3.1.7

LOCAL ACTIONS & APPROVAL CERTIFICATION

NORTHEAST METROPOLITAN REGIONAL VOCATIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
100 HEMLOCK ROAD • WAKEFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01880-3597
781-246-0810 • FAX 781-246-4919

NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES ACCREDITED MEMBER

08/14/2020

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

Dear Ms. Pichetti:

The Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational School District School Building Committee ("SBC") has completed its review of the Feasibility Study *Preliminary Design Program* for the Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational High school project (the "Project"), and on 08/13/2020, the SBC voted to approve and authorize the Owner's Project Manager to submit the Feasibility Study related materials to the MSBA for its consideration. A certified copy of the SBC meeting minutes, which includes the specific language of the vote and the number of votes in favor, opposed, and abstained, will follow this submission.

Since the MSBA's Board of Directors invited the District to conduct a Feasibility Study on April 10th, 2019 the SBC has held five 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, 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 five 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)

Northeast Metro Tech School Building Committee Meetings:

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Picone informed the SBC that the subcommittee should encompass the Chair, himself as the certified purchasing agent, and three other members form the SBC. The commitment would be from early June 2019- August 9th 2019 (anticipated OPM contract execution date). The other members joining the subcommittee were Pat Cronin, Judy Dyment, 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 with 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**

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 Dyment, and Ron Jannino). Ms. Armistead seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. 15 – 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**

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**

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**

August 8th, 2019 – 5:00 P.M.

ATTENDEES *(Absent in italics)*				
NEMT School Building Committee				
Dawn Armistead	Joseph Capraro	Vincent Carisella	*Patricia Cronin*	Deborah Davis
David DiBarri	Judith Dyment	*Jeanne Feeley*	*Henry Hooton*	Ronald Jannino
Grant Leung	Stephen Maio	Robert McCarthy	Larry Means	Ted Nickole (Chair)
Joseph Papagni	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 has 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 let's 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 Dyment.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:52 P.M.

May 21st, 2020 – 5:00 P.M.

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

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 *(Absent in italics)*				
NEMT School Building Committee				
Dawn Armistead	Joseph Capraro	Vincent Carisella	*Patricia Cronin*	Deborah Davis
David DiBarri	*Michael T. Wall*	Judith Dyment	*Jeanne Feeley*	*Henry Hooton*
Melissa Jannino-Elam	*Grant Leung*	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				
James Comeau- DCR	*Sean Grant- 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.

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 /ineligibile 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**

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**

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**

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**

In addition to the SBC meetings listed above, the District held (7) public meetings, which were posted in compliance with the state Open Meeting Law, at which the Project was discussed. These meetings include:

1. August 8th, 2019 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Conference Room at the High School: Discussion on OPM hiring process/hiring of PMA Consultants. Transfer of Funds from General Fund to the Capital Fund for the Feasibility Study of the School Building Project. Discussion also occurred relating to Saugus MS/HS project as PMA/Kevin Nigro were the OPMs for that project and committee noted to meet with Saugus team to go over school building process. ***VOTE:*** **Committee to approve stipulated transfer presented above of $1,000,000 from the General Fund to the Capital Fund. Unanimous. Motion Carried.**

2. September 12, 2019 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Conference Room at the High School: Update on the building project/next steps including Designer Request for Services (RFS) development between the District/MSBA and main point noted District is tentatively scheduled to appear in front of the MSBA Designer Selection Panel (DSP) on 12/03/2019 to review all proposals and shortlist 3 applicants with interviews scheduled for 2 weeks after the initial DSP date.

3. October 10, 2019 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Conference Room at the High School: Discussion regrading process of looking into CH. 74 programs/new programs for the School Project and need for advisory committee. District also provided update regarding Designer RFS being on track for 12/03/2019 MSBA DSP meeting date with 12/17/2019 target date for interviews.

4. November 14, 2019 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Conference Room at the High School: District noted to the Committee that 3 potential applicants submitted a proposal for the School Project and communications are ongoing with MSBA regarding next steps.

5. January 9, 2020 at the Northeast Metro Tech School Committee Meeting held at 7:00 P.M. in the Conference Room at the High School: PMA Consultants/DRA presented to the School Committee regarding updates on hiring of the Architect, project milestones completed, and project team entering into the Feasibility Study portion of the project. DRA presented on introducing themselves/experience with vocational schools, key issues for Northeast Metro, and next steps to be discussed during Feasibility Study. Lastly, kick-off meeting with MSBA was discussed noting was to be held on 02/10/2020 at 1pm. ***VOTE:*** **That the Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational School District hereby additionally appropriates the amount of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) Dollars for the purpose of paying costs of the feasibility study for Northeast Metropolitan Regional**

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

6. May 14, 2020 held virtually via Zoom at 7:00 P.M. due to COVID-19 concerns: Updates regarding school project latest developments/schedule impacts from COVID-19. ***VOTE:*** **Committee to approve/recommend to SBC study design enrollment options between 1,250-1,722 students to account for current and future anticipated growth in existing programs, as well as approve the addition of Marketing, Medical Assisting, and Biotechnology CH. 74 programs as detailed in the CH 74. Viability Document and the included table as presented. Unanimous. Motion Carried.**

7. August 13, 2020 held virtually via in person at the Northeast Metro Tech School Library and Zoom at 7:00 P.M. due to COVID-19 concerns: Updates regarding school project moving from PDP phase into PSR phase.

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 signing this Local Action and Approval Certification, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information supplied by the District in this Certification is true, complete, and accurate.	By signing this Local Action and Approval Certification, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information supplied by the District in this Certification is true, complete, and accurate.
		Deborah P. Davis
By: David DiBarri	**By: David DiBarri**	**By: Deborah Davis**
Title: Chief Executive Officer	**Title: Superintendent of Schools**	**Title: Chair of the School Committee**
Date: 8/13/2020	**Date: 8/13/2020**	**Date: 8/13/2020**