



## MEMORIAL SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE

### OPEN SESSION MINUTES DECEMBER 13, 2016

<b>Meeting:</b>	School Building Committee
<b>Date:</b>	December 13, 2016
<b>Location:</b>	MEHS Library
<b>Attendees:</b>	Pamela Beaudoin, Superintendent; Avi Urbas, Director of Finance; Ann Cameron, Chairman; George Scharfe, Manchester; Sara Creighton, Manchester; Adam Zaiger, Manchester; Ken Warnock, Manchester; Andy Oldeman, Manchester; Jay Pagliarulo, Manager, Building Services; John Willis, Principal, Memorial School; Maggie Tomaio, Teacher, Memorial School; Tyler Birden, Essex; Lisa O'Donnell, Essex; Gordon Brewster, _____; Alva _____, _____; Caroline _____, _____; and Remko Breuker, Manchester.
<b>Absent</b>	
<b>Recorded by:</b>	Adele Ardolino, Secretary

#### A. Call to Order

Pamela Beaudoin opened the Memorial School Building Committee meeting at 7:08 p.m.

#### B. Business Meeting

##### 1) New Business

##### 1. Overview of the MSBA Feasibility Study Process

## Development and Approval of RFS

The RFS document language cannot be changed or deleted, but language can be added.

The MSBC decided that the total project cost will range from approximately \$25 to \$45 million.

Add **Current Licenses** to Submissions.

The MSBC reviewed and discussed the revised and track-changed Request for Owner's Project Management Services ("RFS") document, and the results is as follows:

**Background Section:** Do not delete detail. Add that this is a regional district and subject to approval from both Manchester and Essex.

### Project Objectives:

Ms. Creighton suggested adding to the **Introduction** a language to include "Build a high quality, current, flexible school in a cost-effective manner that meets the elementary education needs of the Manchester-Essex communities."

The Project Manager ("PM") should be sensitive to the bullet-pointed list of objectives (pg. 4), and provides oversight throughout design, bidding, construction, closeout, and serve as the MSBC's advocate.

Project Objectives under consideration by the Owner include (original list):

- *Identification of community concerns that may impact study options;*
- *Identification of specific milestone requirements and/or constraints of the District – e.g. Town votes, swing space, occupancy issues;*
- *Evaluation of current and potential sites that meet project needs and future operational cost expectations*
- *In-depth evaluation of the scope of renovations, new construction, construction phasing, and swing spaces to minimize impacts on the population; along with communication plans to help keep the community informed during construction;*
- *Material evaluations and selections that balance cost and quality to achieve 'greater than normal' expected life of the facility;*
- *Life cycle costs of operating the School as it relates to future operational budgets;*
- *Massachusetts MA-CHPS criteria or US Green Building Council's LEED for Schools Rating System*
- *Evaluation and determination of CM-at-Risk versus Design-Bid-Build delivery methods.*

Mr. Breuker suggested that the project manager be someone who will consider Manchester and our sites different than elsewhere.

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold, Not Highlight

**Comment [AU1]:** Changes from Tyler Virden, echoing comments from Lisa O'Donnell on staging/temporary space needs

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold, Not Highlight

**Comment [AU2]:** Jay Pagliarulo asked if we should include anything about district-specific factors such as environmental/water supply and/or traffic

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold

The MSBC had a discussion on the order of priority of the Project Objectives list and decided on the order as follows:

- *Evaluation of current and potential sites that meet project needs and future operational cost expectations*
- *Identification of community concerns that may impact study options;*
- *In-depth evaluation of the scope of renovations, new construction, construction phasing, and swing spaces to minimize impacts on the population; along with communication plans to help keep the community informed during construction;*
- *In-depth evaluation of the scope of renovations, new construction, construction phasing, and swing spaces to minimize impacts on the population; along with communication plans to help keep the community informed during construction;*
- *Identification of specific milestone requirements and/or constraints of the District – e.g. Town votes, swing space, occupancy issues;*
- *Evaluation and determination of CM-at-Risk versus Design-Bid-Build delivery methods.*
- *Material evaluations and selections that balance cost and quality to achieve 'greater than normal' expected life of the facility;*
- *Massachusetts MA-CHPS criteria or US Green Building Council's LEED for Schools Rating System*
- *Life cycle costs of operating the School as it relates to future operational budgets;*

