

Committee Members
Timothy Harris, Chair
John Foresto, Vice Chair
Michael Callahan, Member
Michael J Schrader, Member
Ted Kenney, Member



Medway DPW Offices
Medway Middle School Door #9
45B Holliston Street
Medway, MA 02053
Telephone (508) 533-3275
Fax (508) 321-4985

TOWN OF MEDWAY COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

WATER FACILITY BUILDING COMMITTEE

APPROVED 3/4/21

January 21, 2021

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, no in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted at this meeting. Committee members will be participating remotely. For public hearings, access via Zoom is provided for the required opportunity for public participation. Information for participating via Zoom is posted at the end of this Agenda.

In attendance via Zoom:

Tim Harris, Medway Resident & Chair
John Foresto, Selectmen & Vice-Chair
Ted Kenney, Medway Resident & Member
Michael Schrader, Medway Resident & Member
David D'Amico, DPW Director
Peter Pelletier, DPW Deputy Director
Barry Smith, Water & Sewer Superintendent
Helen Gordon, Environmental Partners
Paul Millett, Environmental Partners
Jill Karakeian, DPW Program Administrator and Recording Secretary

Chair Harris called the meeting to order @ 7:05pm and asked all attending members to state their name and position.

Approval of past Meeting Minutes

Member Kenney makes a motion to approve meeting minutes from 1/14/21 meeting, Vice-Chair Foresto seconded the motion to approve the minutes. The motion carries unanimously. A roll call vote was taken due to the nature of the remote Zoom meeting.

Evaluation of Designer Short List

Helen Gordon reviews the evaluation process. Environmental Partners received 5 submissions, submissions were distributed to the selection committee, who then made their assessments. All assessments were forwarded to Helen Gordon and I put them together on the Summary Qualifications Spreadsheet. We are missing one review, but the numbers that we have, I don't believe that one we are missing will change the results, unless there is a real difference of opinion on the review piece. All 5 submissions had the minimum requirements needed for submissions that is why we reviewed all 5. While the selection committee was doing their review, Environmental Partners contacted the references. We

asked for 4 references and was able to reach out to at least 3 references for each of the submissions and have input on those. We will review the summation of the averages.

Helen Gordon shared her screen showing the Summary of Qualifications. The Summary totals and point scores were put together, averaged and total overall score is in the order below with the highest score first.

- 1 Weston Sampson = TOTAL 720
- 2 Wright Pierce = TOTAL 663
- 3 Kleinfelder = TOTAL 660
- 4 Haley & Ward = TOTAL 586
- 5 MRB Group = TOTAL 460

Chair Harris asked if Helen Gordon would talk more in detail of the references for each firm before we open up for discussion. While going through the evaluation process, felt some of the specific categories from a reference stand point would be key information.

Member Schrader asked if all things together, what Helen Gordon learned from the reference check versus the reviewing of the submittals.

Helen Gordon was surprised at some, not all of them scored 40. We specifically requested the reference person to weigh in on our scale of 1 to 4, where would you rate them in the various categories. The reference checks we were focusing on were scope, schedule, budget and would they use them again and were there any major challenges.

Haley & Ward – references were very good, the work that they have been doing have been on scope, schedule and budget. 2 of the references felt they were highly advantageous and would use them again. They historically stay on scope, schedule and budget. None of the references were specifically around DPW garages on the municipal building end of things. Certainly from a water perspective and good work, solid and understands Massachusetts Bidding Laws and SRF.

Kleinfelder – there was one reference indicated that the project had not been completed yet and not on schedule. The other references had high rating for aware of budgets, keeping track of things, cost estimates, accurate and reasonable margins, worked with them for a long time and continue to work with them. One reference was in Maine and not in Massachusetts. The bidding environment could have had a lot to do with the fact that the project was slow to get started on the contracting end.

Chair Harris asked Helen Gordon's thoughts as she was reviewing the references and having those discussions, with respect to the COVID environment and the impacts on schedules?

Helen Gordon explains the market place is very busy right now and contractors have been busy. Projects have been going over schedule because of manufacturing issues and getting equipment in. It is certainly not a normal environment and with companies being hit with a COVID spike and needing to shut down. I believe it is safe to say that we all have run into people on various teams that have been out because of COVID and it can impact things.

Chair Harris asked as we go through the list and we talk about the reference checks, could Helen Gordon scale that a little bit, if she knows specifically if some of the issues were relative to schedule and a challenge.

Helen Gordon references the Kleinfelder reference and the project that wasn't complete had more to do with situational rather than the team.

Member Schrader mentions his firm received a letter from Tonka, bigger manufacturers of Green Sand treatment equipment, this is the second time we got a force majeure notice based on materials and they can't get steel and they are saying the foundries can't keep up.

Helen Gordon continues to review the references.

MRB Group – the references were very good and they would continue to use them in the future. The work was all performed in New York. One of the design projects they were using for a reference, the design work was about 18 years old. They've continued to work in that community since the 70's and operate the plant as well. They do have operator's and that is something I see as added value because they understand a different perspective of the design on the operations end of things. There are other candidates here that do that as well.

