Tisbury School Building Committee – Design/Construction Phase 3:30PM, Monday, April 25, 2022 by Zoom Cloud Conference due to Covid-19 Restrictions

1

TSBC Members Present:		Chair – Mike Watts, Connie Alexander, John Custer,
		Sean DeBettencourt, Rita Jeffers, Reade Milne, Jim Rogers,
	Absent:	Sarah York,
Others:	John McGonagle, Rachel Orr, Chris Potts, Kate Shands,	
	Recor	der – Marni Lipke,
	CHA Projects – Aditya Modi, Michael Owen, Tappé Architects – Chris Blessen, Toby Zaltsman,	
	WTR	ich - Harvey Eskenas, Jonathon Rich, Brian Santos,
Town:	Town: Town Administrator – Jay Grande, FinCom – Nancy	
	Clima	ite ComMelinda Loberg, Planning Bd Ben Robinson,
School:	Supt.	Matt D'Andrea, Prin. John Custer, Asst. Prin. Melissa Ogden,
	Julie	Brand, Sean DeBettencourt, Meredith Goldthwait, Kate Harding,
	Rache	el Hickey, Rita Jeffers, Mollee Lewis, Nicole Shirley,
	Anne	Williamson, TSC – Amy Houghton, PTO – Siobhan Mullin,
		* TSBC members late arrivals or early departures

1. Call To Order & Virtual Meeting Reminders

• The Tisbury School Building Committee Design/Construction Phase (TSBC) meeting was called to order at 3:33PM. Chair Michael Watts reviewed the protocol for remote meetings occasioned by the pandemic.

(*Recorder's note*: Discussions are summarized and grouped for clarity and brevity.)

2. Tisbury School Building Committee (TSBC) Attendance - was called.

3. Review and Approval of Minutes

• ON A MOTION DULY MADE BY PRINCIPAL JOHN CUSTER AND SECONDED BY MS. READE MILNE THE FOLLOWING MINUTES WERE UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED: 7 AYES, 0 NAYS, ABSTENTIONS AS ABSENT:

- NOVEMBER 15, 2021,
- NOVEMBER 19, 2021,
- NOVEMBER 22, 2021,
- DECEMBER 13, 2021,
- JANUARY 18, 2022,
- MARCH 16, 2022,
- MARCH 21, 2022;

MR. SEAN DEBETTENCOURT—AYE, MS. CONNIE ALEXANDER—AYE (ABSTAIN AS ABSENT), PRIN. CUSTER—AYE, MS. MILNE—AYE, MR. JIM ROGERS—AYE, MS. RITA JEFFERS—AYE, MR. WATTS—AYE.

4. TSBC Chairperson, Vice Chairperson Update

• Agenda and Minute posting on the Town website was the responsibility of the Committee and Chair Michael Watts and Vice Chair Rita Jeffers apologized for the delays; this agenda was posted and proper publicizing progress would continue.

- Project Website visits were currently minimal, so there was some question as to whether it should continue or post documents and presentation directly on the Town website instead.

• Leadership was working with the Climate Committee and Town Administrator Jay Grande on grants for sustainable construction, and on alternate funding.

- The Field Fund was contacted regarding landscape funding and alternatives.

<u>5. Budget Review on 60% Construction Drawings (CDs)</u> (See documents on file.)

Tappé Architects, Daedalus/CHA Owners Project Managers (OPM), and WT Rich Construction Manager at Risk (CMR) performed separate construction estimates which were then combined to coordinate, tighten, and reduce costs. As everyone was aware of the intense inflation particularly around construction, supply chain and labor, the results were painful but not surprising. Construction costs were now estimated at \$52,416,000 about \$10,000,000 over the original \$42,350,000 estimate.

- The Town could not proceed with a contract if the full amount was not appropriated.

- Unfortunately the same inflation, as well as the temporary school modular rent came to 1-5% cost increases for each month's delay, putting enormous time pressure on the project and on the TSBC to decide how to proceed.

- Mr. Watts asked the team to draft options that could move the project forward, emphasizing that cutting \$10,000,000 would mean that all choices would be agonizing.

• Mr. Jonathan Rich of WT Rich introduced the options with the following points:

- The team performed a grueling review to reduce costs.
- The intent was to separate components of the project to be:

° voted/funded at a later date,

° and/or funded alternately (grants, donations, Town residuals, etc.)

