

Tisbury School Building Committee
5:00PM, Monday, September 25, 2017
Tisbury School Library

1

TSBC Members Present: Chair Colleen McAndrews, Ian Aitchison*, Wiet Bacheller, Harold Chapdelaine, Catherine Coogan*, John Custer, Matt D'Andrea*, Sean DeBettencourt, Cheryl Doble, Jay Grande, Melinda Loberg* by phone, Reade Milne, Erika Mulvey, Sean Mulvey, Dan Seidman by phone, Richie Smith,

TSC Members Present: Colleen McAndrews,

Others: John Guadagno – Tisbury Resident
Daedalus – Richard Marks,
Turowski2 – Libby Turowski, Peter Turowski
Horiuchi Solien – Dan Solien
LEED – Cynthia Kaplan,

Tis. Sch. Staff: Whitney Burke, Natalie Krauthamer, Nicole Shirley, Lura Wiesner,
Planning Bd.: Ben Robinson, Cheryl Doble,
Press: MV Times – Jack Shea, MVTV – Michelle Vivian,
Vineyard Gazette – Heather Hamacek,

* Late Arrivals or early departures.

The Tisbury School Building Committee (TSBC) was called to order at 5:08PM. The meeting was being recorded by MVTV and Mr. Dan Seidman and Selectman Melinda Loberg were participating by phone due to geographical distance and therefore all votes would be by roll call.

(Recorder's note: Occasionally the discussion is re-grouped for clarity and brevity.)

I. Approval of 9/11/17 Meeting Minutes

• ON A MOTION DULY MADE BY MR. HAROLD CHAPDELAIN AND SECONDED BY MR. JOHN CUSTER THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2017 TISBURY SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING WERE APPROVED; 10 AYES, 0 NAYS, 2 ABSTENTIONS (due to absence): MR. SEAN MULVEY—AYE, MS. ERIKA MULVEY—AYE, MS. READE MILNE—AYE, MR. SEAN DEBETTENCOURT—AYE, MS. WIET BACHELLER—AYE, MS. COLLEEN MCANDREWS—AYE, MR. CHAPDELAIN—AYE, MS. CHERYL DOBLE, MR. CUSTER—AYE, MR. JAY GRANDE—ABSTAIN, MR. SEIDMAN—ABSTAIN (due to absence); MS. LOBERG—AYE.

II. Public Presentation Recap

V. Discussion of Potential Program Reductions

The September 18th Public Presentation drew a good turnout of about 50 people. There was satisfaction with the chosen options however Ms. Milne expressed concern and frustration with finding a sector of the community and the Planning Board still talking

about base renovation/modified addition, increasing the possibility of project failure at the ballot. The TSBC discussed the need for public outreach and economic facts that clearly answered questions about the cost and implications of renovation.

- The cost of renovation/addition meeting the education plan was posted on the website (see Minutes: 3/22/17 p.2, 4/12/17 p.1-2, & 6/7/17 p.2 #II) at \$1-2 million higher than new construction.

- It was not the purview of the TSBC to decide what educational programs should be cut to accommodate a base renovation/modified addition.

- An open house tour of the School might show the public the facility deficiencies.

- Owners Project Manager Richard Marks of Daedalus noted the following difficulties.

- The Architects and OPM listened to the Selectmen and Town Administrator and were attempting to cut about 4,000 sq. ft. of reimbursable space for a total savings of up to \$2 million—of which the Town would get 60¢ on the \$1. It would answer about 95% of the educational plan that Principal John Custer felt to be possible but not ideal.

* Mr. Ian Aitchison entered the meeting at 5:17PM.

- However, the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) was very resistant to reducing classroom size to 850 sq. ft. (see 9/11/17 p.5). MSBA classroom standards were designed for 23 students and 900 sq. ft. was the bottom of the range—Tisbury School classes were about 17 to 22 students.

- Returning to amend the educational plan was not within the voted services for the feasibility phase and as a step backward would be a fairly heavy-duty study and cost.

- Renovation/modified addition would be very disruptive to the staff and students for 18 months requiring the construction of a temporary school (with modulars).

- Mr. Dan Seidman asked why MSBA language allowing grandfathering of classroom sizes was not being asserted (see 7/17/17 Minutes p.5) allowing much more leeway in school size. He still felt the school could be renovated with minimal upgrades for special education, cafeteria, English Language Learners (ELL), stage, etc.

- Chair Colleen McAndrews emphasized the tight timeline and hard work ahead for the TSBC and was working with the Tisbury School Committee to respond to community concerns and possibly move towards parallel planning for an alternative.

IV. Review of Siting Options

(See documents on file.)

