



## Town of Swampscott, Hadley Elementary School

### *Swampscott School Building Committee Meeting #24*

Date & Time: 7:30AM on January 14, 2014

Location: Swampscott Middle School

#### *Attended*

---

**Swampscott School Building Committee (SSBC):** Joseph Crimmins, SSBC Chair (JC)  
Barry Greenfield, Board of Selectmen (BG)  
Laurier Beaupre, Ex. Officio (LB)  
Gregory D'Antona, Finance Committee (GD)  
Carin Marshall, School Committee Member (CM)  
Pam Angelakis, Assistant Superintendent (PA)  
Sandra Rivers, Principal, Hadley School (SR)  
Garrett Baker, Member, MCPPO Certified (GB)

**Hill International (Hill):** Paul Kalous (PK)  
Inger Hamre-Foley

**Mount Vernon Group Architects (MVG):** Al Cuevas, AIA (AC)

---

The purpose of the meeting is to move the Hadley Elementary School Project forward.

---

#### *Update*

Joe Crimmins stated that he gave a project update to the Town's Finance Committee yesterday. The Finance Committee asked if the SBC has an estimate for how much it will cost to reconfigure Clarke School to fit Pre-K and K. Pam Angelakis and Garrett Baker to review numbers that they had previously calculated for this purpose.

#### *Approval of Meeting Minutes*

Motion: That the minutes of meeting #23, dated January 7, 2014 be accepted.

Motion by: Garrett Baker

Seconded: Barry Greenfield

Vote: Unanimous

#### *Approval of Invoices*

Motion: That Collaborative Partners invoice 13051-09 for \$11,817.50 and Mount Vernon Group Architects invoice 02013.08-0000006 for \$43,078.00 be approved for services in the feasibility study/schematic design phase be approved.

Motion by: Garrett Baker

Seconded by: Barry Greenfield

Vote: Unanimous



### ***Schematic Design Cost Estimates***

The handout from Hill included four summary pages from Fennessy Consulting Services (MVG's Cost Estimator) and four summary pages from A.M. Fogarty & Associates (Hill's Cost Estimator). Hill and MVG reviewed the details of the two cost estimates. The total estimated construction cost is \$42,693,000 by Fennessy Consulting Services and \$42,095,115 by A.M. Fogarty & Associates. Hill stated that the cost estimators was given a narrative of the HVAC, Electrical, Fire Protection, Plumbing, and Landscaping as well as the elevation, floor and site drawings, and both Hill and MVG have worked and feel comfortable with each of the cost estimators performance on this and other projects. The cost estimates were issued yesterday by the cost estimators and together with Hill and MVG, they spent all day yesterday reconciling each line item of the cost estimate. The final cost estimates included in today's handout is a result of the reconciliation meeting.

The estimates are roughly \$9 million more than the preferred schematic construction cost estimate. Some of the contributing factors include that the geotechnical testing results are back and they show that part of the Middle School soil is contaminated and will cost more to remove and replace, as well as cost of the development of the fields and playground at the Stanley site. The estimators are also seeing a larger than expected increase in the construction cost escalation. The cost of the selected HVAC system increased the estimate as well. It was noted that the site cost is capped by the MSBA at 8% of the direct building cost, and any cost above the 8% will not be eligible for reimbursement.

MVG and Hill both noted that the cost would be higher for all the options reviewed during the feasibility study due to a large percentage of the rise in escalation and site cost. The Committee asked what consequences there would be if they went back to review the other feasibility options. MVG and Hill stated that the team would have to submit another feasibility study package to the MSBA, if permitted by the MSBA, and the project would be delayed and not be voted on this spring.

The handout for the meeting also included a draft Appendix 4C, Schematic Design Submittal Notification Template. Hill noted that the MSBA requested an email with the suggested text in Appendix 4C, which includes the Designer and OPM's Cost Estimate, as well as OPM estimate of Project cost and District's Project Budget sent to them today. Hill will insert the District's Project Budget amount used in prior submissions. For the OPM's Estimate of Project Cost, Hill will calculate the soft cost and contingencies by adding 24% of the estimated construction cost to the construction cost.

Hill will be working on developing the MSBA Budget Form 3011, which will include all the costs for the project and present at next week's SBC meeting. MVG and Hill both emphasized that as we develop the MSBA Budget Form 3011, showing numbers in each of the budget line items, these will become the final numbers as the MSBA approves the budget. There is not an option to exceed any of the budget line item after Schematic Design package has been approved, and therefore it is important to have a full understanding of each of the line items prior to the submission to the MSBA. As the Schematic Design documents progress to Design Development and then to the Construction Document phase, new cost estimates are developed. If the cost estimates are over the estimated budget lines, value engineering will need to take place.

### ***Design-Bid-Build or CM At Risk***

Hill stated that the SBC must vote in the near future if they would like to use the delivery method Design-Bid-Build (Chapter 149) or CM at Risk (Chapter 149A) for the construction of the building. CM at Risk delivery method includes a qualification based selection of a Construction Manager, who will join the team during design to assist with cost estimates and review of the drawings for phasing and coordination purpose. As the drawings are complete, the Construction Manager submits a Guaranteed Maximum Price for the construction portion of the project. The costs of a CM at Risk project tend to be higher due to the extra services from the Construction Manager, and are typically used for complex, phased projects.

The Design-Bid-Build delivery method is the most common, where the team designs the building, send it out to bid, and select the lowest bidding General Contractor to build the project.



Hill and MVG recommend moving forward with the delivery method Design-Bid-Build. A vote on the matter will be taken at a later SBC meeting.

***Code Analysis***

MVG will review the code analysis and the bylaws of Swampscott with Thomas Younger.

***Next Meeting***

The next School Building Committee (SBC) meeting is scheduled for January 21, 2014 at 7:30AM to review the MSBA 3011 Form.