

DRISCOLL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – BROOKLINE, MA	MEETING MINUTES Approved 11/5/21
---	---

DRISCOLL SCHOOL BUILDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE		May 20, 2020
Location:		Online GoToMeeting
Time:		7:30 AM
Name	Assoc.	Present
Susan Wolf Ditkoff	Town of Brookline, Co-Chair SBS, PSB	Y
Heather Hamilton	Town of Brookline, Co-Chair SBC, TOB Board of Selectmen	Y
Karen Breslawski	Building Commission	N
Ken Kaplan	Town of Brookline, Building Commission	Y
David Pollak	Advisory Committee	Y
Ali Tali	Transportation Board	N
Nancy O'Connor	Parks and Recreation Commission	Y
Dan Deutsch	Community Representative	Y
Victor Kusmin	Community Representative	Y
Linda Monach	Community Representative / Special Education Parent Advisory Council	Y
Arjun Mande	Community Representative	Y
Lakia Rutherford	Parent Representative / METCO	Y
Sara Stoutland	Community Representative	N
Mel Kleckner	Town Administrator	N
Dr. Jim Marini	Interim Superintendent of Schools	N
Matt Gillis	Director of Operations	Y
Michelle Bartley	Driscoll School Vice Principal	N
MaryEllen Normen	Deputy Superintendent for Administration and Finance	Y
David Youkulis	Interim Driscoll School Principal	N
Helen Charlupski	School Committee	N
Tony Guigli	Project Manager, Town of Brookline	Y
Dan Bennett	Building Commissioner	Y
Charlie Simmons	Director of Public Buildings	Y
Jim Rogers	LEFTFIELD	Y
Lynn Stapleton	LEFTFIELD	Y
Jen Carlson	LEFTFIELD	Y
Matt Casey	LEFTFIELD	Y
Adam Keane	LEFTFIELD	Y
Jonathan Levi	Jonathan Levi Architects	Y
Philip Gray	Jonathan Levi Architects	Y
Carol Harris	Jonathan Levi Architects	Y
Walt Kincaid	Gilbane Building Company	Y
Lynda Callahan	Gilbane Building Company	Y
Robert Braga	Gilbane Building Company	N

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 AM.

The April 1, 2020 meeting minutes were approved by the SBC contingent upon a change suggested by Nancy O'Connor to add commentary she made after a member noted the building is a permanent structure and should take priority over the landscape that has the ability to change over time. She

followed the comment with an explanation on the thorough public process that led to the current site design and that the school's park and playground amenity should not suffer as a result of any value management changes to the project as it is a community amenity.

Leftfield provided an update on the project, explaining that the first round of bids came in \$5.6 million over budget. To get the scope back in line with the budget, the team made some changes to the exterior of the building. The changes were presented to the planning board.

Jonathan Levi Architects provided an update on changes made to the building design. JLA briefly reviewed the value management changes previously decided on by the SBC that have since been made by the project team. The building's educational program was not affected by the updates, and the building continues to be Fossil Fuel Free as the Brookline mandate dictates.

JLA explained that the open pagoda on the west side of the plan was removed and replaced with a series of tables. The 150 new trees proposed for the site were maintained. Changes planned were reviewed in depth with the park and recreation department to ensure standard practices were followed and that the site could still easily be maintained. JLA is confident that the overall concept of the landscape of the building remains intact.

JLA presented visuals of the changes to the exterior of the building that were submitted to and accepted by the Planning Board. Of note are the deletion of the sunshades at the Washington Street side of the building which will be replaced by banners, the shortening of the building by 2 feet, and the removal of the trellis and terrace at the media center balcony. At the Washington Street entrance to the building, there was a glass canopy that was removed from the project – there is an overhang in that location regardless.

JLA noted that the Planning Board decided that the changes were minimal enough that the approval process did not require an additional meeting. Leftfield emphasized that the changes did not affect the educational program or the Fossil Fuel Free aspect of the building.

A member of the committee asked to confirm that the project no longer includes the geothermal wells. It was confirmed. The member asked if the synthetic turf field was maintained through the VM process, this was also confirmed.

A member of the committee asked if there are shades for light control no the interior of the building in lieu of the exterior sun shades that were eliminated from the project. This was confirmed.

Leftfield provided an update explaining that the project went out in the middle of February for the middle of bidding with bids coming back in \$5.6 million over budget. To ensure the project came back within budget in a second round of bidding, the project team identified \$7 million in value management opportunities. Of that \$7 million, \$1.6m was realized in filed sub bid category with \$2.8m with non-filed sub bid categories. It was noted that the target for filed sub bid trades was \$2m savings and the target for non-filed sub savings was \$5m. The project still was \$1.6m over the budget target, but there have been soft costs that were identified that could be moved around to ensure the uptick in bidding can be absorbed by the budget.

Leftfield presented the Total Project Budget as it relates to hard and soft costs. The original soft costs for the project were \$22.4m, with hard costs totaling \$92.9m. The project team is proposing that of the soft costs are reclassified as hard costs resulting in \$21.1m in soft costs and \$94.2 in hard costs for the project. Leftfield explained the budget line items that changed in order to allow for this increase in construction cost. Given there are not a lot of soft cost unknowns at this stage in the project, the team felt comfortable reclassing some of the owner's contingency line to cover the change in budget. The sum of the reclasses totaled \$1,255,201, which allows the project to move forward. Leftfield noted that there are two contingencies on the project, the owner's contingency and the construction contingency that total around 6% when combined. It was noted that this is beyond what is typically carried at this stage in the process.

Leftfield explained that the GMP contingency and construction contingency are two different budgets – GMP contingency is carried by the CM while construction contingency is part of the owner's contingency that covers construction issues that may arise in the way of change orders.

A member of the committee noted the volatility of the construction market at the moment, based on his professional experience. He asked if the Town and Gilbane are comfortable with the proposed budget number. Gilbane responded that the \$94m that the project team is driving towards will cover the bids received to date. Once Gilbane is authorized to proceed, they will lock the pricing in with their subs via contracts.

Leftfield provided a schedule update as it relates to next steps. The GMP is expected to be issued for approval on Monday, May 24th and a small group will meet with the team on Tuesday morning to review the draft. On May 26th the team will meet with the Building Commission and School Committee and then will follow up to meet with the Select Board. Once approval is obtained, Gilbane will begin executing contracts with their subcontractors to lock in pricing. This timeline will get the project to a construction start date of June 15th which allows for a September 2023 open date for the new school.

Tony Guigli, the Project Manager for the Town Building Department noted that the project team has done an excellent job getting the project to this point. If the SBC is satisfied with the presentation, then the team will move forward to present to the three boards for approval.

Nancy O'Connor motioned that the SBC approves sending the project forward to the Building Commission, School Committee and Select Board for consideration and approval in signing the GMP. Arjun Mande seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25am.