

Draft Memorial School Building Minutes

January 8th, 2026

Agenda

Mr. Meyler called the meeting to order at approximately 6:06 p.m.

Committee Members In
attendance:

James Hannigan

Kyla Meade

Allan Cloutier

Kat Monahan

Catherine Brunell

Steve Myler

Bill Spratt

Matt Gillis

Melissa Spash

Non Voting Members:

Beth Heffler

Jillian Wilson Martin

Deborah Schatz

	Position	Name
1	Superintendent	Melissa Spash
2	Assist Superintendent Business Office	Matthew Gillis
3	Chair	Stephen Meyler
4	Town Administrator	James Errickson
5	Select Board	Bruce Evans
6	Finance Committee (FinCom)	Kat Monahan
7	Planning Board	Alan Cloutier
8	Facilities Lead	Bill Spratt
9	School Committee Member Rep.	Catherine Brunnell
10	Member of the Public	Sam Soderholm
11	Member of the Public	Kyla Meade
12	Member of the Public	Maria McMorran
13	Member of the Public	Doug Tierney
14	Member of the Public	James Hannigan
1	Natick Police Representative	Officer Beth Heffler
2	Sustainability Leader	Jillian Wilson-Martin
3	Natick Fire	TBD

Committee Member, Mr. Tierney, entered the meeting at 6:08 p.m.

Public Speak:

A member of the public informed the committee that she was recording the meeting. She encouraged the committee to create a system in order to ensure that the meetings are accessible virtually and recorded so that in the long process of building support for the eventual vote, the committee will have the materials to be as transparent as possible.

She also noted that early on there was a member who dropped off the committee. Given the wide interest in the public to participate in the process she did not understand why the committee had not appointed an additional member.

Member, Ms.Monahan entered the meeting at approximately 6:10 p.m.

Dr. Spash walked the committee through the powerpoint presentation that the district is using to map the timeline of the MSBA project.

She defined the MSBA term “First come First Serve” for the committee. The MSBA has three dates available this spring to go before the MSBA panel to choose the OPM.

The first district to submit the complete package gets to pick their date for the panel date. We are balancing doing it well while also giving our district the optimum level of choice in the panel.

Ms. Brunell asked if the OPM is selected by one school if that makes it unavailable to the other districts. Mr. Gillis responded that different companies have different capacities. Mr. Myler clarified that we will ask the OPM’s questions about what projects they have taken on and what capacity they have for our project.

MSBC member, Ms. McMorran, entered the meeting at 6:21.

The chair indicated that the committee is working on getting the meetings on Zoom and future meetings on Thursdays. He will also take feedback from committee members on the order of the agenda so that if someone needs to leave, items that they would like to speak to will be taken up whenever possible.

The committee chair continued to the next agenda item clarifying the role that MCPPO official, Mr. Gillis, will play in writing the RFS. Mr. Gillis will handle most of the tasks that need to be executed with regards to the OPM Procurement. Mr. Gillis then presented a memo to the committee identifying key dates in the process.  msbc mtg 1.8.26.pdf

There will be a subcommittee to review the OPM proposals. Mr. Cloutier asked how many proposals were turned in for Kennedy. Mr. Myler replied that there were 5 proposals. Mr. Gillis has seen 6- 12 proposals in other projects noted there are fewer construction jobs happening right now from state and Universities projects so he thinks we will receive proposals on the higher end.

Mr. Tierney asked if the whole committee will have access to the proposals so that committee members could scan through and give comments to the subcommittee.

Ms. Brunell asked if any of the members wanted to be part of the subcommittee. Mr. Tierney shared that this is part of the process where he feels he has the most experience and does plan on reading all of the proposals.

The chair indicated that the committee will vote tonight on the subcommittee. Ms. Wilson Martin asked if the MSBA has to approve the RFS going out. The procurement officer is responsible for this part of the project. We will get the RFS in its formal format before it goes to the MSBA

and can give feedback by emailing members of the subcommittee. Mr. Gillis encouraged people to put OPM in the subject line.

Kate Mora, a member of the public, introduced herself as an architect for educational buildings. She stated that she been at every meeting thus far and has been following the design and OPM process carefully. She has reviewed the template of the MSBA and noticed that there are a lot of possibilities of nuance in how we describe ourselves in the introduction and the list of objectives.

Mr. Gillis responded that part of what we will use is the statement of interest and the numbers that were agreed upon by the MSBA and the district. He indicated that the RFS will communicate the values Natick has agreed to for example, the town's net zero goals.

Mr. Myler clarified that while our values will be clear, how they are pursued will be part of our work to come. For example, the use of geo-thermal will be voted on after the OPM is chosen but during the feasibility stage.

Ms. Mora continued that from the public point of view, they have not been able to see people's comments about the RFS and as such it has been hard to know the direction of the committee.

Mr. Myler shared that the town has made several statements that the committee will use to guide our decisions with sustainability in mind. Ms. Mora asked if that language will be in the OPM procurement process and Matt Gillis responded that it will be.

Mr. Myler advised that the committee will have to be conscious of the system and materials that we are choosing and consider it all in regards to value. If the voters decide that they cannot afford what we choose to build, the citizens will not vote for it.

Ms. Flathers, a member of the public, asked if preferred vs. required is weighted in the rubric and committee members explained the MSBA template and how each point is given a point value in the procurement language. Dr. Spash clarified that if something is required, it is a yes or no and not weighted.

Ms. McMorra asked what happens if the company does not have a required item? The committee learned that the bidder would not move on in the selection process. Additionally the MSBA will review our requirements and will not allow language that would narrow the field too far, for example the MSBA may not approve of language that requires "20 years experience and at least 8 schools."

