

## High School Building Committee Meeting Minutes

**Meeting date & place: 7 pm, March 22, 2017, Pentucket High School Library**

**Members Present:** Jonathan Seymour, Greg Hadden, Kim Jackson, Elisa Grammer, Michael Stevens, Joseph Torrisi, Laura Costigan, Carol McLeod, Denise Dembkoski, Mark Tocci, Greg Labrecque, Jeff Mulqueen, Lisa O'Connor, Stephanie Seeley, Bill Daley. **Members not present:** Bill O'Neil, Earl Baumgardner, Glenn Kemper, Dena Trotta, Wayne Adams, Emily Dwyer.

### **Public present:**

None.

### **Minutes**

Committee Chairman Seymour presented draft minutes of the High School Building Committee's December 13, 2016 meeting. *The Committee approved the draft minutes unanimously.* He then presented Owner's Project Manager (OPM) Subcommittee meeting minutes for March 7, 2017 and March 15, 2017. *The Committee approved the draft Subcommittee minutes unanimously.*

### **Progress Update By OPM Subcommittee Selecting The Top Candidate**

Ms. O'Connor, Mr. Tocci and Mr. Labrecque described the OPM Subcommittee's process of evaluating both written proposals and the interviews, in which 39 requests for the solicitation packet were made, 5 proposals were returned, and 3 candidates were interviewed. Subcommittee members individually ranked the written proposals pursuant to a predetermined scoring mechanism. They also devised a list of interview questions.

Subcommittee members stressed the interviews' value. Mr. Torrisi suggested that interviews should have greater than 20% weight as opposed to 80% for the written proposals, in view of large firms' ability to assemble sophisticated written packages that may not necessarily show whether a firm is a good fit.

Subcommittee members expressed a consensus, particularly based on the interviews but also based on the scoring outcome, that Vertex was the fit for Pentucket. In response to Mr. Jackson, Mr. Seymour explained that references were checked, including from schools *not* listed as references in the proposal. Many positive comments for Vertex were collected, as shown on the last page of the March 21 overview of the OPM selection process. Mr. Daley noted that Vertex had all bases

covered and offered a hands-on approach. Ms. Seeley said that Vertex would be able to communicate well with the community.

### **Cost Considerations**

Mr. Lebreque reported that in accordance with the procedures in place, he called Vertex to inform it of its top score and that the next step was to negotiate price. Pentucket could offer up to \$700K for the initial stage, which Vertex first said was insufficient. Further discussions with Vertex, however, established that the initial appropriation *was* in line: additional costs such as wetlands studies (which have just been done in connection with athletic field construction) and traffic studies (unnecessary because traffic volume, ingress and egress are unchanged) should not be of concern. Multiple designs (which Pentucket intends to avoid) and geotech studies (which are necessary at a cost of about \$10-15K) would add to costs.

Mr. Lebreque said that an OPM fee of up to \$330K, which includes \$62K for two additional items, was agreed upon. This is comparable to costs other schools incurred. Actual costs may be lower because some tasks may be done in-house. For instance, Mr. Lebreque may be able to save 120 OPM hours by submitting invoices to Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) himself.

An architect/designer will also need to be selected, with OPM help, in this initial phase. This will not involve a fee based on percentage of construction cost, which per MSBA would be exorbitant and inappropriate for this project. Services for a schematic design may cost \$300-500K and may require an increase above the \$700K Pentucket planned.

In response to Mr. Daley's concern that Pentucket avoid spending money on a design for a combined middle/high school or high school only when the towns ultimately may support something else, Messrs. Lebreque and Tocchi explained that the OPM will help determine which should be chosen (remodel, new school, combined or not). Once a mandate is identified, the designer will work on the preferred choice.

In response to Mr. Torrisi's observation that it is very important that townspeople fully understand that building a larger combined school will have a material impact in cost per household when compared to a stand-alone high school, Mr. Mulqueen noted that Pentucket has held a public meeting and is working on a web-based "thought process" that so far has identified the balance of best outcome vs cost as a major issue. This will be an ongoing process in consultation with the OPM and MSBA. The importance of reaching out to community members not directly involved with schools was stressed.

In response to Mr. Torrissi's inquiry whether the school enrollment projection is sufficient, Mr. Seymour said that the target number (not the maximum) is 605 for the high school and 935 for the other. MSBA is very thorough in this evaluation. Student populations have declined and, among other things, a lack of sewer infrastructure in the district impedes large scale dense development.

### **Committee Vote On OPM Selection**

*The Committee voted unanimously to submit Vertex to MSBA as Pentucket's selected OPM.*

### **Next Steps**

Messrs. Seymour and Labrecque said that Pentucket will submit a packet concerning OPM selection to MSBA by April 5 and then perhaps in mid-May we will get a letter in response saying that we may proceed with Vertex as OPM.

*The Committee offered thanks to those who worked on OPM selection.*

### **Adjournment**

7:48 pm

### **Meeting Documents**

1. 03/22/2017 Meeting Agenda
2. 12/13/2016 Draft Full Committee Minutes
3. 03/07/2017 Draft OPM Selection Subcommittee Minutes
4. 03/15/2017 Draft OPM Selection Subcommittee Minutes
5. 03/21/2017 OPM Selection Process Summary

Respectfully submitted,

Elisa Grammer  
School Building Committee Secretary