° or permanently cut.

Separating the portions to fit the project within the current budget, would allow WT Rich to proceed with the project immediately, going out to advertise for trades and subcontractors, to get real Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) numbers.

- The separated components could also be bid to set subcontractor and trades costs which were held for a certain period of time, allowing the Town to raise funds and/or vote on additional moneys at a Special Town Meeting (STM) with hard/guaranteed numbers.

• The finances of all 3 options were detailed (see documents on file) including Value Engineering (VE) reductions in such things as: materials, light fixtures, windows/window walls, insulation, etc.

- <u>All 3 options</u> drastically reduced site improvements (eliminating a playground, benches, plantings, changing concrete to asphalt, etc.) as already having some alternate funding and/or being easier to fund at a later date. (Due to procurement regulations, site improvements were also hard to get and hold set bid prices.

- Two of the options presented serious design and bid difficulties by resulting in two possible and simultaneous eventualities, redesign if the Town vote/alternate funding failed or original design if it passed.

- These were preliminary drafts and some storylines might shift for the better or the worse.

• <u>Option #1</u> – would retain the gym/cafeteria addition as designed but separated the administrative/Project Headway addition to be funded later or incorporated into a smaller addition to the building.

• <u>Option #2</u> – would renovate the existing gym (retaining the sub-standard music and Spanish classrooms), requiring only a cafeteria addition. The administrative wing with some VE reductions would remain. Although the most financially desirable by severely reducing square footage, this option was the least suitable in every other way, losing the community disability access to the gym, maintaining or increasing current space deficiencies, and most importantly, failing to meet the Education Plan.

• <u>Option #3</u> – retained the gym/cafeteria addition as designed, and moved the Administrative addition with VE reductions, but made major reductions in the renovation of the 1929 building—specifically windows and masonry.

The TSBC expressed dismay and discussed the options and issues.

• There was strong feeling that after committing to the 1929 building improvements, reducing the renovations (Option #3) would be unpopular with Tisbury residents/taxpayers and that an administrative wing would be a better ask.

- Members expressed serious concern about hazardous materials (hazmat) and failing to deliver a sustainable and weather tight building.

- Mr. Rich emphasized that all three options included full hazmat abatement.

• A more basic administrative wing possibly across the street was suggested, however Mr. Rich explained this would involve new expenses such as extending heat: electrical services and other utilities, although repurposing modulars on site might be an option.

• There was a feeling that the project should be done right the first time.

• The temporary school would not be ready in time for a September move and a mid fall move would be a challenge (although it could be staggered a few classroom at a time) otherwise the new move-out/move-in target was the winter holidays. The gym demolition was likewise delayed till the fall.

• Options #1 and #3 would require about 6 weeks of redesign, with a target of a STM followed by a ballot vote at the State November elections (see below: Meetings/Events), so the July 2024 completion could still be a possibility. Option #2 would require 18 weeks of redesign, delaying the bid process, precluding hard numbers for a November vote and pushing completion to fall 2024 and move-in to winter holiday break 2024. This would also incur 10 additional months of modular rent at \$105,000 per month— about \$1,000,000.

• It was noted that there were likely to be other increased costs such as for Daedalus/CHA and Tappé work, besides this core-construction inflation. The team emphasized that savings in this area depended to some extent on a fast TSBC decision so the team could start planning.

• A straw poll vote was taken on Option #2:

- ° 5 agreed to eliminate it, because not meeting the Education Plan was unacceptable;
- ° 1 strongly requested more time—others expressed similar wishes;

° 1 suggested re-examining the Education Plan and redesigning the project. Issues included:

- a \$50,000,000 building that did not meet State minimum standards or even good educational spaces regardless of State standards,
- unexpected demands that exacerbated inadequacies such as the pandemic,
- what the community wanted the school to look like,
- short-sightedness in over-emphasizing the Education Plan as only one of several important factors.

• Only Option #2 encompassed a full 1929 envelope restoration/energy efficiency—although the 1995 gym addition insulation was less certain. The other options were tightly budgeted, with the intent to do as much envelope/energy efficiency as possible, but emphasizing that 4% VE was a lot to squeeze out of the project.

