

MEETING MINUTES



MANAGEMENT
PARTNERS, LLC

Project: Manchester Memorial Elementary School
 Subject: School Building Committee Meeting
 Location: Manchester MS/HS – Library
 Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No: MP17-114
 Meeting Date: 12/19/2019
 Time: 6:00 PM
 Prepared By: R. Donner

Present	Name	Affiliation	Present	Name	Affiliation
✓	Caroline Weld *	SBC Co-Chair		Jim LaPosta	JCJ
✓	Ann Cameron *	SBC Co-Chair	✓	Debi McDonald	JCJ
✓	Pam Beaudoin *	Superintendent		Lauren Braren	JCJ
✓	Avi Urbas *	Dir. of Fin. & Ops		Emily Czarnecki	JCJ
✓	Alva Ingaharro *	Essex		Joe Fazio	JCJ
✓	John Willis *	Principal MMES		Mike Burton	DWMP
	Jason Waldron	Dir. of Facilities		Chip Heitkamp	DWMP
✓	Andy Oldeman *	Man. Fin. Comm.	✓	Christina Shefferman	DWMP
✓	Lisa O'Donnell *	Essex	✓	Rachel Donner	DWMP
✓	Remko Brueker *	Manchester		Jon Rich	WT Rich
	Adam Zaiger *	Manchester		Alex Corbett	WT Rich
✓	Tyler Virden *	Essex	✓	Brian Paradee	WT Rich
✓	George Scharfe *	Manchester			
	Gordon Brewster *	Manchester			
✓	Charlie Hay *	Essex			
✓	Sarah Creighton *	Manchester			
	Maggie Tomaiolo *	Essex			
✓	Jake Foster *	Essex			

* SBC Voting
Member

PROJECT MANAGERS
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950
 260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7
 978.499.2999 ph
 978.499.2944 fax

www.doreandwhittier.com

Item No.	Description	Action
51.1	Call to Order: 6:05 pm meeting was called to order by the SBC Co-Chair A. Cameron with 14 of 17 voting members in attendance.	Record
51.2	Previous Topics & Approval of October 22, 2019 Meeting Minutes: A motion to approve the 12/10/2019 meeting minutes as submitted made by A. Ingaharro and seconded by J. Foster. Discussion: None. Abstentions: A. Urbas, L. O'Donnell : All in favor: Motion passes, minutes approved.	Record
51.3	<p>Value Engineering Review: A. Cameron states this topic is for clarification on the VE items. C. Shefferman explains S. Creighton and C. Hay asked a few questions at the last meeting and we now have answers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A-01: JCJ has already cut a significant amount of wood ceilings in the project. This deduction would compromise the design. L. Braren said JCJ would have to perform another acoustical analysis and it could impact LEED points. If the wood is replaced by ACT, change order pricing would occur. A. Cameron asks if there are any objections. None. ➤ A-08, A-09, A-10: L. Braren said it would be minimal savings to switch from wood to veneer. There have also been a lot of complaints about delaminating in the high/middle school. A. Urbas attests to the laminate being a maintenance problem. A. Cameron asks if there are any objections. None. ➤ A-12a, A-12b: L. Braren said for the solid surface, Corian does not match the design intent and Avonite does not meet the durability standard. Icestone has recycled material in it and contributes to LEED points. A. Urbas comments he agrees with the durability difference and doesn't want to save money by getting an inferior material. A. Ingaharro asks if the lifespan difference is 50 years or an extra 5-6 years. D. McDonald explains she does not know the actual lifespan of each product but the Icestone contains recycled glass which is why it helps with LEED points. R. Brueker notes the Icestone will last longer as it is a harder product. A. Cameron asks if there are any objections. None. ➤ Comments: R. Brueker shares that regarding approving change orders, the SBC should look at VE items a little closer from now on. J. Rich responds we must be careful with that as time is ticking and a lot of subs are already on board. We need to make sure there's enough time for lead times. A. Urbas notes prior to setting the budget, if we were over budget, we would make last minute changes. There is a difference between change orders versus being over budget. A. Ingaharro states there is an additional issue now that is urgent and may cost \$200K. A. Cameron shares the SBC did not think the budget would be as tight as anticipated. The SBC figured the collaborative buying would help with the FF&E deficiency. C. Shefferman explains the deficiencies are all items we are trying to work back to budget. These deficiencies are different than change orders. Change orders come out of contingency as that's what it's for. Owner and CM contingency are meant to pay for unforeseen conditions. As for the deficiencies, the project team is working hard to get all categories back to budget. G. Scharfe states this isn't a change order and contingencies are made for this reason. We have picked up savings in other areas and this happens. G. Scharfe continues, in my experience, dirt always has a surprise. C. Shefferman shares before final GMP we had savings and rolled them into the budget so it wouldn't come out of contingency. J. Foster comments the 	Record