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold, Not Highlight

**Comment [AU3]:** Changes from Tyler Virden, echoing comments from Lisa O'Donnell on staging/temporary space needs

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold, Not Highlight

**Comment [AU4]:** Changes from Tyler Virden, echoing comments from Lisa O'Donnell on staging/temporary space needs

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold, Not Highlight

**Comment [AU5]:** Jay Pagliarulo asked if we should include anything about district-specific factors such as environmental/water supply and/or traffic

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold, Not Highlight

Feasibility Study/Schematic Design Phase: 15 months

Design Development/Construction Documents/Bidding Phase: 12 months

Construction Phase: 18 months

### **Evaluation Criteria**

Mr. Urbas recommended that the Evaluation Criteria be less specific, and more specific in the Submission Criteria.

**Past Performance of the Respondent:** References will be based upon due diligence performed by MSBC. Add:

C. Information Regarding Legal Proceeding, Administrative Proceeding, and Arbitration, or Formal Dispute Resolution Process Pending Against Respondent within the Past Five (5) Years:

**Management Approach:** Add to (a): Provide examples of documents used in prior construction projects.

**Key Personnel:** Unchanged.

**Capacity and Skills:** Unchanged.

**Identify Respondent's Current and Projected Workload:** Unchanged.

**Financial Stability:** Add: Provide three (3) most recent years of balance sheets and income statements.

**Respondent's Plan to Implement a Successful Project on Time and on Budget:** Definition of a "Model School": A school design proposed by design firms from projects they have done in the past. The MSVA evaluates them and choose three (3) from firms in Massachusetts, and they become model schools. If the MSBC had an interest in one of these model schools and it met our criteria, we would not have to hire an architect, because we would use the model's schematic design.

**Thorough Knowledge of Commonwealth Construction Procurement Laws, Regulations, Policies and Procedures, experience managing a CM-At-Risk Procurement Process:** Unchanged.

**Familiarity with US Green Building Council's LEED for Schools Rating System:** Add: Grant applications and utility rebates.

**Thorough Knowledge and Demonstrated Experience with Life Cycle Cost Analysis, Cost Estimating, and Value Engineering:** Unchanged.

**Knowledge of the Purpose and Practices of the Services of Building Commissioning Consultants:** Unchanged.

**Thorough Knowledge of Mass State Building Code, Regulations Related to Americans with Disabilities Act, and All Other Pertinent Codes and Regulations Related to Successful Completion of the Project:** Unchanged.

## **SCORING**

Ms. Beaudoin stated that the MSBC must produce a record of all the candidates' tally sheets.

The MSBC had a discussion regarding the weight of importance of each criterion and scored them accordingly:

	Criterion	Percent
1	Past Performance of the Respondent	10
2	Management Approach	15
2	Key Personnel	20
4	Capacity and Skills	10
5	Identify Respondent's Current and Projected Workload	10
6	Financial Stability	3
7	Respondent's Plan to Implement a Successful Project	15
8	Thorough Knowledge of Commonwealth Construction Procurement Laws, Regulations, Policies and Procedures, experience managing a CM-At-Risk Procurement Process	3
9	Familiarity with US Green Building Council's LEED for Schools Rating System	3
10	Thorough Knowledge and Demonstrated Experience with Life Cycle Cost Analysis, Cost Estimating, and Value Engineering	7
11	Knowledge of the Purpose and Practices of the Services of Building Commissioning Consultants	3
12	Thorough Knowledge of Mass State Building Code, Regulations Related to Americans with Disabilities Act, and All Other Pertinent Codes and Regulations Related to Successful Completion of the Project	3

**6. Requirements for Content of Response:** Page 10, second paragraph under #2: Change 3 page maximum to 10.

**Certifications:** Delete this section on page 10.

The MSBC reviewed the remainder of the document, and no further suggestions were made to the present RFS document.

**Approval of RFS Document:** Mr. Scharfe made a motion to approve this document as edited. Ms. Creighton seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor.

**Approval of 11/29/2016 Minutes:** Mr. Scharfe made a motion to approve these minutes as edited. Ms. Creighton seconded the motion. The vote was unanimously in favor, with the exception of Ms. Wells, Ingaharo, and Mr. Breuker

Ms. Beaudoin adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.