Weston & Sampson – all good references and input. Their slightly lower number is related to escalation in cost of equipment and the time between when the project was originally designed and went out to bid and started construction. The OPCC on the bidding end, that was a little lower than what they saw on the bid tabs. That is more related to inflation and escalation of costs due to COVID.

Member Schrader asked with regards to Water Treatment Plant experience, I was surprised to see the way the scores went. Not sure if it matters but, I thought Wright Pierce had that locked down. Looking at the other ones, not sure they are as relevant? Not sure how specific to get, personally impressed that Wright Pierce had 14 Green Sand plants in the last 5 years. Looking at Weston & Sampson, and the first 3 they give were Kristen Berger, that's the team. A lot of the other ones are as compelling.

Chair Harris suggest to have Helen Gordon finish up reference discussion then we can open up for discussion.

Helen Gordon continues to review the references.

Wright Pierce – all very good references and top ratings, and on Ground Water Treatment Plants and all in Massachusetts. All on schedule and change orders were based on material available. Scope, schedule and budgets were good on the Treatment Plant end of things.

Chair Harris looking at the rankings that he sees and his own thoughts, feels they fall into line with what his thoughts and review.

Vice-Chair Forest feels that there are at least 3 candidates that need to move forward.

Member Kenney thinks that we are looking at weighted aggregate scores and seeing how close the total numbers are and then tracking back to our own numbers, even with variables it points to the top 3.

Deputy D'Amico believes we can all agree that we shouldn't spend much more time on MRB. Asks the committee if we want to interview 3 or 4?

Chair Harris agrees to focus on the top 4 with no discussion.

Vice-Chair Foresto mentions the experience the town has had with the top 4. Feels, from a politics standpoint, a lot of contact with Haley & Ward, significant contact with Kleinfelder over the years, feels we should at least interview them.

Chair Harris suggests when the interview questions are finalized, we target cost.

Superintendent Smith states that we have a budget for this project and the applicants need to design with that in mind.

Member Kenney supports what Superintendent Smith is saying. They know what the numbers are and they need to meet that. We are looking at common approaches.

Chair Harris questions the next step. Once we move forward with our Short List, when will we be in a position where we see actual fee proposals.

Helen Gordon explains, qualifications and base selection, the outline that was put together and advertised, you short list, you interview, you prioritize, you negotiate a fee.

Paul Millett agrees that this discussion has a lot of great questions. The applicants know the floor plan, the general layout, the site, the budget – we want them to come in and discuss their approach to this job – their commitment of staff and availability and how are they going to design this job to the budget we have. Before you choose someone to design your building, after the interviews in the next couple weeks, you have to be 200% sure that you choose someone that commits to the budget, plus or minus 5%-7%.

Director D'Amico suggests we work on our questions, and specific questions that anyone has, submit them to Helen Gordon.

Helen Gordon goes over the Short List letter that will be sent to the designers. We currently have the dates of February 3rd and 4th, with a 30-minute presentation and 30 minutes for questions. We will also list that it is a Zoom Meeting. The letter mentions that the presentation team should include key project team members and focus on the project approach and initial thoughts on the design. If we want to mention that we want them to focus on the following 3 questions?

Member Kenney mentions Helen Gordon and Paul Millett could come up with a list of key questions that we will ask the applicants, then we could have wild card questions that each of us can ask.

Chair Harris agrees with Member Kenney, nail down the major critical questions and have everyone give it some thoughts over the next couple days and send some other questions over to Helen Gordon. Feels we should have core questions that they need to be prepared to discuss.

Helen Gordon mentions when you ask the questions, you will be able to see how the team works together as they answer the questions and how they react with each other.

Chair Harris talks about the interview and that once you get through the introduction part, then have it more of a casual discussion – almost like a project meeting – seeing how the team works with each and other with us and how they will perform for us.

Paul Millett agrees and suggests to have them tell us about their project understanding and their approach. Give us a detailed schedule for the first 6 months of the project. You will be able to tell within the first 10 minutes if people are just yessing you to death. We can ask questions about approach, understanding, the real schedule and cost control. You can have some wild card questions. We want to get into some of the details.

Helen Gordon suggests asking them to expand on the project approach that you have, and focusing on the following areas – outline how you will approach the schedule in the next 6 months, cost control, PFAS approach. The goal for the Short List letters was to have them sent on Monday 1/25/21.

Director D'Amico suggests that Helen Gordon send something out to the 4 firms and letting them know the dates and times for the interviews.

Helen Gordon agrees and she will give them a call in the morning then will follow up with a letter. The Committee needs to vote on the firms that they are short listing. Then we will need to know how we are going to split the interviews up.

Superintendent Smith suggests we discuss how long we are going to give each firm to talk. Suggests a break in between each interview for our discussion.

Helen Gordon recommends 30 minutes for their presentation and 30 minutes for the questions.

Member Schrader has a conflict on February 3rd, suggests the 2nd and 4th and hoping that works. Agrees with Superintendent Smith with the break in between for the committee discussion.

