



Town of Wilmington

Town Hall/School Administration Building Committee
121 Glen Road Wilmington, 01887

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK

2022 AUG 11 PM 2:42

TOWN OF WILMINGTON, MA

Meeting Minutes

January 4, 2021

Chairperson George W. Hooper II, called the meeting to order at 6:02pm. Members present via video conferencing on ZOOM were Diane Allan; Kevin Caira; John Doherty; John Holloway; Paul Melaragni; Paul Ruggiero and John O'Neil. Stephen Bjork and Michael Tkachuk were absent.

PRESENT IN INTEREST: Jeffrey Hull, Town Manager

To begin the meeting Mr. Hooper read a statement regarding Open Meeting Law and public access to the meeting via technological means. He then took a verbal roll call of the attendees and noted the two members who were absent. Mr. Hooper then called for a motion to approve the Minutes of the December 15, 2020 meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – DECEMBER 15, 2020

Mr. Caira moved to approve; the motion was seconded by Mr. Doherty. It was unanimously and by verbal roll call:

VOTED: To approve the December 15, 2020 Minutes

Mr. Hooper reviewed the process and purpose of the meeting, noting that fifteen (15) firms had been evaluated and, at the December 15th meeting, the committee identified four (4) firms to be interviewed. Two firms would be on this evening's call, with two more firms to be interviewed on Thursday, January 7, 2021.

Mr. Hooper asked if everyone had the opportunity to review the questions, to which everyone replied in the affirmative. He then assigned questions to each committee members to ask during each of the two interviews. Mr. Hooper asked if the committee members had been successful making their reference calls. Mr. Caira asked if he should be calling only the people on the reference sheet, or looking at additional projects for additional references. Mr. Hooper said that the references provided were normally sufficient, but that members could also choose a project from any of the firms' presentations that may be similar to the Wilmington project, and that completing four-to-five reference checks would be helpful.

Mr. Hooper asked if anyone had any questions on the process so far, noting that the first firm, Vertex Companies, would be allowed on the call at 6:30pm. Mr. Hooper then mentioned that members could ask follow-up questions of the firm members if they felt their response(s) didn't fully answer the question(s).

Mr. Hooper said that the interviews on January 7th would begin at 6:15pm, rather than 6:30pm, noting that the time was later for the January 4th meeting so that the committee members could

review the interview questions. It was determined that not all of the committee members had the correct set of interview questions; Mr. Hooper then reviewed each question prior to the first interview to ensure that all committee members had the correct set of interview questions and had each been assigned questions to ask.

FIRST INTERVIEW: VERTEX COMPANIES, INC.

Members of the Vertex Companies on the call included:

Mr. Jon Lemieux, P.E.
Mr. Steve Kirby, Senior Project Manager
Mr. Bryan Jarvis, Senior Project Manager, Design
Ms. Laurie Soave, Construction Site Manager

INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Hooper introduced himself as the Chair of the Committee, and asked the members of the firm to do a roll call of those present. Mr. Hooper then called for a roll call introduction of the TH/School Admin Building Committee. Mr. Hooper asked Mr. Lemieux if he would lead the presentation; Mr. Lemieux confirmed that he would and also confirmed the members of the firm on the call. Mr. Lemieux then shared that their presentation would take approximately 20 minutes, leaving time for questions by the committee. Each of the members of VERTEX introduced themselves by name and role.

Mr. Lemieux provided an introduction of VERTEX Companies, Inc., noting the qualities that set them apart from other OPM firms. Mr. Lemieux also reviewed the additional services that VERTEX does in-house, including Civil, Structural, Digital/IT, Hazmat and Cost Estimation.

PROJECT EXPERIENCE

Mr. Lemieux reviewed local projects the firm had been involved with, including the Tewksbury Fire Department and Cohasset Town Hall, which was a project that had stalled, and they were able to get approval for it to be completed. Mr. Kirby discussed the Foxborough Town Hall project that the firm completed in 2018. Mr. Lemieux discussed the Dracut Town Hall project, completed in 2015.

STRATEGY/PLAN

Mr. Lemieux and Mr. Jarvis explained the strategy/plan that VERTEX Companies followed with their clients, including procuring a designer who has similar municipal project experience of the same size and scope; identifying programming solutions and specific problems that require solutions; and evaluation of sites and options. Mr. Kirby also reviewed the matrix they use to work with the project owners to establish and rank criteria for the project and to identify multiple solutions.

Mr. Lemieux continued, noting that the complete construction cost estimate should reflect the current market conditions, including appropriate escalation costs and COVID-19 impacts. The plan would also confirm a comprehensive budget to ensure that Wilmington would be carrying all of the necessary costs, such as smaller and unexpected budget items including utility backcharges, specialty equipment, furniture and equipment and moving costs. Finally, Mr. Lemieux noted that the budget would be tracked and updated on a regular basis. He reviewed the proposed, estimated timeline, highlighting the Community Forums they would hold to keep everyone informed throughout the process.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH

Mr. Lemieux reviewed their approach to project management, including design coordination, understanding impact to staff and public during construction; promoting constant cost analysis and prioritization of needs vs. wants; coordination with the Senior Center project team; promoting a team approach; maintaining the master project schedule; providing a web-based project management software for electronic transfer and management of documentation and, finally, setting realistic milestones between the firm and the building committee to provide realistic feedback to the committee's request.