Mr. Peter Turowski of Turowski2 Architects (T2) and Mr. Dan Solien of Horiuchi Solien Landscaping presented the remaining options (see 9/11/17 TSBC Minutes) with modifications from feedback and the Outdoor Working Group. The Selectmen were expected to sign the upper Parking Lot Memorandum of Understanding shortly.

Option 3B – The preferred schematic design (allowing use of the current building) was revised by turning the gym to increase the setback from Spring St. However, this eliminated the small back parking (merging parking to one lot) and lost the primary grade parent drop-off. The TSBC examined the service space and pointed out that Project Headway pre-school class should have direct disability access to their space.

- Ambulance/Fire services usually requested access to three sides and this scheme allowed access to two and a half sides.

Option 3C – This option had been modified to separate middle school and elementary play areas. The previous cons of play areas distant from classrooms still applied.

- Mr. Marks reported that unfortunately the type of gym bubbles (see 9/11/17 Minutes p.3) were in demand as temporary shelters for hurricane damaged buildings and consequently not feasible for this project. The alternative would require a hurricane proof foundation slab, estimated cost \$5-600,000, so, along with the modulares for displaced classrooms (music, ELL, etc.), temporary buildings would cost ~ \$750,000. Option 3D (1 & 2) – as there was minimal feedback T2 did not modify these options.

• ON A MOTION DULY MADE BY MR. CHAPDELAINE AND SECONDED BY MR. DEBETTENCOURT THE TISBURY SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ELIMINATE OPTIONS 3D(1) AND 3D(2) A NEW SCHOOL ON THE EXISTING LOCATION; 13 AYES, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSTENTIONS: MR. MULVEY—AYE, MS. MULVEY—AYE, MS. MILNE—AYE, MR. DEBETTENCOURT—AYE, MS. BACHELLER—AYE, MR. AITCHISON—AYE, MS. MCANDREWS—AYE, MR. CHAPDELAINE—AYE, MS. DOBLE, MR. CUSTER—AYE, MR. GRANDE—AYE, MR. SEIDMAN—AYE, MS. LOBERG—AYE.

• To allow T2 to concentrate on the design, the TSBC compared Options 3B and 3C:

- play area/emergency services access joint space through loops or gates;
- Oak Bluffs School (OBS) primary grade play area as too small and unused;
- parent drop-off, parking and access to play areas for community use;
- play areas as better spaces to abut neighbors than parking or service access;
- parking configurations;
- compact versus building sprawl;
- sun exposure for outdoor spaces.

* Supt. Matt D'Andrea, Asst. Supt. Richie Smith and Ms. Catherine Coogan entered the meeting at 6:11PM.

• ON A MOTION DULY MADE BY MR. GRANDE AND SECONDED BY MR. CHAPDELAINE THE TISBURY SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING VOTED TO MOVE FORWARD WITH OPTIONS 3B THE PREFERRED SCHEMATIC; 13 AYES, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSTENTION: MR. MULVEY—AYE, MS. MULVEY—AYE, MS. MILNE—AYE, MR. DEBETTENCOURT—AYE, MS. BACHELLER—AYE, MR. AITCHISON—AYE, MS. MCANDREWS—AYE, MR. CHAPDELAINE—AYE, MS. DOBLE, MR. CUSTER—AYE, MR. GRANDE—AYE, MR. SEIDMAN—ABSTAIN, MS. LOBERG—AYE, MS. COOGAN—AYE.

VI. Discussion of General Contractor (GC) Procurement Options

Mr. Marks introduced this complex topic, which would have to be decided by the Schematic Design deadline. Massachusetts General Law (MGL) Ch. 149/Reform Act Ch. 149A delineated two methods (see documents on file).

- Almost 50% of construction project costs were 13-14 sub-contractors/bidders: painting, electrical, plumbing, fire suppression, etc.

• The traditional procurement process (Design, Bid, Build—DBB) required choice of the low bidder—although the Ch. 149A required contractors to pre-qualify eliminating very low quality contractors. It was fairly easy to implement, allowed maximum owner control, easily accommodated design changes prior to construction, and fixed the construction cost at bid time, i.e. Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) including sub-contractors. However cons included: no GC input in design, planning or engineering, no say in the individual assigned to the project, sequential design and construction (no early work packages), and unknown construction costs before the bid.

Mr. Marks added that due to the very busy mainland construction market there were likely to be a limited number of bidders, citing the example of the Martha's Vineyard Museum now having difficulties attracting any contractors to the Island.

