

Draft Memorial School Building Minutes

1/22/26

[Agenda](#)

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:10

Committee Members In attendance:

James Hannigan

Kyla Meade

Kat Monahan

Catherine Brunell

Steve Myler

Bill Spratt

Matt Gillis

Melissa Spash

Doug Tierney

Maria McMorran

Non Voting Members:

Jillian Wilson Martin

Deborah Schatz

Public Speak

No one came forward

The chair introduced Mr. Gillis as the district's writer of the RFS and MCPPO and indicated that Mr. Gillis has 51% of the vote and the rest of the committee 49% tonight in any changes that are made to the document presented.

Then, Mr. Gillis began to walk the committee through the [draft RFS document](#). He shared the price estimate has gone up from \$70M to \$100- \$150M because the timeline has changed at a time when costs have increased.

On page three he added a paragraph about Natick being a Climate Leader with language directly from Natick's Stretch Code provided to him by Ms. Wilson Martin.

The building is estimated to be 90 - 100,000 square feet. It will be comparable to the size of Ben Hem which is 84,000 square feet. The additional square footage in this potential build is to accommodate additional pre-k classrooms. On page 8, Mr. Gillis also added a bullet point about achieving the highest possible MSBA reimbursement rate with the most cost effective building to meet the educational needs. Ms. Brunell asked if the other items on that list were standard. Mr. Gillis replied that they are.

On page 9, the minimum requirements begin. Mr. Gillis added language to ensure that we will hire a seasoned professional with a firm behind them to support them through the full project.

Under evaluation criteria, Mr. Gillis spoke to each item and how many points he gave to them. He gave particular emphasis on #8 for the committee to decide if the wording around geo-thermal represents the committee's consensus. Mr. Gillis also added language around grants to ensure that the OPM can integrate them into the overall project and timeline were we to win them.

The total points an applicant can earn in the rubric is 150 points. The subcommittee will bring in the top three applicants to the committee for an interview for the final ranking of preference. He asked the committee what points should be awarded for the interview. The committee discussed how many points should be awarded to the interview.

Ms. Meade suggested that the interview points be big enough so that people can stand out if they do well in the interview. Mr. Tierny suggested that we want to put ourselves in a position so that we can make an overall judgement. Ms. Brunell asked if the interview process was like starting over in the rankings? She referenced her experience in the Superintendent Search and indicated that once the information is all public, the committee will need the ability to incorporate new information.

Mr. Tierney asked if there are other rating systems, for example, no one uses Leed in his work and wondered if there are other rating systems. Ms. Wilson Martin offered to connect with Mr. Gillis about some of the technical language. She referenced that Natick is a Specialized code town and she would suggest that language be added to the RFS. She encouraged the section with the LEED certification, for example, to show an EUI Score that is in compliance with a Mass Saves number that is less than 25. She thinks that we are giving them an out with the "or" language around LEED. Mr. Gillis indicated that is the MSBA standard term so he would rather control that with the points that we reward instead of changing the standard language.

Ms. Wilson Martin said that when we are looking for the designer, she would like to see stronger language.

Mr. Haningan, asked about the not-advantageous category and why there was not a range to 0. Mr. Gillis responded that companies always get something for applying because of the time it takes to apply. Mr. Hannigan questioned why a bidder could get points on some of the higher point items for not meeting the category that would be the same amount of points for meeting another category. Essentially, a bidder could not meet requirements and still get 43 points overall. Mr. Gillis is going to speak to the MSBA about the possibility of bringing the range to 0.

Mr. Hannigan suggested that #7 be brought up to 10 points to ensure that the OPM was available during the duration of the project.

The points to rank the top 3 will be in the subcommittee. The full committee will interview the firms. The committee continued to discuss what the range of points could be to ensure that the interview is meaningful but does not deter people from applying. Mr. Gillis indicated that his experience has been that the top 3 typically come in very close in points.

Dr. Spash read an example from Lexington with points awarded in categories for specific parts of the interview.

Mr. Spratt motioned that the interviews will be 35 points. Mr. Gillis seconded the motion. In debate, Ms. Brunell verified if the final interviews are in public based on the Lexington example. She wondered if we should add specific points to each question so there was an understanding of how we get to 35 points vs. 0. Ms. McMannon disagreed and suggested that we keep the interview with a more simple rubric so that the firm that is one's top preference receives 35, the middle 20 and the last preferred 5. Ms. Wilson Martin re-read the Lexington example which reads that there is a clean slate after the interview process. Mr. Gillis is going to get a clear answer on this from the MSBA.

Dr. Spash asked about Mr. Spratt's rationale and the committee's interest on the weight of the interview. She hoped the committee will be able to write questions that will differentiate the top three. Ms. McMorran agreed.

The committee accepted the motion unanimously, 10-0-0.

Ms. Mora, a member of the community and former architect for school buildings asked if the committee would consider adding language that went beyond LEED especially to communicate that we are a Specialized Code town. Mr. Meyler asked if her question was for an architect or OPM. Ms. Mora responded that it would be advantageous from her perspective for the whole team to understand the sustainability goals. She explained that an OPM who is managing a project towards a low energy building is a different experience.

Mr. Gillis walked the committee through the dates of the RFS process. It will appear in the Central register on February 25th with responses due by March 26th.

The full committee would interview the three finalists on Monday, April 13th. This will allow us to be in front of the MSBA OPM Review panel on June 1st.

Ms. Wilson Martin asked if the walk through could also include the alternative sites that they may need to consider. Mr. Gillis responded that a walk through of the existing building is important because a renovation and build is possible and it will allow them to see the scope of the project on the existing building. Once hired, the OPM will be looking at other sites. In that stage, the site selection will be thorough and involve all parties impacted.

Ms. McMorran asked a question about the language in #8 to not limit us but to come forward with the information that helps us understand their experience with low energy schools. As an architect, she explained that there are more steps that will need to be taken. Ms. Meade agreed. Mr. Gillis spoke about the schedule and how all of the parties work together to ensure the mile markers can be met by the designer and builder. Mr. Gillis would like to consider language used in other RFS' before finalizing.

Mr. Myler asked if the language would prevent us from following a model school. Ms. Wilson Martin said that none of the current model schools were built to the specialized code but they could be added to the plug and play nature of the already existing plans.

Mr. Tierny suggested that the specialized code language be added into the place of project objectives on page 8.

Mr. Myler suggested adding the term "net-ready" so as not to preclude us from the model school. Ms. Brunell asked Ms. Wilson Martin to suggested wording. Ms. Monahan summarized what she heard and offered that this bullet be added to the project objectives: "Compliance with Natick's adopted specialized code and exploration of net-zero ready construction."

Mr. Myler motioned for approval to the document with the suggested changes. Mr. Tierny seconded. The motion passed unanimously, 10-0-0.

Mr. Myler asked about the make-up of the subcommittee. Ms. Meade asked if anyone has specific experience working with OPM's? Mr. Myler, Mr. Gilis and Mr. Tierney have experience. Ms. Meade works for a structure engineer and has been on many projects with the MSBA.

The chair is going to look into the current committee composition to see if the two members of the public, Mr. Tierny and Ms. Meade, on the building committee with experience, could be part of the subcommittee. Mr. Meyler asked them to follow up with him after the meeting if they are interested in being part of the subcommittee.

Ms. Monahan clarified that the next meeting will be Monday, February 2nd with lessons learned from the Kennedy Middle School. Mr. Meyler proposed that this be a joint meeting with the School Committee.

Mr. Spratt motioned for adjournment at 8:19. Ms. McMorran seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 10-0-0.

