## **MEETING NOTES**



Meeting Date: October 3, 2024
Project Name: Lexington High School

Project Number:

Subject: Attendees: LHS Communications Working Group Meeting

Christina Dell Angelo ( <b>CA</b> )	DWMP - Project Manager
Mike Burton ( <b>MB</b> )	DWMP- Partner
☑ Jacob Greco ( <b>JG</b> )	DWMP - Assistant Project Manager
✓ Lorainne Finnegan ( <b>LF</b> )	SMMA – Principal in Charge
Anoush Krafian ( <b>AK</b> )	SMMA – Assistant Project Manager
Mark Barrett (MB2)	LHS- Public Facilities Project Manager
Mike Cronin ( <b>MC</b> )	SBC Vice Chair & LPS Facility Director
☑ Charles Favazzo	
Jon Himmel (JH2)	PBC Chair
Kseniya Slavsky ( <b>KS</b> )	SBC Community Representative

Agenda Item	Description
1.	Introduction: Refer to attendees list.
2.	Review Timeline
	C. Dell Angelo outlined the timeline for the CM Selection group, which includes a meeting to discuss qualifications, voting on qualified CMs, distribution of request for proposals, a CM walkthrough, proposal submission, proposal review, and interviews with qualified firms. The team agreed to review the RFP responses before the 15th meeting to prepare for the discussion. They also discussed the possibility of rescheduling a meeting to better align with their schedules and allow for more time to digest and evaluate the information received. The team emphasized the importance of not divulging sensitive information during the meeting. They agreed to review the proposals before the next meeting and discuss any questions or

comments during the meeting. The conversation ended with a discussion on Section One of the documents, with C. Dell Angelo highlighting that she couldn't include any of the CM firms until they were known.

## 3. **Review Request for Proposals**

- RFP Process Discussion and Project Experience Emphasis
  - o C. Dell Angelo led a discussion about the upcoming RFP process, emphasizing the importance of project experience, particularly in occupied buildings and high school projects. The team agreed to adjust costs for inflation and to consider comparable projects from various sectors, not just MSBA high school projects. They also decided to include the bid cost and date in the request for proposal (RFP) and to highlight proposed staff with K-12 MSBA school experience. The team agreed to be specific in their scoring to ensure fairness and relevance.
- Joint Ventures, Pre-Construction Services, and Estimating
  - o The team discussed the potential for joint ventures among firms expressing interest in a project. They agreed that firms would need to submit their interest jointly to be considered as qualified bidders. The conversation then shifted to the importance of diligent pre-construction services and estimating. J. Himmel expressed concern about potential shifts in estimates and the need for better understanding of the assigned staff's capabilities. K.Slavsky emphasized the need for flagging issues early in the process to ensure the project's success. The team agreed to evaluate the firms' staffing and capacity during the pre-construction phase. C.Favazzo highlighted the importance of self-governance and accountability in the estimating process to avoid potential issues. The conversation ended with L.Finnegan preparing to share her comments on the section.
- Pre-Construction Services Timeline and Design Review
  - o The team discussed the pre-construction services timeline, focusing on the design review process and the involvement of the designer. They agreed to update the timeline to reflect the end of Construction Documents and to include schematic design before design development. The team also discussed the need for a construction schedule, including phasing, to be confirmed by the CM. They agreed to start with a first pass of the schedule after discussions with the CM, with updates to be made monthly. The team also discussed the need for the CM to review and provide feedback on the project estimate, with the understanding that the CM would need time to develop a phased construction schedule. The conversation ended with the team still discussing the project's

phasing and the need for the CM to provide input on the project's schedule and estimate.

- Project Progress, Price Proposals, and Schedule
  - o The team discussed the progress of the project, focusing on price proposals and rate charts. They agreed to include project benefits in the contract and specify internal toilet facilities. The team also discussed the project schedule, the importance of specifying materials, and the need for fiscal responsibility. They emphasized the importance of confidentiality during the selection process and discussed the valuation criteria. The team agreed to include public projects of similar size and complexity in their project, specifically mentioning Chapter 149a of M.G.L. They decided not to add the term "CM at risk" to distinguish between public and private projects.
- Scorecard Development, RFQ, and Contract Negotiations
  - o The team discussed the development of a scorecard for evaluating potential partners, with C. Dell Angelo confirming its progress and distribution to the team. They also discussed the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and the negotiation and award of contract sections. The team clarified the fee for the pre-construction phase and the inclusion of project communications in the RFQ. They also discussed the pricing and services for pre-construction and construction phases, with M. Burton suggesting locking in a specific fee for pre-construction services. The team agreed to further discuss these issues and finalize the pricing and services for the project. They also discussed the process of pre-construction and its associated costs and agreed to update the project timeline and deliverables. The team decided to leave the pricing for pre-construction open, with a reference to form C for clarity.
- Discussing the Multiplier Approach for Staff Rates
  - O C.Favazzo proposed a new approach to include staff rates in a multiplier to account for expenses like office computers, cell phones, parking, and car payments. However, L.Finnegan and K.Slavsky expressed concerns about including everything in the multiplier, suggesting a need to review the list and decide which items to include. They also noted that this approach might not be feasible for all projects. The team agreed to further discuss this matter. L.Finnegan, C.Favazzo, K.Slavsky, and M.Burton discussed the inclusion of certain items in their rate calculations, with L.Finnegan suggesting making the items consistent and included in the rate. M.Burton clarified that these items are considered fees in the CM agreement and general conditions, and he wanted to see how much they're spending on computers and software etc.. every month. C.Favazzo proposed making these items part of the multiplier on their rates to make them more competitive.
- Federal Funding Rates, Tool Ownership, and Interview Scheduling

o The team discussed the applicability of federal funding rates with the IRA, the issue of small tools being turned over to the owner, and the waiver of permit fees. They also discussed the inclusion of police traffic details in the cost of work and the need to update the affidavit dates. J.Himmel raised a question about the cost of time between September and the town vote, which M.Burton clarified was part of the design development phase. The team also discussed scheduling interviews for December, with a tentative schedule of two 90-minute sessions each day from 3 PM to 7 PM. The team agreed to create a script of 5 questions to ensure fairness and consistency in the interview process. The location for the interviews was left as 'TBD' until M.Burton confirmed the details.

- Close

## Sincerely,

## **DORE + WHITTIER**

Jacob Greco Assistant Project Manager

Cc: Attendees, File

The above is my summation of our meeting. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact me for incorporation into these minutes