Mr. Lemieux pointed out that another important aspect of their project management was limiting exposure to claims and change orders, including discussions about the design and budget and explained the importance of receiving approval by Town Councils. Mr. Jarvis explained the process that they would take to back-check the design team, to ensure there was a complete set of drawings to avoid issues and to make sure needs are met.

Mr. Kirby reviewed their process for conflict resolution, including addressing issues as they arise, stressing accountability with all parties involved; prequalification to resolve potential issues; and to consider all remedies available to the project owners, using their experience and expertise to resolve any and all issues.

COST AND SCHEDULE CONTROL

Ms. Soave reviewed the construction phase process, managing quality control, change orders communication, clarity and closure and noted that it was important that the communication was clear so that decisions could be made as things arose. Mr. Lemieux added that the project team would be the eyes and ears of the Project Owner.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND COMMUNICATION

Mr. Lemieux stressed the importance of assisting in raising support for the project by keeping project stakeholders informed and maintaining an open dialogue, and inviting the public into the process, noting how important communication would be due to COVID-19 restrictions.

WHY VERTEX?

Mr. Lemieux reviewed the reasons why VERTEX would be the right OPM for the project, including:

- Specific, comparable and recent experience providing services required
- Responsive and attentive team
- The firm is large enough to have depth of resources, but they operate with customer-driven small firm focus.
- The VERTEX Ownership Commitment.

At this time, Mr. Hooper opened the floor for questions. Each committee member had been assigned the following questions to ask each firm. Mr. Hooper began with Question #1.

1. As an OPM, what criteria do you feel are the most important in the selection of an OPM for our project?

Mr. Lemieux responded that what he felt was most important was the ability for the project owners to be able to see themselves working with the team, noting that the firm would be a partner in the project for the long-haul, and that the personal relationships would be important.

Mr. Jarvis added that what set them apart would be the ability to work outside of the construction project and work with the community, from Town Hall to the IT Director. Mr. Kirby added that communication would be key to the project and that, ultimately, while the project would be Wilmington's, it would also be VERTEX's project, and they would be available at all times.

Mr. Ruggiero had Question #2.

2. Tell us why your firm is best suited to provide OPM services for Wilmington's proposed Town Hall/School Administration Building, and describe the qualities that give your firm the edge over the competition.

Mr. Ruggiero said that he enjoyed the presentation and that his question had been answered during the presentation to his satisfaction.

Ms. Allen had Question #3.

3. Please describe your firm's experience with public outreach for getting information out to residents of Wilmington and making a compelling case to obtain support for funding this project?

Mr. Lemieux responded that every town was different, giving an example of a previous project they had in a regional school district, where they provided regular information sessions, giving

the community opportunities to be involved and to answer questions and concerns truthfully to ensure that all in the community felt heard.

Mr. Doherty had Question #4.

- 4. Describe some of the more common and some of the more serious mistakes that occur during the planning stages and the cost estimating process. Explain the procedures or approach that your firm has in place to eliminate these issues?**

Mr. Lemieux explained that questions must be asked and answered, and issues discovered early to weed out prospective problems and to avoid delays. He provided examples of issues that could arise and how they would review the designs, have question and answer sessions with the design firm to ensure information is being exchanged, and vice versa with the project owners to discuss concerns and issues.

Mr. Melaragni had Question #5.

- 5. Describe the reasons for change orders and how your firm will work to limit them?**

Mr. Lemieux and Mr. Kirby responded, saying that they would want any change orders to ultimately be to cover unexpected costs or to be owner-adds for wants or needs, and that they would track those change orders throughout the project, determining when and how to respond, as they review the process.

Mr. Caira had Question #6.

- 6. Describe a difficult situation you have had on a project and how you resolved the issue(s) to move the project forward?**

Mr. Lemieux responded that they had faced plenty of difficult situations, that they were usually familiar with the designers and general contractors on projects such as these, and that they were not afraid to broach uncomfortable subjects, such as situations where subcontractors were not paid, or having to discuss issues with legal counsel

Mr. Holloway had Question #7.

- 7. One of the most important decisions that needs to be made is the site selection for a new Town Hall/School Administration Building. How would you evaluation site selection criteria and help us reach a consensus as to the best location?**

Mr. Holloway note that Mr. Jarvis had not only answered the question during the presentation, but that he had actually responded above and beyond. Mr. Holloway said that he was satisfied with Mr. Jarvis's response.

Mr. Melaragni had Question #8.

8. Describe your firm's approach and past experience working with a Town that has multiple projects possibly being deployed simultaneously (such as Wilmington's Senior Center and a Town Hall/School Administration Building).

