



Memorial Elementary School

Memorial School Building Committee Meeting

Date	Time	Location	Meeting No.
3/30/2026	6:15 PM	Natick Town Hall	

Attended	Name	Organization	Email
X	Melissa Spash	Town of Natick – Superintendent of School	MSpash@NatickPS.org
X	Matt Gillis	Town of Natick – Assist Superintendent Business Office	Matgillis@NatickPS.org
	James Errickson	Town of Natick – Town Administrator	Jerrickson@NatickMA.org
X	Stephen Meyler	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee Chair	smeyler@natickps.org
	Maria McMorran	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee Vice Chair	mmcmorran@natickps.org
X	Catherine Brunell	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee – School Comm\ Rep.	
X	Bruce Evans	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee – Select Bd. Rep.	bevans@natickma.org
X	Kat Monahan	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee – Fin. Comm. Rep.	kmonahan@natickma.org
X	Alan Cloutier	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee – Planning Bd. Rep.	acloutier@natickma.org
X	Karen Ghilani	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee – MES Principal	kaghilani@natickps.org
X	William Spratt	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee – Facilities Lead	wspratt@natickma.org
	Jaymin Patel	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee –School Comm. Rep.	jpatel@natickps.org
X	Kyla Meade	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee – Community Rep.	kmeade@natickps.org
X	Doug Tierney	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee – Community Rep.	dtierney@natickps.org
X	James Hannigan	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee – Community Rep.	jhannigan@natickps.org
*	+Deborah Schatz	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee – Dir. of Facilities	dschatz@natickma.org
X	+Jillian Wilson-Martin	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee – Dir. of Sustainability	jwmartin@natickma.org
	+Officer Beth Heffler	Town of Natick – Memorial School Building Committee- Police/Fire Rep.	ehffler@natickma.org
+	Non-voting member		
*	Virtual attendee		

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Item No.	Item	Discussion	Action	Assigned	Status
1.0	Call to Order	The meeting was opened by the chair at 6:14p			Record
2.0	Public Comment	Ms. Brinley Vickers, came forward. She noted that tomorrow, March 31st, is election day for Natick and encouraged anyone who can vote to do so.			Record
3.0	NPS Solar Projects and historical use	Presentation by Jillian Wilson Martin: School buildings host most of the solar in town; 2 parking units at KMS and NHS. - Historically purchased through power purchase agreements (20 years); 25 years is the typical life span; we agree to purchase solar rate - PPA is similar to a leased system; - Guaranteed production: - Guarantee rate: - Do not own the system - no payments from the state incentive system; Ameresco received this benefit. - Front of the meter - connect directly to the grid; existing MEM school system; - Eversource bill does not change; red highlights are a credit on the bill; not a fixed rate. - Behind the meter - it is lowering the amount of electricity that the school pulls from the grid - WMS: compare Eversource and Ameresco costs; uses a different formula (see slide); Solar represents a large amount of demand and use of electricity. - Demand response program - encourages turning off devices when not in use; peak hour dictates - KMS - Battery system allows for closer monitoring of use and savings. - Lessons Learned: - Building had existing panels; 20-year life; we had to terminate our agreement and pay a cost; will have a similar situation at Memorial; we buy them out - Ameresco will not take them back because the technology has changed; panels were disposed of at a cost; cancellation charge also as part of the PPA (power purchase agreement - has to maintain the systems) - Liability to donate to citizens; hard to handle - Question (KM): Is there a disposal fee at the end of the contract? Ameresco is required to remove the systems and structures at the end of the agreement. - Question (BE): Is there a sweet spot at lease vs buy? KMS's conclusion was that schools would save \$100,000 at the end of the contract. The district's stance is that it poses a lot of liability. - Leasing = Maintenance is covered for the life span - KMS charge was to deliver a solar-ready roof: strength to support the needs. Maximize the site for solar - it is not just a roof option.	Include in discussions with AE team when engaged		Open



