hold a continued public hearing regarding the Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation for 3,181 linear feet of BVW, 193 linear feet of Inland Bank, 921 linear feet of Riverfront, and 770 linear feet of isolated vegetated wetland at 100 Hemlock Road.

In addition to the all the public meetings listed above, the District continued community outreach and held **(4)** meetings with different District stakeholders, at which the Project was discussed. These meetings include:

- 1) May 24th, 2021 at both June Circle and Stone Way Culdesacs to discuss any questions about the project with the Abutters in advance of the 05/26/2021 Abutters forum
- 2) May 26th, 2021 direct Abutters Community Forum held at 12:30 P.M. in the Library at the High School and virtually via Zoom.us to discuss the project from invitation to Feasibility Study to Schematic Design progress to date
- 3) June 2nd, 2021 District Wide Community Forum held at 5:30 P.M. in the Library at the High School and virtually via Zoom.us to discuss the project from invitation to Feasibility Study to Schematic Design progress to date.
- 4) June 17th, 2021 Project Forum with La Colaborativa from Chelsea, MA at 25 6th St., Chelsea MA and via Zoom.us to discuss the project from invitation to Feasibility Study to Schematic Design progress to date with members from La Colaborativa

July 2018

The presentation materials for each meeting, meeting minutes, and summary materials related to the Project are available locally for public review at 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: David DiBarri

Title: Chief Executive Officer

Date: 7/2/21

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: Superintendent of Schools

Date: 7/2/21

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: Deborah Davis

Title: Chair of the School Committee

Date: 7/2/21