

## Meeting Minutes

Name of Committee: Pierce School Owner's Project Manager Selection Committee

Meeting Date: 16 July June 2020 Time: 1:00 p.m. Meeting Location: Zoom Webinar

Attendees: B. Greene, H. Charlupski, S. Federspiel, J. Fierman, K. Kaplan, N. Peck, M. Gillis, D. Geanakakis, T. Guigli

Next Meeting: None scheduled

Topic: Meeting Minutes – Meeting Minutes of 8-9 July 2020 unanimously approved by roll call vote after moved by M. Gillis and seconded by H. Charlupski.

Topic: Discussion of Finalists

T. Guigli noted that he had shared with the Committee the reference checks on all four (4) firms. It had been his goal to get a least three references for each firm. It was a time consuming process as in a number of cases the referenced individuals were no longer employed or otherwise unavailable or wrong contact information furnished. In addition calls were placed around the July 4 timeframe (in advance of the interviews) and many are working remotely owing to COVID-19. In any case, at least three references were obtained for the four finalist firms. All references were shared with the Committee prior to each firm's interview.

The Committee then discussed each firm in order of interview, as follows:

### CHA

N. Peck stated he felt they had a strong interview, with project specific information including net-zero projects. The person connected with commissioning seemed to be a strong team member. He also liked the fact that estimating is done in-house and they seem knowledgeable about MSBA processes. However, he felt the interview itself was dominated by R. Marks, who is likely to have less involvement in the project than others. He was disappointed that the Committee didn't hear more from others on the team. He also questioned the apparent negative reference received on the Lowell Collegiate Charter School. T. Guigli stated that when he finally received a call back from the reference, it was unfortunately a bad phone connection and he was unable to hear everything said. A further attempt to gather more information from the reference was unsuccessful.

J. Fierman expressed concerns that the CHA proposed team hasn't seemed to work together for a long time. There may have been poor communication between the team and R. Marks in assembling the reference list. Daedalus has gone through a number of changes recently, including being absorbed by CHA. M. Gillis noted R. Marks knows Brookline well and their performance may depend on his involvement.

While B. Greene agreed that R. Marks dominated the discussion, he noted that T. Walton gave a very good and detailed account of how CHA worked with the City of New Bedford on MBE/WBE issues. He recognized that the Dearborn School project was also completed successfully on a very tight site. Finally CHA seemed experienced with fossil fuel free projects. They emphasized the importance of "time tested" systems such as geothermal and solar.

S. Federspiel stated she felt R. Marks involvement would be a positive for the Pierce project as he knows the community, lived here for a long time and therefore his reputation would be on the line. H. Charlupski said she somewhat agrees with those statements, but questioned how involved R. Marks would actually be.

### Dore + Whittier (DW)

M. Gillis said DW experience is mostly in suburban settings. While the DW proposed team appears good, he simply feels other firm's proposed teams are stronger. H. Charlupski agreed with these sentiments.

J. Fierman stated she agrees the DW team is fully qualified but noted the statement in the interview that DW "needs work" since a number of their current projects are "winding down". It seems DW really wants to grow and there is a concern of what happens if they get lots of work all at once. It would be better if their work load were staggered, i.e. their project being in different stages of the design and construction process.

N. Peck said M. Burton is a strong team member for DW however he is not as confident about the others. T. Hartford has a background not very relevant to the Pierce School project.

B. Greene said he agrees with the other committee members. This will be a challenging project. He did note the DW efforts to reach out to Wentworth for interns to further diversity in the industry and its future. DW also emphasized that the fossil free component of this project would be a challenge. They appear to have spent some time on looking at how difficult it will be and it may not even be feasible. This realism can be a plus if based on knowledge of the site and the state of technologies.

S. Federspiel spoke to her contact in Manchester and they have been pleased with DW performance. DW Has a reputation they want to grow and that they are eager for more work. She agrees most of their experience is in suburban settings.

K. Kaplan said the Pierce School project is likely to be the Town of Brookline's most difficult school project in recent memory. M. Burton has the experience but the rest of the team not as much. DW can do the job but there are better choices among the other firms.

### Hill

M. Gillis said some of his colleagues in other communities have worked with M. Mahoney over the years and he feels she would be a great for the Pierce project. However, he is not as impressed with the rest of the proposed Hill team. Based on that Hill is not his top choice.

K. Kaplan said the BHS experience is important. While the budget issues there are not necessarily the fault of Hill, he does feel it is an indication of their philosophy as a group; perhaps they are not as proactive as one might expect.

J. Fierman had the same initial thoughts. Further it does not seem Hill has a lot of contacts with local contractors that other firms may have. She is impressed, however, with M. Mahoney and the fact that she has worked together with R. Boddie on a number of projects.

S. Federspiel was surprised Hill didn't talk about the BHS project or what they may have learned from it.

N. Peck agreed with previous comments and felt Hill didn't interview well as some of the presenters seemed rehearsed and he too felt they should have addressed the BHS project.

### Leftfield (LF)

H. Charlupski said she has enjoyed working with LF on Driscoll, team members are smart and the firm is doing a good job. They had a rough start on the Driscoll project; they acknowledged it and it has been turned around. Part of the issue seems to have been one of expectations and personalities. Over time the schools are finding LF good to work with. One advantage of LF is that they know how the town operates, a disadvantage perhaps is the fact they have proposed the same team for the Pierce School project as is currently working on Driscoll.

J. Fierman agreed with H. Charlupski and recalled the point made that school projects are all LF does and as a firm they are at least as big as their competitor's local offices. They are a local, privately owned firm.

K. Kaplan agreed with the very rough start on the Driscoll project but noted they listen to the Town and have a cohesive team. The Pierce project needs a proactive OPM that is enmeshed in all that goes into a successful project.

M. Gillis said the Town has a good working relationship with LF and it appears mutual. There was some concern when the Driscoll project was soliciting interest from CM@R firms. A couple of large firms that have experience with Brookline indicated no interest. He felt LF was helpful in getting other firms to be interested and compete. It is his opinion LF has the capacity to do both projects with the same team, given the timing of both.

Topic: Rank Finalists

After some discussions, the Committee chose to rank the four finalists in the order of preference as follows:

1. Leftfield
2. CHA
3. Hill International
4. Dore + Whittier

The above was unanimously approved by roll call vote after moved by B. Greene and seconded by H. Charlupski.

Topic: Old and New Business

T. Guigli summarized the next steps. He will ask Leftfield (LF) for a proposal which will be negotiated by the Building Commission. If that effort is successful, LF would then sign the contract. If not, the Building Commission will terminate discussions with LF and move to the second ranked firm, and so on. If successful, the contract signed by LF only then becomes part of a larger package to be assembled and delivered to the MSBA no later than 19 August 2020 to be considered for their OPM Board Meeting of 14 September 2020. If approved by the MSBA, the Town would then have the green light to execute the LF contract. Once the OPM contract is approved, the next step is to retain the services of a design team.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Anthony Guigli  
Project Administrator