

Committee Members
Timothy Harris, Chairman
John Foresto, Vice Chairman
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 11/24/2020

November 12, 2020

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:

Timothy Harris, Medway Resident & Chairman
John Foresto, Selectmen & Vice-Chairman
Ted Kenney, Medway Resident & Member
David D'Amico, DPW Director
Peter Pelletier, DPW Deputy Director
Barry Smith, Water & Sewer Superintendent
Helen Gordon, Environmental Partners
Michael Callahan, Medway Resident
Alysa Longo, Environmental Partners
Jill Karakeian, DPW Program Administrator and Recording Secretary

Chairman Harris called the meeting to order @ 7:02pm and asked all attending members to state their name and position.

Approval of past Meeting Minutes

Member John Foresto makes a motion to approve meeting minutes from 10/22/20 meeting, Member Kenney seconded the motion. The motion carries unanimously. A roll call vote was taken due to the nature of the remote Zoom meeting.

Debrief/discussion, 10/31/20 tour of proposed Water Treatment Facility site

Member Timothy Harris mentions he felt it was a successful tour and great suggestions by all that attended. Suggests putting together a write up of the tour and suggestions.

Helen Gordon speaks about the tour and states that the notes and discussion was basically about the three layouts that were put together. Will pull formal notes together. A number of topics touched on, one was looking at the placement of the facilities and making sure we can, as little as possible, impact the tree line on the Populatic side.

Tim Harris states that another topic that was mentioned was the amount of trees that would need to be removed, certainly for another discussion. Rotating the proposed facility and phasing of the existing facility, potentially.

Helen Gordon, took the input that was discussed and sat down with Alysa Longo (Project Engineer) and we took into consideration some of the ideas, some didn't work because of placement, but we put together was the three best options and put them in the RFQ and to offer them to the proposer to come up with any suggested alterations they might have.

Helen Gordon presented the layouts (attached to these minutes). Fig 1, showing a small adjustment pushing the buildings back a little bit so it's not as much as an exposure out front. Still carrying the lagoons. Today we did get the approval letter from MassDEP on the results of the pilot plant study and the recommendations are from them and that will also be incorporated into the RFQ. We were able to refine the size of the lagoons, so they are slightly smaller than we were previously showing, if we were to have to use them. Currently the plan would be to send it to the Treatment Plant.

Timothy Harris questioned the size they were reduced.

Helen Gordon was asking Alysa Longo, Alysa is having problems with here audio. Helen believes they were 2 – 100 ft x 40 ft before and now they are 2 - 75 ft x 25 ft, the goal is not to have to use them. Submit the industrial request to the CRPCD. Recommendation was to submit sooner than later. Alysa spoke to them directly and confirmed it has to be submitted as industrial. Based on the flows that we would be adding, most likely we would be able to do that. We are in the process of filing.

Timothy Harris asked about the turn-around for the approval of the request.

Helen Gordon, shows Fig 2, showing the buildings relocated, creating more of a buffer from Populatic and moving the buildings closer to the Chemical Building.

Timothy Harris likes this layout a little better because it gives more of a buffer.

Helen Gordon, states it also keeps the Administration area connected to the Garage and Treatment Facility with a nice flow.

David D'Amico comments on keeping the Treatment Facility as far back as possible from Populatic – concerned about the noise coming from the facility. Water Street is not a street – it is a driveway so there would be no setback required.

Timothy Harris mentions if flipping the buildings would that make accessing the garage difficult.

Helen Gordon will need to look at that proposed change and check in with Peter Pelletier and Barry Smith.

Helen Gordon shows Fig 3, with splitting the garage off and making it an outbuilding. The members felt that all 3 buildings should be kept together to allow for a good flow.

Ted Kenney talks with respect to the noise, the plant should not make a lot of noise.

Barry Smith mentions if there is any noise, the noise from the vehicles at the garage building would make more noise than the plant.

Timothy Harris mentions the conversation at the site tour of incorporating the existing facility, pulling everything back a little bit and maintaining existing facility during construction to create more of a buffer on the road.

Helen Gordon says that will impact cost of construction. We can definitely get into more of a discussion once we get to the design phase.

Review Environmental Partners draft Water Treatment Facility Design Consultant selection template

Helen Gordon talks about the draft and feels the weight for Project Understanding should be moved up. One of the items that are different, Effective Community Engagement was added in, being important. In the actual request for qualifications, I get into the Project Understanding more detailed, they will get extra credit, to look at the 3 proposed layouts, any immediate ideas would get more points for filling that in. Was carrying a 10% for a weight but thinking 15% would make more sense. The total number will not be 100 because there a lot of different categories to take into consideration. This is a time to discuss all the categories with you, if they are addressing the priorities that you want us to be looking at when we are all reviewing the proposals.

Timothy Harris states that a discussion of whether the weighting percentages are in-line with what we are looking for.

Ted Kenney, agrees that the key elements are there and feels the weighting percentages may need to be adjusted. #2 Treatment Training is important as we were approved from DEP for that as a grade 2 facility. In the multi-disiplinary item, that we will give the extra credit if they keep it all in house and no subbing out. Key elements looks like they are there just how we want to weight them. Anybody that is going to propose will talk about how they have been creative in addressing certain items.