• In considering Option #3 it was noted that windows were an expensive item (at least \$2,000,000) but they could be replaced individually or in small groups on an ongoing basis. Grant funds and State green money were likely to be more available for windows and energy efficiency—whereas such funding would be less available for an administrative wing.

9. Public Comments

• Tisbury School Committee Chair Amy Houghton agreed that more time and information was needed to consider the options.

• Ms. Rachel Orr, a former TSBC member, suggested using the parking to expand the gym cafeteria component to include administrative space.

- Mr. Grande emphasized the huge scope of the decision and recommended TSBC:
- choose the option requiring the least re-design, so that construction could proceed as soon as possible to minimize further inflation costs;
- choose an option that met the Education Plan;

- instigate a fundraising campaign and committee, to identify other funding.

He also emphasized the importance of energy efficiency and solar power and offered that there might be Town resources.

5. Budget Review on 60% CD (continued)

• Mr. Michael Owen of CHA/Daedalus reminded everyone that the causes of this difficulty were not within the Town's control in that the world had changed in the last 12 months with the impact of the pandemic and the war in Ukraine, and that it was quite possible there could be another problem in 6 months. The professional team was pushing urgently under unfortunate circumstances for the requested project that met the Education Plan and served the community.

• Both Mr. Owen and Mr. Rich stressed that the situation was and should be presented as a solution to the pressures that caused a cost overrun. It was not that the team or the TSBC did not want an administrative wing, or 1929 envelope restoration, but rather that these were major discreet scopes that could be postponed for later creative and alternate fundraising, grants or town resources, while proceeding as efficiently as possible. The focus was on a strategic business path. Any Town vote was to fund the overrun, and was not about this or that component.

• Mr. Watts understood the TSBC need for more information (how walls would change, how the Administrative wing would fit into a courtyard space, etc.). The TSBC requested a narrative on all three options, and scheduled a meeting for Thursday (see below: Meetings/Events & Actions). Mr. Watts knew this would be difficult for the professional team and all the TSBC members thanked them commending their work and dedication.

6. Architect's Update - See above #5

7. Owner's Project Manager (OPM) Update - See above #5

8. Construction Manager's Update - See above #5

<u>10. Other Topics Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair Within 48 Hours of the Meeting</u> - None

11. Adjournment

The meeting concluded with salutes to and a moment of silence for former TSBC Chair Harold Chapdelaine, who had been a tremendous force in Tisbury and was a huge loss to his family, the Town and this project. People spoke of his amazing hard work and thoughtfulness. He was a self-taught man who reinvented himself 2 or 3 times, and it pained him greatly when his health forced him to remove himself from the TSBC.

• ON A MOTION DULY MADE BY MR. ROGERS AND SECONDED BY PRIN. CUSTER THE TISBURY SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING UNANIMOUSLY ADJOURNED AT 5:48PM: 7 AYES, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSTENTIONS: MR. DEBETTENCOURT— AYE, PRIN. CUSTER—AYE, MS. MILNE—AYE, MS. JEFFERS—AYE, MR. ROGERS— AYE, MS. ALEXANDER—AYE, MR. WATTS—AYE.

Appendix A: Meetings/Events:

- TSBC 4:30PM, Thursday, April 28, 2022
- TSC 5:00PM, Tuesday, May 10, 2022 TBD
- TSBC Monday, May 16, 2022
- TSBC -Monday, June 20, 2022
- Tisbury State Election November 12, 2022

Appendix B: Actions:

- Tappé/CHA/WT Rich present more detailed narratives on all 3 options.
- All please share any creative solutions or ideas with the Chair or the professional team.
- All În order to avoid violating Open Meeting Law please remember not to hit "Reply All".

Appendix C: Documents on File: (*Available at:* <u>http://www.tisbury.mvyps.org/ click on Tisbury</u> School Project & Official archive hard copies on file at Tisbury School)</u>

- Agenda 4/25/22
- Modi/Rich/Blessen emails re: SBC presentation (8 p.) 4/25/22
- Tisbury School Project SBC Meeting April 25, 2022, Design Direction Options (14 p.)

Minutes respectfully submitted by Office On Call/Marni Lipke.

Marni Lipke – Recorder

Date

Michael Watts – TSBC Chair

Date

Accepted 5/16/22