- Construction Manager at Risk (CMR) allowed the community to choose a firm and staff mid-way through the design process by a stringent process interviewing pre-qualified construction managers. The Manager then became part of the team adding cost control and construction/engineering value to the design process such as avoiding specification inconsistencies. This might also fast track the project and would allow the Manager to recruit Island sub-contractor/bidders. The cons included: approval by the Inspector General's Office (30-45 days), additional 2-3% in CMR services for initial cost (MSBA reimbursable). The owner had to pay for any changes, i.e. the CMR takes on very little risk and the GMP was set later.
- Mr. Marks felt that the CMR method had a slightly better quality of construction, higher caliber paperwork and a cleaner, safer and generally better run construction site since the contractor was not pressured by a price ceiling.
- Both had fixed costs except for changes in scope or change orders, with no appreciable difference between the two. The OPM still acted as check and balance, and oversaw the work.
- TSBC members were urged to study the two methods for a vote at the next meeting.

* Selectmen Melinda Loberg exited the meeting at 6:32PM.

III. Architect Report

A. Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) versus (vs.) North East Collaborative for High Performance Schools (NE CHPS)

LEED representative Cynthia Kaplan outlined the difference between these two programs (see documents on file) either of which carried a 2% reimbursement credit. LEED was the larger, more universal certification (\$7,340 estimated cost) and required building level water metering (which the School probably already had). NE CHPS (\$7,440) was smaller and more regional and included such things as: educational displays, crime prevention, integrated pest management (probably already in place), facility and staff training. The certification processes were configured differently, had different on line document submittal protocols. LEED had a 25 day review period and NE CHPS took about 2-4 months, although the reimbursement rates were equal. LEED had various publicity options (plaques, presentations, inclusion as model buildings, etc.), while NE CHPS had more limited options.

- It was agreed that as the Sustainability Working Group would meet tomorrow the vote would be postponed till the next meeting.

IV. Presentation of Edgartown and Oak Bluffs School Visits (See documents on file.)

- The members liked a number of Edgartown School features (built 2003):
 - amazing outdoor garden space integrated into the curriculum;
 - creativity with spaces not otherwise utilized, e.g. the old school gym;
 - an impressive nurse's area;
 - entryway and cafeteria connection encouraging public gathering and community use;
 - similar neighborhood situation to the Tisbury School.

They were disappointed with the use of dull colored cinder block, and noted the School was replacing all its carpets with vinyl tile. Administration reported that heating/lighting change-over to energy savings was a challenge.

- The 1994 built Oak Bluffs School felt a little more sterile:
 - large, less welcoming entry, although used for morning meetings,
 - hallways seemed overly wide and classrooms too big for small primary grade classes;
 - conversely the stairway to narrow and small;
 - excellent maker space and a greenhouse connected to the Science room;
 - inviting library with in and out-door seating.

* Mr. Seidman exited the meeting at 6:54PM.

The TSBC did not get any feedback on the OBS move away from the center of Town. Both buildings sprawled a little and were difficult to navigate, reaffirming the TSBC decision for a three story better organized building. Both schools had multiple teacher rooms reachable within the limited travel timeframes for work and small conferences.

Invoices

- WORK OUTLINED ON THE FOLLOWING INVOICES HAD BEEN PERFORMED:
 - MVTV INVOICE DATED 9/22/17 FOR THE 8/9/17 OPEN HOUSE FOR \$70; AND
 - MVTV INVOICE DATED 9/22/17 FOR THE 9/18/17 PUBLIC FORUM FOR \$105.

Adjournment

- ON A MOTION DULY MADE BY MR. AITCHISON AND SECONDED BY MS. BACHELLER THE TISBURY SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE ADJOURNED AT 7:03PM: 12 AYES, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSTENTIONS.

Appendix A: Meetings/Events:

- TSBC Sustainability Subcommittee, 9:30AM-12:00N, Tuesday September 26, 2017
- **Joint TSC/BOS – 5:00PM, Tuesday September 26, 2017 at Town Hall**
- School Tour – 7:00AM Ferry, Thursday, September 28, 2017
- Security Work Group – 10:00AM Monday, October 2, 2017
- In-House Staff Meetings – October 5-6, 2017
- **TSC – 8:30AM, Tuesday, October 10, 2017 at the Tisbury School**
- **TSBC – 5:00PM, Tuesday, October 10, 2017 at the Tisbury School**
- **TSBC – 5:00PM, Monday October 23, 2017 at the Tisbury School**

Appendix B: Actions

- All - *please* read material on procurement vs. lump sum finances for October meeting.
- T2 - design to accommodate Project Headway direct disability access.
- All - email questions to Chair McAndrews.

Appendix C: Documents on File:

- Agenda 9/25/17
- Sign In Sheet 9/25/17
- Building Committee Presentation for: Tisbury Elementary School September 25, 2017 (61 p.)

Minutes respectfully submitted by Office On Call/Marni Lipke.

Minutes approved by the TSBC 10/17/17