

MEETING NOTES



Meeting Date: September 10, 2024
Project Name: Lexington High School
Project Number: Click or tap here to enter text.
Subject: LHS Communications Working Group Meeting
Attendees:

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

Agenda Item	Description
1.	Introduction: Refer to attendees list.
2.	Request for Qualification (RFQ) Review <ul style="list-style-type: none">• K.Slavsky asked what is meant by Schematic Design PO, is it just for review of the Schematic Design?<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ M.Burton noted they are hired for a SD review and estimate, there will be a separate PO for SD to the Project Funding Agreement (PFA)

- J.Himmel asked if they are guaranteed the construction administration
 - M.Burton noted they are not guaranteed it but he has never seen a CM at Risk not get the job after
- C.Favazzo asked if when they go out for Request for Proposal will the cost include the extra 6 months to get from SD to the PFA?
- J.Himmel noted they are selecting someone who will do a great job at preconstruction
 - L.Finnegan noted that it is more important to look for a partner for the whole job
- J.Himmel noted that an earlier walk through may be good to give the CM's more information
 - M.Burton noted that there can be multiple walkthroughs but normally it is done in the RFP phase to make sure only qualified CMs are viewing it to save time.
 - J.Himmel noted he is concerned with who shows up in the credential aspect and it should be provided what the sub-committee is looking for
- C.D. Angelo noted she sent out the RFQ PDF for review earlier but has taken out the key aspects that require discussion
- C.D. Angelo noted that it will be hosted on the Dore + Whittier website for download. She noted that they adjusted the range of construction to \$450 million - \$550 million.
- M.Burton noted that the escalation of the past years will be taken into account on the value of past projects
- C.Favazzo noted he did not see the estimated square footage
 - M.Burton noted this will be added if it is not there
- K.Slavsky noted the three things she sees missing from the description are the terms public project, school project, and occupied site
 - M.Burton noted they want to qualify as many people as can be so they do not want to limit the availability
 - It was agreed upon that the term public will be included
 - M.Burton noted that for the RFP portion they will ask for examples of how they have converted their system to the MSBA system
 - L.Finnegan noted they should not include the occupied site as they would be limiting themselves on options as these CMs are qualified
- J.Himmel asked if they should include Chapter 149.a somewhere
 - L.Finnegan noted this is included already in the RFQ
- C.D. Angelo noted she is currently working with the DCAMM office for the WBE and MBE percentages

- K.Slavsky noted that it should be clear that there are four (4) percentages that should be listed
- C.D. Angelo asked M.Barrett if they do want one hard copy or if all electric is fine
 - M.Barrett noted he is fine with all electric but will check with purchasing
- C.Favazzo asked if it is common to limit the size of the qualifications
 - C.D. Angelo noted no this is not part of the process she has seen as they do want to see all the information
 - C.Favazzo noted that it may be good to just get the important information
 - L.Finnegan noted she has not noticed any filler/not important information as the CMs have done this process a lot
 - M.Barrett noted he uses a sentence that just asks for relevant information
- C.D. Angelo noted for past project experience she has ten years listed
 - C.Favazzo noted that the last five (5) years will be more the most important
- J.Himmel noted that all of this information is about construction and not about prequalification, which Himmel views is mor important at this stage.
 - C.D. Angelo noted there will be more of this in the RFP as this is just for the qualifications. The RFP is much larger and covers a lot more
- C.D. Angelo noted she has terminations for the last 5 years, administrative proceedings for the last 3 and arbitrations in the last 3
- C.D. Angelo noted the safety record will be extended for the last 5 years
- C.D. Angelo noted they have 3 prior CMR projects with GMPS and at least one completed at least in the last 10 years
- Bonding Capacity set in the amount equal to or greater than 110%
 - L.Finnegan noted the M.G.L must be 110%
- C.D. Angelo noted the DCAMM certification of eligibility will be shared
 - K.Slavsky noted this will have their single project and cumulative limits
- C.D. Angelo noted they have references listed at 3 from owners that the firm has worked within in the past 5 years
 - K.Slavsky noted that if we are accepting projects from the last 10 years than it should also be 10 here
 - M.Burton noted the only issue is that a lot change in towns and companies and after 5 years there is not much weight in those references

- C.Favazzo noted that the bank references should be separate so 5 total
- C.D. Angelo noted that the project report examples will be limited to 1 project and 20 pages
- K.Slavsky asked if they will be getting their labor rate tables fixed for the duration of the project
 - L.Finnegan noted for the GCs they will be yes
 - C.D. Angelo noted yes this is part of their price proposal not the RFQ. A table is provided for them to fill out
 - M.Burton noted to him fee is the number one priority and rates are number two as they can evolve
- C.D. Angelo asked what the best page number limit would be for each project
- C.D. Angelo asked if the group wants an earlier walkthrough
 - C.Favazzo noted that this may be better to wait for the RFP stage to make sure just the qualified firms are present
 - J.Himmel hears what these viewpoints are but thinks it will be good to get unwanted questions. Himmel noted maybe a short video introducing the project may be helpful
 - M.Burton noted that a reference to the project website will be better to let them do the work themselves
 - J.Himmel noted they should include some of the information on the RFQ download page and reference the website for the rest
- J.Himmel noted to maybe add a line that projects completed in the last 5 years will be weighted more heavily
 - K.Slavsky noted this will be better in the RFP portion
- J.Himmel asked if the pre-construction can be a qualification
 - L.Finnegan noted they could include asking for a two-page approach on the firm's pre-construction approach
- M.Barrett is going to reach out to legal about working relationships with some of the firms will be applying
- J.Himmel asked if the group is allowed to ask the CM firms to undergo exercises similar to how a designer would be asked for renderings prior to be selecting
 - L.Finnegan noted that she has worked with every major company, and they all work very differently, and the teams within these companies play a factor with each
 - J.Himmel noted when he interviewed people, he asked for the project teams to come not the suits. Himmel noted that if they are all qualified for the project then pre-qualification should take a step forward in importance

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K.Slavsky noted she does not agree with biasing this heavily towards preconstruction as the other aspects are just as important
3.	<p>CM Selection Sub-Committee RFQ Recommendation of Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The sub-committee will make a recommendation to the SBC to approve the RFQ
4.	<p>Timeline Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● C.D. Angelo shared the timeline for the CMR procurement process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Develop Construction Manager at Risk (CMR) sub-committee 08/19/2024 ○ Develop Request for Qualifications (RFQ) 08/26 – 09/5/2024 ○ Review RFQ with CMR sub-committee 09/09/2024 ○ Issue RFQ 09/18/2024 ○ CMR qualifications due 10/09/2024 ○ Short list CMR 10/17/2024 ○ CMR Request for Proposals (RFP) 10/17/2024 ○ CMR site walkthrough 10/24/2024 ○ CMR proposals due 11/14/2024 ○ Review proposals with CMR sub-committee 11/14 – 11/22/2024 ○ Interview CMR firm's week of 12/03/2024 ○ Award Schematic Design (SD) Purchase Order (PO) 12/16/2024 ○ C.D. Angelo noted that these dates are tentative specifically the walkthrough one ● M.Burton noted there will need to be more meetings during the RFP phase
5.	<p>Close</p>

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