

Nashoba Regional School District

Minutes of the Nashoba Regional High School Building Committee April 12, 2022 (Meeting held via Zoom Technology Video Conferencing Platform)

VOTING COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Joseph Gleason, Leah Vivirito, Amy Cohen, Ken Frommer, Robert Czekanski, David Hartnagle, Stacey Dupuis, Tania Rich, Christopher Buck, Kim Earley, Maura Bailey, Kristen Kendall, and Superintendent Kirk Downing.

NON VOTING COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Pat Marone, Rob Frieswick, Kate Boynton, Don Lowe, Joe McCarthy, and Todd Maguire

ABSENT: Scott Gibson, Steve Rubinstein,

NON-MEMBER INVITEES:

Ross Mulkerin

SKANSKA - OPM

Mary Ann Williams, Sy Nguyen

KAESTLE BOOS ASSOCIATES (KBA)- Architects

Joe Milani, Craig Olsen

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Gleason called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM

CITIZENS COMMENTS:

None

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

A request was made to approve the minutes of February 8, 2022 and March 15, 2022 of the Nashoba Regional High School Building Committee (hereinafter "SBC"). Mr. Robert Czekanski indicated that the minutes regarding the adjournments were not correct. Approval of these minutes will be tabled until the next meeting.

APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARY TO THE N.R.H.S. BUILDING COMMITTEE:

Chairman Gleason indicated that Ms. Sy Nguyen will be the recording Secretary and the SBC will need a Committee Secretary.

Chairman Gleason opened the floor to nominations for SBS Secretary.

Motion to nominate Ms. Kristen Kendall as SBC Secretary was made by: Chairman Gleason

Motion was seconded by: Robert Czekanski

Kristen Kendall accepted the nomination to the position of SBC Secretary and further agreed to be the designated “moving member” for all pre-prepared requisite motions.

Motion was approved by all voting members. No discussion on the motion.

COMMUNICATIONS:

KBA received the letter from Nashoba Regional School District’s Special Education Parent Advisory Committee (SEPAC). Mr. Craig Olsen stated that it was a thoughtful letter, he would like SEPAC to understand that the project team does hear what they have to say, and all the items will be considered as the project is progressing. The project will circle back to SEPAC and review with them sometime during the project.

STATUS AND UP-DATE REPORT FROM SKANSKA USA

Ms. Mary Ann Williams reported for Skanska that they are working with KBA and the SBC’s Working Group on the presentation for Public Forum 2, project potential site options and analysis, and meeting with the District’s leadership team to review the draft education vision report. KBA’s design team continues collecting information, evaluating and documenting existing conditions, and investigating and analyzing site options. Public Forum 2 is now scheduled for April 25, 2022, 6:00 PM, and will cover Educational Visioning and Education Plan Update.

NEW BUSINESS:

(a) Discussion on approval of project invoices

Ms. Patricia Marone presented Skanska Invoice #6 in the amount of \$2,725 and KBA Invoice #3 in the amount of \$31,250. Ms. Marone has reviewed the invoices and is recommending approval.

Motion to approve Skanska Invoice #6 in the amount of \$2,725 and KBA Invoice #3 in the amount of \$31,250.

Motion to approve: Robert Czeskanski

Motion was seconded by: Tania Rich

Motion was approved by all voting members in attendance. No discussion on the motion.

(b) Education Visioning Up-date:

Slides were presented to the SBC. Mr. Olsen provided an update on the educational visioning which, with the assistance of Dr. Frank Locker, will develop into the educational program that the design team will use to design the building. A meeting was held last week with key members of administration who will continue engaging people in the District over the next month and a half.

Mr. Olsen provided an update on the evaluation of the existing conditions and noted that geotechnical investigation will be done next week.

(c) Potential Project Site Locations:

Slides were presented to the SBC. Mr. Olsen presented the following:

KBA’s site selection is a 5 Step Process:

1. Establish Required Criteria

2. Identify Sites that Meet Required Criteria
3. Develop Site Evaluation Matrix
4. Review Potential Sites Based on Matrix
5. Select Preferred Site

The criteria established were:

- Site must be a minimum of 45 acres, this is based on size of school building needed with appropriate athletic fields and site amenities to go with it.
- Location must be in compliance with any controlling authority as provided for this in the Nashoba Regional School District Regional Agreement.
- Priority for the District-owned property.
 - Cost of procurement of land is not reimbursable by MSBA.
 - Fiscally responsible solution for the District.

Once the criteria were established, KBA looked at the map of the District and evaluated properties that meet the criteria. First all properties that were 45 acres were identified. Of these properties those not within 3-mile radius of the center of the District and near Route 117 (due to ease of roads to travel on and access) were eliminated. Of the remaining properties KBA reviewed how many were District-owned and the only property was the site of the existing high school site.

