

## **Whitman Middle School Building Committee**

### **Meeting Minutes**

**Time: 4:30 PM**

**Place: Whitman-Hanson Regional High School**

**Date: Tuesday, April 5, 2022**

**Members Present:** Beth Stafford, John Stanbrook, Ernest Sandland, Rich Pulkinen, Crystal Regan, Randy LaMattina, Lincoln Heineman, John Galvin, George Ferro, Donald Esson, Robert Curran, David Codero

~ Christopher Scriven participated remotely

**Absent:** Fred Small, Jeff Szymaniak, Kerri Sandler

**Building Team Present:** Ken Guyette, OPM - Colliers Project Leaders (CPL), John Bates (CPL)

**Absent:**

### **Call to Order:**

At 4:30 pm Randy LaMattina, The Committee Vice Chair opened the meeting by calling it to order.

#### **A. February 15, 2022 Meeting Minutes Approval**

The Vice Chair entertained a motion to approve the minutes of February 15, 2022.

Motion: Ms. Stafford

Second: Mr. Galvin

The minutes were approved by roll call vote with (1) abstention (Lincoln Heineman) at 4:32 pm.

#### **B. Submission of OPM Monthly Reports to MSBA**

Mr. Bates provided an overview of the OPM Monthly Report process noting that these reports include financial, schedule and project activity status updates. The reports are generated by the MSBA's online system. It can typically take 30-60 days from the time the OPM is onboard to the point where the MSBA and the District have fully initiated the project on the online system, inclusive of the Total Project Budget from which the Budget versus Actual expenditures can be tracked. Once initiated, Colliers will be provided the reports monthly for the Committee's review. Colliers hopes to have the first report for review at the next meeting.

#### **C. Designer Selection Panel (DSP) Timeline Status Discussion**

Mr. Bates briefly noted the milestones related to the Designer Selection process:

- Applications Due to the District – March 23, 2022: *Colliers received the application submissions and delivered the District/Committee's copies the following day (March 24) at the District Office.*
- Applications Due to the MSBA – March 31, 2022: *Colliers sent via FedEx the MSBA's copies of the applications immediately following receipt in addition to submitting digital copies. The MSBA has confirmed receipt.*
- DSP Applications Review: April 19, 2022: *Virtual meeting on Zoom*
- DSP Interviews: May 3, 2022: *Virtual meeting on Zoom*

#### D. Overview of DSP Selection Process

Mr. Guyette provided an explanation of the DSP process noting the following.

- During the DSP Application Review, the panel will go through each application in detail, noting pros and cons of each.
- Based on the discussion, each DSP member will be asked to rank the applicants in order to create a shortlist of 3 firms to be interviewed on May 3<sup>rd</sup>.
- The intent of today's Committee meeting is to confirm that the 3 District representatives understand the Committee's consensus on the top 3 Designer candidates (without a formal ranking). As noted by Mr. Guyette, the non-District DSP members will often defer to the District's preferences.

The Vice Chair opened the meeting up for discussion amongst the Committee on the Designer Applications. The following points were noted:

- The Committee does not foresee putting forth a recommendation to interview all 4 firms.
- It is important to consider firms that have done work in this geographic area.
- Some programmatic elements, (e.g., a Performing Arts Space) were mentioned in some proposals, possibly due to it having been mentioned during the walk through.
- Whitman voters may not vote to approve the *highest* level of design that some of these applicants are known for.
- Applications that speak to designing within a budget and educating the public should be given consideration.
- From an education standpoint, 2 of the applications focused on that aspect of the project and 2 did not.
- Having recognizable and qualified consultants (HVAC, electrical, plumbing engineers, etc.) will be an important factor in a successful project. Some of the consultants listed in the applications are recognizable and some are not.
- Finding a balance between budget consciousness and good design is important.
- During the Designer site walkthrough there were some general questions regarding various programmatic components of a potential project, e.g., Athletic Fields, Gymnasium, however, no specific direction or consensus was given by the District representatives.
- Colliers noted that, once the Designer is onboard, as part of the Due Diligence process there will be an existing conditions survey that includes, geotechnical review, wetlands delineation, etc.
- The unknowns regarding the existing facility, and what is discovered through the Due Diligence process will be an important factor in the design process. Some applications spoke to that more than others.
- Colliers noted that, as part of the Feasibility Study requirements, the designer will review *all* possible site options in Town, as well as considering all project types including Base Repair, Renovation, and New Construction. At the conclusion of the Feasibility Study, the Committee decides on the Preferred Option to take forward into Schematic Design. The Committee should note that this Application/Interview process is strictly to decide on the right Designer for the project. All other design related decisions regarding site, program, etc., happen further on in this process.
- Colliers noted that the MSBA has a standard list of Designer interview questions. The Committee may have additional questions that can be communicated to the 3 District DSP members, if in the event the standard questions do not cover the Committee's criteria.
- Colliers noted that 4 total applicants is not a small number when considering the current market and the large amount of work currently in progress, particularly with the MSBA.

- Once the top Designer is selected, there will be a fee negotiation process. The fee for the Feasibility Phase is separate and smaller than the fee that would be negotiated after the Public Approval process.

**E. WMS Feasibility Study Account/Invoice Approvals**

Mr. Stanbrook noted there are 5 invoices pending, totaling \$4,020.15

The Vice Chair entertained a motion to approve the invoices.

Motion: Mr. Ferro

Second: Mr. Esson

The invoices were approved, as presented, by unanimous roll call vote at 5:16 pm.

**F. Other Business**

No other business discussed.

**G. Determine Next Meeting Date**

Mr. Bates advised that the Committee meet on April 26, 2022 to discuss the results of the April 19<sup>th</sup> DSP Application Review. The Committee agreed to reconvene on April 26, 2022.

**Adjournment**

The Vice Chair entertained a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Ms. Stafford

Second: Mr. Ferro

The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote at 5:17 pm.