Memorial Elementary School

		■ Coordinate the installation of canopies, etc., so that we do not have to undo the new build; need the design, build, and Ameresco to coordinate with each other • Considerations: size of the lot and more real estate options on a two-story building for MEM; • Solar was not part of the energy model - we were unable to maximize the benefits because it was not integrated into the design. • Existing MEM solar - prorated on MEM % (about 22%) • Planning Ahead: • Worked with a solar designer on their project; be clear on our charge in the energy design • State incentives have changed and are really strong right now - • Specialized code: pushes toward an all-electric building - do not have to have all electric, but you have to be prepared to move to that (infrastructure) • Installation costs: on Ameresco; no up-front costs; early termination is based on individual building costs; (\$88,000 approximately in year 2027) • SM: considerations of infrastructure and replacement planning for different systems, i.e., heat pumps vs. burners; life span of solar panels; Consider the behavior of the inhabitants, and whether they understand that the HVAC system is designed to respond to needs and not open windows • We will inquire with the architect about designs and ask what is the ROI; if prices are close, then the documents are clear and we know what we want • BV/Citizen comment: How do we evaluate what happened in the coordination of roof readiness, the building/architect, and Ameresco? Is that a communication need, OPM, committee decision going through design review? This lives in design review. ○ Address the design and then stick with it; don't allow for changes; if we are confident, make sure the architect is on board to design for the system. ○ Make the decision sooner and then stick to it.			
4.0	OPM schedule and process	Timeline of what is supposed to happen in the next 2 months: • RFS is out; OPM info meeting at Memorial has happened. JH: Were the committee given the opportunity to review the submissions? They are public documents, and we can share. If a member has comments, you can share them with Stephen Meyler by April 2. • Interviews are governed by procurement regulations: ○ April 13, 2026, at 5:30 pm at Natick Senior Center ■ Agenda and protocol will be actively managed. ■ Will follow procurement law. ■ Only pre-established questions will be asked. ■ Follow-up/Clarification questions will be managed through the facilitator (SM) ■ The general public is not allowed to participate. ■ Named voting will be made at the end of the interviews. A decision will be made before the conclusion of the meeting. Scoring will be validated. ■ The final vote is not open for discussion. • The meetings will not be on Pegasus. We do have an agreement with Randy for community-minded decisions. This meeting will not be recorded. SM/MG will identify if a ZOOM meeting will be available. • Clarity on scoring at the end - if not 100% confident, then we will forego decision-making until the next day. • Scoring sheets are public. • Strong argument to not post it on ZOOM to protect the integrity of the meeting and the established protocol. • Proposal: SM recommended that we not offer a ZOOM option for the meeting on April 13th. ○ CB - seconded the recommendation ○ Doug Tierney: Questioned the need for a forum. ○ Unanimous vote for no ZOOM meeting on the April 13th meeting.			Open
5.0	26-27 Feasibility Activities review	Stephen Meyler shared 26-27 Feasibility Activities review based on slide deck (slide 4). • Cost estimate is at 20 - 25%. (only one vote) ○ MSBA design, floor plan, square footage, answers a lot of questions, then you focus on cost estimators, industry practice • If we consider a new site, it will cost more to evaluate. We will be asked to do risk mitigation testing to determine the cost of the project. ○ Determine risk? ○ Consider asking MSBC for more money and bringing the plan to Town Meeting to increase the funding available for additional design funding to minimize financial risks. If the committee is going to a different build site			



Memorial Elementary School

		then there will be additional financial risks 20-25 % based on unknown site and geological factors. ■ KMS was two votes, and the town got to 60% cost estimate before the final vote. KM Question: Can we define what we want from the schematic designs? MG response: Yes. You can take a look at OPM's past projects, and we need one good number, and we need to get it right. Real cost only comes through when you send out your estimate from the builder. Costs are really important. Tariffs and geopolitical concerns will influence this part of our project. It is expensive in today's environment. MG: 20-25% is different for every building. That is the MSBA standard. It doesn't mean we can't change it, but we don't need to change it before we begin the process. ● SM: The 20-25 % is not standard for what Natick has done for Town Meeting and voters. Town Meeting and voters. The committee will need to have a high degree of confidence in what number is brought forward to Town Meeting and voters for a debt exclusion override vote. We will re-evaluate this need once we get further into preliminary design so we can better assess building and financial risks. We do not want to fall short of funding and either make reductions in scope due to other potential unavoidable risks.			
5.0	KMS Post Occupancy Debrief with MSBA	● Review of lessons learned from KMS ○ Encourage natural light ○ Keep light fixtures simple; buy extra lights to support replacement once built			Record
6.0	Approval of Meeting Minutes	Bruce Evans moved to approve the minutes. Melissa Spash seconded. No debate. Unanimous acceptance of minute			Record
7.0	Changes to Membership of OPM Finalist's Subcommittee	Proposed: Melissa Spash, James Errickson, Matt Gillis, Kyla Meade, Doug Tierney and Stephen Meyler. <i>Changed Karen Ghilani for Kyla Meade.</i> Vote to approve the change: Will Spratt moved to vote, Catherine Brunell seconded. The vote was unanimous to endorse the change.			Record
8.0	OPM negotiating Committee	Mr. Meyler moved to create a negotiating committee. Review and Approve Negotiation Sub-Team Recommendation: Melissa Spash, Matt Gillis, Bruce Evans, Maria McMorran, & Stephen Meyler. ● Negotiation is over the fee structure for OPM ● Ms. Brunel stated: Typically, the SC negotiates for the SC. Do you have room for an SC member on the committee? Do you have room? Ms. Brunel would like the committee to include an SC member. ● SM: This negotiation subteam is not either a School Committee nor Select Board role. Therefore, a member of the SC would not represent the SC on this team. ● Bruce Evans is not representative of the Select Board ● Vote: 10 yes; 1 no; 0 abstain		Sub-Comm.	Open
9.0	Adjournment	Move to adjourn the meeting. Matt Gillis moved. Bruce seconded. Move to executive session. Then moved to the end of the meeting. All was unanimously voted. Stated that members of the community are not invited to the executive session.			Record

Next Meeting	Time	Next Meeting Location	Prepared By
TBD			