Chair Harris asked if February 2nd and February 4th works for all – everyone agrees.

Superintendent Smith suggests starting at 4:00 pm for the interviews.

Chair Harris recommends February 2nd 4:00 – 5:00pm, a break from 5:00 – 6:00pm, second interview 6:00 – 7:00pm, then discussion. Questions before a motion on the short list. Evaluation of the interview – will there be a checklist?

Helen Gordon shares her screen and shows the interview form and confirms that we will be using the same number ranking with room for notes on each item.

Member Schrader questioned the proposed schedule and asked if it was in the RFQ and asked if we expect them to be ready with a detailed schedule to present?

Paul Millett responds that a couple of the firms had submitted a schedule with their proposals. We did talk about the schedule in the RFQ. You will be surprised what will come out of the interview. The lack of preparation and lack of team energy will show up pretty quickly. We want them to talk us through the details of the schedule.

Member Schrader feels that if we are looking for a detailed schedule discussion, we should list that in the Short List letter. Questions the presentation of cost estimating approach and results – what do you mean by results?

Chair Harris responds track record – initial estimate versus as-built.

Paul Millett agrees and would like them to take 3 of their projects and talk about where they were on the money and where they weren't and explain what happened. Would welcome a candid conversation about accuracy of cost estimates.

Helen Gordon agrees and would also welcome a candid conversation about accuracy of cost estimates over the last 2 years and what their opinion is on OPCC creation and how they include escalation over the course of the project. Those are the items that seem to have been missed.

Deputy D'Amico questions the cost estimating consultant, how do they collaborate with that firm and come to resolution of numbers.

Helen Gordon mentions as indicated before, we had a very detailed RFQ, we talked a lot about the scope and requirements associated with scope of work, we talked about a very detailed matrix for the review, we've identified the interviewer valuation points. When we say presentation of cost estimating, approach and results, we want to talk about your approach and we are going to ask questions about these items.

Paul Millett suggests we decide the amount of people on the team that should be allowed at the interview. I would suggest 5 to 6 at the most. Request no more than 5 people of their key personnel.

Director D'Amico asked about public outreach and if that was listed.

Member Schrader questioned the public outreach, what do you think we are going to get for comments from people, town wide, do we expect input from the public?

Member Kenney pushed back on that and explains, we have an 18-million-dollar plant, first one for the town and the citizens need to know what they are going to get out of this project. Someone needs to be connecting and selling this plant.

Paul Millett suggests talking about the bullet points of the Short List letter.

Chair Harris suggests adding Community Outreach.

Paul Millett requests changing the first bullet point should be Treatment / PFAS Approach, the second could be Site Specific Factors and that would be a good list.

Chair Harris would suggest team members not to exceed 5 members at the interview. Asked the committee if they had any suggestions on who to interview on what date and time.

Vice-Chair Forest suggests interviewing, what we feel the top 2 candidates together.

Chair Harris suggests candidate 1 & 2 to interview on Thursday, February 4th and 3 & 4 on Tuesday, February 2nd.

Chair Harris asked if everyone is in agreement for the top 4. Suggests proposing a motion to Short List the top 4 candidates as detailed in Helen Gordon's Evaluation Analysis.

Member Schrader motions to Short List the top 4 candidates as detailed in Helen Gordon's Evaluation Analysis, Member Kenney seconds. The motion carries unanimously. A roll call vote was taken due to the nature of the remote Zoom meeting.

Helen Gordon asked if the committee want's the letters to come from the Town's letterhead or Environmental Partner as OPM?

Director D'Amico explains it's come from the OPM in the past.

Helen Gordon will draw the letters up and send to Director D'Amico for a second set of eyes.

Chair Harris reviews the letter and is fine with as it's written.

Member Kenney is also ok with the letter as written.

Paul Millett suggests telling the candidates that the dates and times for the interviews are fixed times and not negotiable.

Helen Gordon agrees and will state that.

Member Schrader suggests adding to the letters to submit the names and email address of their team members to make it easier for the Zoom meetings.

Director D'Amico asked if these interviews were going to be public meetings? Will check with Michael Boyton on the particulars.

Helen Gordon explains once the interview starts, the candidate will present, then when it is time for questions, they will have to identify who will be answering the question. One of the team members will need to have co-host privileges so they are able to share their screen if needed.

Paul Millett feels we need to have one person on the Town's side as a moderator and one person on the candidate's side who is their moderator. Either divide questions up before hand, but it needs to be organized.

Member Kenney talks about the questions and we had talked about boiler plate questions that Helen Gordon and Paul Millett would put together, then we would have wild card questions. I do support one person to be the moderator.

Director D'Amico explains that our next meeting is scheduled to talk about the questions and the process of the interviews.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 28, 2021 @ 7:00 pm.

Member Kenney makes a motion to adjourn at 8:38pm, Vice-Chair Foresto seconds. The motion carries unanimously. A roll call vote was taken due to the nature of the remote Zoom meeting.