	<p>bottom line is we're still spending money if we chose a different material. A. Ingaharro asks again, how long do these materials last? A. Urbas comments he cannot answer that. D. McDonald explains there is a requirement for having a certain amount of recyclable materials in the building. There is a cost for these LEED certifiable materials. The lcestone is a very durable material and will move us a step forward in our LEED points. P. Beaudoin mentions any change will have a cost impact at this point. The loss of points outweighs the savings. M. Burton says if we decided not to use the lcestone we would need to find another recyclable material. T. Virden comments this process is very normal. This is only a late/short VE list. T. Virden also mentions he is not surprised about finding extra money in the dirt. That is where all the large change orders come from.</p>	
51.4	<p>Change Order Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Change Order Subcommittee Approval <p>J. Rich explains the change order to the SBC. J. Rich shares that the west side of the building needs ground support. This issue has developed quickly so I will review the history and context that has increased the urgency of this solution. There are 2 distinct issues at the west end of the building.</p> <p>Slope stabilization outside of the building footprint.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The clay is running off on the west side of the building which is creating some vulnerability in the ground. Geopiers could stabilize the slope and create the safety factor we are looking for. The outdoor stair and ramp area have not been treated by geopiers and there is a layer of thick clay in that area. That area needs to be supported as it is sensitive to some settlement. The building needs to withstand seismic events and this situation needs to be addressed. In the beginning the reports said they did not think slope stabilization would be required. This could not be confirmed until the final loading of the building and then they would reach a conclusion whether it was required. Originally, we excluded the slope stabilization as we were told we wouldn't need it, but we set aside an allowance of \$60K which would cover 3 rows of geopiers. Geopier is the patented engineer and Helical is the local installer. The design process has created a lot of schedule pressure. Once asked for load information, they did not really cooperate, and it took awhile to get information. On July 23rd they felt it wasn't required. LGCI then responded on August 12th and felt the slope stabilization was necessary. Nothing in the specifications said to provide geopiers for foundation or slope stability. WT Rich raised the question in an RFI for the ramp and stairs where LGCI responded yes it was required. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exploratory Options: Load up the building to create settlement. LGCI said they would not be comfortable with that. When doing geopiers, it's best to do them in the spring and hoped that would be the solution. Now, LGCI is saying they need to be installed prior to the building slab. The slab is being installed in 2 weeks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Option A: 56 Geopiers to support the stairs and ramp. More elements would be required for the slope stability. ▪ Option B: Helical piles – Helical piles have less vibratory impact and they are more economical. (WT Rich shows a helical pile 	Record

	<p>demonstration video to the SBC). Helical piles can be done in the spring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Comments: J. Foster asks if LGCI is ok with Helical piles. D. McDonald responds LGCI is okay with the option. Geopiers would have a scheduling impact. Helical piles allow the slab to move forward and it's less expensive. A. Cameron asks how expensive will this be? J. Rich explains the challenge is once an option is decided on there's no turning back without some risk. The project team wants to get to a point to select option B which is the better option. 56 piers for stairs and a ramp in early-mid January is aggressive. If this was the selected option, we could only pour 2/3 of the slab away from the geopier area and it would minimize schedule impact, but it is not the ideal option. Also, a metal expansion joint would be used which is not ideal for a brand-new building. Helical piles will require design changes and produce less vibration and can be installed after the slab on grade. The ramp is also subject to settlement. Helical Piles for the building and ramp are estimated to cost \$90K-\$130K without design changes. M. Burton asks if all 3 engineers agree on option B? D. McDonald confirms yes, all 3 engineers agree. L. O'Donnell asks if Helical says we do not need to stabilize the slope? J. Rich responds that Helical's original analysis is yes. Tonight, we are asking the SBC to approve the process and/or authorize someone who can approve the process. D. McDonald shares that LGCI would prefer some slope stabilization, but they accept Helical's recommendation as the engineer on record. L. O'Donnell comments that Helical Piles are the more reliable method. ➤ Change Order Subcommittee: L. O'Donnell, T. Virden & A. Ingaharro <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A motion was made by S. Creighton and seconded by J. Foster for the approval of the Change Order Subcommittee. Discussion: None. All in favor, motion passes. 	
51.5	Other Topics Not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to Meeting: None.	
51.6	Public Comments: None.	Record
51.7	Next SBC Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1/21/20 @ 7:00pm 	Record
51.8	Adjourn: 6:57 A motion was made by R. Brueker and seconded by T. Virden to adjourn the meeting, Discussion: None. Vote: Unanimous to approve.	Record

DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC.

Rachel Donner
 Assistant Project Manager
 Cc: Attendees, File

The above is my summation of our meeting. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact me for incorporation into these minutes.