

Minutes
Committee of Seven for Designer Selection
Brookline High School
Selective Structural and Waterproofing Repairs
7 November 2023
Brookline High School, walk thru of affected areas 10:00 a.m.
Brookline High School, MLK Room 10:30 a.m. and via Zoom (hybrid)

In attendance: John VanScoyoc, member of the Select Board and chair of the Committee of Seven, Helen Charlupski and Mariah Nobrega (via zoom), School Committee, Karen Breslawski, Nate Peck and Brooke Duskin, Building Commission, Betsy Fitzpatrick, Executive Assistant, School Committee, Lap Yan and Anthony Guigli, Building Department staff.

At 10:00 a.m. and prior to the meeting, Committee members and staff participated in a walk-through of the areas in need of repair to view existing conditions.

Meeting called to order by John VanScoyoc at 10:30 a.m.

The Chair made brief opening remarks and Committee members and staff introduced themselves. The Chair then asked A. Guigli to provide a brief summary of process and goals.

A. Guigli stated that designer selection is a qualifications based process. Price is a consideration afterwards. Designer selection for public entities in the Commonwealth is prescribed by regulation. All such awarding authorities are required to develop processes that are consistent with state requirements. The Town of Brookline By-Laws call for a Select Board (SB) appointed "Committee of Seven" (C7) for designer selection for applicable capital improvement projects. These committees are chaired by a member of the SB and typically include three (3) members of the Building Commission (BC) and three (3) members of the user agency (in this case the School Committee). H. Charlupski noted that for this project there are only two School Committee (SC) representatives as one member is no longer on the SC and moved out of town. The SC declined to nominate another.

A. Guigli stated a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for design services for the project was crafted and made available to interested parties and was advertised in the Central Register, COMMBUYS and a local newspaper, all in accordance with applicable regulations. The Town had retained the services of LeMessurier to conduct a preliminary investigation of the work and provide a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) of project costs to better inform the development of the RFQ and that information was included in said RFQ. LeMessurier is also a sub-consultant to William Rawn Associates (WRA) who is the architect for the recently completed High School STEM, 22 Tappan Street and Quad and Third Floor Classroom Renovations Projects (all part of the overall BHS Improvements).

Two (2) proposals were received in response to the RFQ, from LeMessurier and Socotec. The task of the C7 is to carefully review both proposals, weigh the merits of each, and ultimately rank them in order of preference. A. Guigli stated the C7 could elect to conduct interviews before ranking, but that is entirely optional. In any case, once the ranking is done, the work of the C7 is complete. The BC will subsequently request the top-ranked firm to submit a cost and scope proposal for review and negotiation. If those discussions are fruitful, a contract will be crafted and presented to the BC, SC and SB (in that order) for approval. If not, the BC will then terminate discussions with the top-ranked firm and move to the second firm. A. Guigli noted the nature of the work is disruptive such that it is planned

for the summer of 2024, so design and bidding will need to happen in the winter and early spring to meet that time frame. The C7 then began discussions on the merits of the two proposals.

J. VanScoyoc asked other C7 members if they were concerned that only two (2) proposals were received. Noting that it is a relatively small project of limited design disciplines, the overall consensus was of no concern. He then asked if the conditions that necessitate the work of this RFQ may have been related to the work of the High School project and therefore be a potential issue of possibly retaining one of the parties involved (LeMessurier). Because the work this project is outside the project limits of it and because the deterioration of structural elements appears to have developed over time, the general consensus was that such a scenario is not likely.

Building Department staff have worked both with LeMessurier in the past and with certain staff members of Socotec. The distinction being that staff has little experience with Socotec itself but considerable experience with both Russo Barr Associates and CBI before both firms were acquired by Socotec.

Discussion of the LeMessurier submission included the fact that they are already familiar with the site and project having worked with WRA over the years. B. Duskin noted one of their proposed staff members whose expertise is in envelope design had been at Simpson Gumpertz and Heger (SGH) and she is familiar with his work. K. Breslawski noted the proposal included a cost estimator and hazmat consultant as well as other items required in the RFQ. The C7 observed it included some information as to what staff would be committed to the project and a projection of their time dedicated to it.

Discussion of the Socotec submission included that while it appears the firm is qualified, it seemed unclear what staff member(s) would be chiefly assigned to the work of the project. In the organization chart key roles are filled by staff who are more in a management or executive role, which didn't appear credible to the C7. It was also noted their proposal did not include certain items called for in the RFQ such as a hazmat consultant and cost estimator.

Motion made by H. Charlupski to rank LeMessurier first and Socotec second. Motion seconded by J. VanScoyoc.

Aye: VanScoyoc, Charlupski, Breslawski, Peck, Duskin

Nay: Nobrega

By Role Call Vote Approved.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted

Anthony Guigli, Project Administrator