Main reasons why District-owned properties are a priority include:

- Costs associated with procurement of land is not reimbursable by MSBA
- Duration for procurement of land. Per MSBA, the property will need to be secured prior to approval of the project, which is before Schematic Design.
 - Potential that District will acquire property and the project does not get approved leaving the District with a property and no project.
 - Time to procure the property can potentially delay the project for a year or more. This would impact construction cost due to cost escalation.

With the site of the existing high school as the only property meeting the criteria, it was selected as the Preferred Site without doing Step 4: Review Potential Sites Based on Matrix. However, KBA did this step for the existing school site as part of its due diligence.

The recommendation from the Working Group to the SBC is to select the existing school site as the preferred site.

Mr. Ken Frommer stated that the Working Group discussed the different sites and at the end it came down to:

- the Town did not own the other properties
- it would be a lot more money and time
- potential to have to ask all 3 towns to buy a piece of property for a project that has not been approved
- if for some reason the project does not get approved then the District would have a piece land that nothing happens on

After a long discussion that was a main reason why the existing site was selected.

Ms. Kristen Kendall stated that while it isn't disagreed that this is the only viable site based on the Working Group's study, she would like confirmation that this study will fulfill the

MSBA's requirement for site selection and investigation into the other potential sites. Mr. Olsen confirmed that it does and that investigations did occur and was shared with the Working Group and the documentation will be in the MSBA submission.

Mr. David Hartnagel inquired at what stage of the project will the determination of how the existing site is used for construction and still continue to operate as a high school be analyzed. Mr. Olsen said that this will begin after tonight's approval from the SBC of the existing high school site as the preferred site. Mr. Olsen stated that KBA will start looking at different building options of addition, renovation and/or new construction and will analyze many options and iterations that will be reviewed with the group to get to the Preferred Schematic Report submission. Ms. Williams added that in the Preliminary Design Program will be submitted in June, 2022 and in the next submission is the Preferred Schematic Report where the District will be telling the MSBA that the team has study many options and this is the selected option.

Superintendent Downing agreed with Mr. Frommer's assessment.

Mr. Christopher Buck inquired if Mr. Olsen can comment, based on experience and benchmarking, the implications on the overall timeline and cost driven by construction and operating school on same site.

Mr. Olsen stated that it varies and depends on the options. If addition/renovation option, they typically take longer because the nature of phasing. As the team starts to look at and work through options, will consider solutions that are fiscally responsible and educationally appropriate. There might be options put forth that might add time to the construction process and money but these might be the most appropriate long term solution (50 years) for the District. These are things will be considered. More often than not, the building does end up on the existing school site because of multiple reasons – usually - it is the most ideal site to begin with and also has the existing utilities, which has a substantial cost if have to bring in. Building on existing school site has its own challenges such as how to manage construction on an operating school and impacts to student that will be considered.

Mr. Buck inquired why Mr. Olsen thinks it would be less in cost and time to use the existing site than go look for a new site. Ms. Williams stated that there are many factors to consider, and cost is a function of time. Ms. Williams added that if you want to purchase a new property then you have to look at what it takes to buy a new property, is the property for sale, need to determine suitability of restrictions on land if any, or if it would have to be taken by eminent domain if desired but not for sale, and also need to consider escalation cost, impacts of supply chain, market conditions and global economy.

Mr. Frommer stated the Working Group also discussed buying a 2nd Parcel for the athletic fields or phasing, but ultimately decided against that due the same reasons for selecting the existing school site.

Ms. Leah Vivirito stated that if new structure will impede into the athletic fields, then there are fields that are owned by the District's sending communities that can be used and that the District can get creative in that regard.

Motion to accept the recommendation of the Working Group to maintain the existing school as the project site.

Motion was made by: Robert Czekanski
Motion was seconded by: Ken Frommer

Discussion: Ms. Vivirito asked if it was premature to select the site prior to the Geotechnical investigation. It was further clarified that Ms. Vivirito's question was if there is a concern that the geotechnical testing would find something that would disqualify the site as suitable to build. Mr. Olsen indicated that he does not think that it is a concern and that the geotechnical will help better understand the soils in regards of type of foundation, where to put the building, and more define the cost of the building.

Motion was approved by all voting members.

CEO SUBCOMMITTEE

Ms. Cohen stated that the Nashoba High School Building Project website has been made public. On the website, there is a form for submitting a question. CEO will facilitate gathering the questions and sending to Skanska. Public Forum 2 has been posted on Facebook and local newspaper(s).

ADJOURNMENT

No further business being before the Nashoba Regional High School Building Committee. Chairman Gleason requested a motion to adjourn.

Motion was made by: Kirk Downing
Motion was seconded by: Robert Czekanski
Motion was approved by all voting members.

Meeting adjourned at 7:56 PM

Respectfully submitted by Sy Nguyen, Skanska USA. Recording Secretary