Timothy Harris questioned nailing down from a cost and creativity engineering standpoint and really optimizing the cost of the design.

Helen Gordon says when the references are called we do ask the questions, what were the change orders, were they client driven, or was there value added. The Board should start thinking about some specific questions that you want to be asking. I would recommend that once we have the short list of the 3, these are things we would like you to present on. We are talking about the project, here are the 3 topics.

Helen Gordon asked the Board if there were any other items that should be weighed differently. I think Project Understanding should have a little more weight.

David D'Amico suggested schedule should be a little higher – time is money. If things drag that will cost us and we have to meet a Town Meeting schedule.

Helen Gordon will put schedule up to 15%. Timothy Harris agrees and states that we all have to be on schedule as well to keep things moving.

David D'Amico asks about how we are ranking (ie. Highly-Advantageous, Advantageous, Not Advantageous), there is no definition as to what that means.

Helen Gordon explains that we can define it more in the RFQ.

Timothy Harris asked if we are creating a problem by doing that – isn't it better if we are subjective?

David D'Amico is looking at it as if we get challenged with the AG in court and why we came up with these rankings with no definitions – how do you defend that?

Ted Kenney believes what David is looking for an answer key for the rating scale. David D'Amico agrees.

Helen Gordon states the experience with this is that everyone is going to be within 5 points of each other. There are a lot of companies that are looking at this project and want to design this project and have the ability to do so. There are certain things here you already have in place – that are easily defensible. One is, you prefer to have a company that has everything in house, rather than being concerned with bringing in sub-consultants and having to manage someone else's staff. That is very defensible there. In a designer you are looking for a team that is definitely comfortable with each other and working together.

Ted Kenney questions if we want to leave the project experience from 2 to 5.

Helen Gordon suggests it's a minimum of 3 and if they have 5 they get more points.

Barry Smith didn't want to push a good company out that hasn't completed as many projects.

Helen Gordon states the quality of references has a big impact on some of this. There are some basics that we want to make sure of expertise in.

Barry Smith asked if it has to be noted that they are required to work with our current SCADA company?

Helen Gordon states we don't have to bring it up at this time. It will be part of the specification writing. Helen Gordon asked if they were going to give this to the Town's procurement officer and work with them to put together.

David D'Amico, legal will eventually review once it's all together. We typically have our project manager put the front end together, which is our standard contract and standard provisions and that will get tied into the main bid documents.

Helen Gordon will work on the RFQ and add information that has been talked about tonight. Hoping to have a finalized package by 11/24/2020.

Ted Kenney makes a motion to approve as noted the template for the Design Consultant as well as the document in front of us for the RFQ, seconded by Michael Callahan. A roll call vote was taken due to the nature of the remote Zoom meeting. Passed by unanimous vote.

Timothy Harris asked about the schedule and asked if there needed to be some adjusting of the dates.

Helen Gordon talks about the schedule changing the video conference to a potential site visit. Would the Board be interested in a site visit prior to proposers submit?

Timothy Harris thinks it would be a good idea to do a site visit. Are we giving them enough time to submit questions.

Helen Gordon says that the time for questions can certainly be extended if needed.

The Board questions the amount of days required for them to respond and if there is enough time to respond.

Helen Gordon explains historically there isn't very many questions. There might be a question or two for clarification on information that was provided. Is there anymore information available on X, Y and Z. I do want to talk about the budget. We do want to put in is that we have an upset limit for the project of X. We need to make sure that is included. When we originally went for the job on the RFQ for the OPM services it was \$13,000,000. We want to say right up front that it is \$13,000,000 and there is a maximum of 12 months to complete the design. We should be putting a total fee for Designer Services and it will be put in the project description. We could move everything on the schedule down a week.

Ted Kenney agrees that would be a good idea with the holidays. Most of them are more procedural and straight forward.

Helen Gordon we can move it down a week from Deadline for Questions, that would be February 19, 2021.

Timothy Harris asked at what time do we receive the fee proposals.

Helen Gordon explains this is a qualifications based selection and you negotiate the fee. It's generally standard between 25% overall cost for design, construction and services. You could ask for anticipated hours, but qualification based selection is set so as not to ask for dollar amount. Totally on qualifications. You will negotiate with the team that is #1 and if you can't come to a negotiation with them you go to the next in line. We could ask them to submit what their proposed level of effort is, so we could adjust the second phase, then say we could pick you on qualifications, then short list down to 2 or 3, then we would add a week and we would like them to come in for an interview. We would want to know level of effort and potential budget. Then we would take that into consideration when we do our final review. Level of effort, keeps you true to the qualifications base selection process. Rates are known in the industry. Part of the reason you have an OPM, we are going to look at it and tell you whether or not you are getting a realistic fee for this. When it comes to Designer Services, too low is not good either.

Helen Gordon will work with Alysa to get the package over next week and will put together the minutes from the site visit on 10/31/2020.

Barry Smith questioned meeting prior to Thanksgiving, if we have any questions prior to getting over to legal. Timothy Harris suggests a check in meeting to go over everything so we will be on time for the posting.

The next meeting is scheduled for November 24, 2020 @ 7:00 pm to check on documents and December 3, 2020 @ 7:00 pm.

Unanimous vote to adjourn at 8:10pm. A roll call vote was taken due to the nature of the remote Zoom meeting.