Ms. Monahan asked if the MSBA panel will consider all of the proposals that are turned in or only the short list that the subcommittee brings forward. From experience, Matt Gillis thinks they review only the short list.

Mr. Tierney asked when we will set the evaluation criteria.

Mr. Gillis indicated that he would be doing that next week. Ms. Brunell asked if we were going to discuss the criteria at all tonight. Mr. Tierney and Mr. Hannigan also expressed interest in discussing the item.

Ms. McMorran asked if the MSBA was going to give feedback on the criteria? Mr. Gillis thought they would to some extent.

Ms. Wilson Martin spoke about four proposals that she has read and emphasized that the amount of weight given to items is what varied greatly from each proposal.

Mr. Myler asked Mr. Gillis how the committee could help him in this process. Mr. Gillis responded that he has never had a committee want to write something like this.

Mr. Courtier indicated on page 4 if we were going to use all of the criteria listed here and asked if the "scorecard" has to be included with the RFS.

Mr. Myler asked Mr. Gillis when he would have the RFS ready for the subcommittee to see the draft? Mr. Gillis indicated it would be ready on Tuesday, January 20th.

Mr. Myler suggested that the committee have a high level review of the output of the subcommittee on the RFS to look for major suggestions or changes. Thus, the full committee will meet again on Thursday, January 22nd.

Ms. McMorran noted that there is a lot of overlap in the comments members submitted and in numbers 9-11 that are already part of the MSBA process. She asked if Mr. Gillis will incorporate our comments into the points that already exist? Mr. Gillis agreed that he was planning on such a process.

He explained further that of the 11 items they already have a priority simply in the way they are listed on the MSBA template.

Mr. Gillis continued that 1, 4 and 5 are the key items because you want to know that they can manage the variety of things that will come up. They need to be flexible to keep the project going when things could potentially slow items down.

Ms. Wilson Martin agreed that those are consistently the items that are weighted highly in the projects that she has read both in general and in those that are sustainably focused. She also indicated #8 to be important.

Mr. Gillis and Ms. McMorran also spoke about #9 being important in an inflationary environment. We are looking to understand if their approach make sense and who the people are behind the team. For example, Mr. Gillis likes to write into the contract, "the owner gets to approve any changes to personnel."

Ms. McMorran commented that #8 in the evaluation criteria seems like a good place to start as a place to update the current language. For example, grabbing their attention by expanding it beyond LEED but with more updated sustainability language.

Ms. Brunell asked if there was a potential in hiring an OPM that isn't able to manage a program that we eventually vote to have. For example, Marlboro shared with us that they had to change architects in the middle of the building when they went a different direction. Mr. Gillis described that the role of the OPM is to guide us to the builders and architects that will be able to execute on the direction that we go.

Mr. Harrigan introduced a document where he had compiled everyone's comments within like themes. He suggested that the committee look the document to understand what people would like to see as preferred vs. required.

Mr. Harrigan noted there was a consensus that sustainability be required and that geo-thermal be preferred.

Ms. Wilson Martin spoke that great OPM have experience with all of these items. For example you should have experience with a low score eui.

Mr. Myler referenced that the Select Board has indicated the sustainability decisions be indicated as "preferred." He emphasized that the committee doesn't want to go through what other towns have done with making sustainable options required and then end up unable to fund their decisions.

Mr. Gillis stated that he is hesitant to get too micro in any of this language in the RFS because the OPM doesn't build to install any of this.

Ms. McMorran suggested we cast a wide net - for example, instead of saying familiar with LEED be more comprehensive with other metrics that measure high performing buildings. She wondered if we could find the sweet spot to say what you mean without being too prescriptive.

Mr. Myler agreed that you need to add a little more than things that everyone has. Mr. Cloutier asked what the wording would be.

Mr. Hannigan asked if we can use the grading rubric to incorporate values into the RFS. For example, if sustainability is important to us...you are going to score a 10 if you have demonstrated items as X. He asked what we would score a 1 and what would we score a 10?

Mr. Spratt suggested we come out of the details and cast a big wide net ensuring that our require needs create as much room as possible and the preferred that drive us towards the the decisions.

Mr. Hannigan summarized how he understands that Mr. Gillis will be going to filter through the comments and incorporate them into the required and others that don't fit will fit into the minimum requirement. Mr. Gillis said that is an option.

Ms. Monahan made a motion to create a subcommittee to prepare the RFS and review the proposals that are submitted. Mr. Cloutier seconded the motion. There was a discussion about what her motion included and then a vote taken to form a subcommittee. The motion passed unanimously, 11-0-0.

Mr. Spratt then moved to install Mr. Gillis, Dr. Spash, Mr. Myler, Ms. Gilani, Mr. Erickson, and Mr. Tierney on the subcommittee for the RFS and proposal reviews. Ms. McMorran seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 11-0-0.

Mr. Myler indicated that he is still looking for administrative support and that the construction will be finished soon in the town offices. Mr. Myler is also meeting with someone who can help us update the website.

The meeting schedule will be updated and sent to the committee in the coming days. Monday is the preferred date, some Thursdays will be used.

The committee agreed that seeing Kennedy is a priority and will meet on Monday, February 2nd. Dr. Spash also explained that the school is going to go through the MSBA lesson learned module #9. Stephen suggested we also look at lessons learned from a facilities stand point. Mr. Spratt suggested we do that on the tour. We will focus on the construction materials.

Ms. Monahan motioned for adjournment at 8:21. Mr. Tierney seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 11-0-0.