Mr. Lemieux responded that the goal was to work collaboratively with any other projects to determine whether the site would work and noted that there was a benefit to two design teams reviewing options and to discuss the pros and cons and determine viable solutions. Whether the decision were to be one site for all projects or separate sites, the teams could establish procedures through joint meetings and regular reporting.

Noting the time, Mr. Hooper decided to forego Questions #9 and #10, listed below, noting that they had been addressed during the presentation.

9. Once chosen, the OPM will assist in hiring an architectural firm for the feasibility study and schematic design. What experience/criteria should we be looking for in an architect to perform those duties?

10. Are there any other issues that we have not discussed that you feel are important and would like to discuss?

Mr. Hooper thanked the members of VERTEX Companies, Inc. and asked if anyone had any additional questions.

Mr. Ruggiero asked what they did differently for the Cohasset project to finally be approved. Mr. Lemieux noted that the design had not yet been finalized, but that it had gotten larger than it needed to and, because there had not been a lot of communication to the community, there was a push back when the town finally learned of the final design. VERTEX was able to establish a process via feedback from all of the constituents and the community felt better about the change.

Mr. Hooper and the committee members thanked the members of VERTEX and they departed the call at 7:33pm. Mr. Hooper commented that there was a few minutes before the next interview with Colliers International, but that he felt that the presentation went very well, with the members of VERTEX answering many of the questions during the presentation before the committee question and answer session.

The committee took a short break before interviewing the next firm. Mr. Hooper resumed the meeting at 7:43pm.

SECOND INTERVIEW: COLLIERS INTERNATIONAL

Members of the Colliers International on the call included:

Ken Guyette, Senior Director
Phil Palumbo, Senior Project Manager
Adam Dalessio, Project Manager

INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Hooper introduced himself as the Chair of the Committee, and asked the members of the firm to do a roll call of those present. Mr. Hooper then called for a roll call introduction of the TH/School Admin Building Committee. Mr. Hooper asked Mr. Guyette to share the firm's presentation.

Mr. Guyette thanked Mr. Hooper and reviewed Colliers Key Personnel, including Mr. Palumbo and Mr. Dalessio as the Core Team. In addition, Mr. Frank Baldino, MEP Support; and Ms. Thao Nguyen, Financial Monitoring and Reporting.

PERFORMANCE SIMILAR EXPERIENCE

In addition to the team mentioned on the previous slide, Mr. Guyette noted that Colliers International had more than 120 project managers, and that they would leverage their combined years of experience on the Wilmington project. Projects in the Commonwealth reviewed by Mr. Palumbo included similar projects at Fitchburg City Hall Campus, Longmeadow New Public Works Facility, Somerville Public Safety Facility and the Longmeadow New Adult Center. Mr. Dalessio discussed the two Longmeadow projects, both currently near completion. He noted that the firm had to coordinate different aspects of the project to ensure the logistics were successful.

PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

Mr. Palumbo reviewed the understanding that the firm had for the project, including that the existing Town Hall and School Administration buildings were both undersized for their uses and had accessibility issues. He said that their first task would be the designer selection process and site selection, after which they would create a schematic matrix and coordinate logistics with the Senior Center Project.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

Mr. Guyette identified several modes of communication they would use to ensure that the public would have the ability to be involved, ask questions and issue concerns, such as Community Forums and surveys and a Facebook Project page to keep the community informed.

DESIGN PHASE

Mr. Palumbo reviewed their approach to the Design Phase process, including the Financial/Budget Management, Bid Strategy Development/Quality Assurance and Schedule Management.

CONSTRUCTION PHASE/FURNITURE, FIXTURES AND EQUIPMENT/CLOSEOUT PHASE

Mr. Dalessio reviewed their approach to the Construction Phase, including Financial/Budget Management (contracts, invoices and change orders); Quality Assurance (coordinating

construction, corrections and commissioning coordination and oversight) and Schedule Management (maintaining dates, critiquing contractor schedules and weekly progress and schedule checks). Moving on to the furniture, fixtures and equipment move management phase

FURNITURE, FURNISHINGS AND EQUIPMENT MOVE MANAGEMENT PHASE

Mr. Dalessio noted that it was the team's job to manage the procurement process with the vendors to ensure deliveries arrive on time, and that the construction schedule was accurate to coordinate issue-free delivery of furniture and equipment.

CLOSEOUT PHASE

Mr. Dalessio reviewed their closeout phase process, including Punchlists, Training, signing off on the Final Commissioning Report, and the Close-Out Process.

WHY COLLIERS?

Mr. Guyette discussed the key differentiators of why Colliers would be the best team, including extensive municipal experience, and protecting the interests of the project owners and the community.

At this time, Mr. Hooper opened the floor for questions. Mr. Hooper began with Question #1.

Mr. Palumbo responded to the question by saying that, as the firm had noted during their interview for the Senior Center project, ultimately, project owners want an OPM firm that had done similar work to assist the Town and to be their advocate from start to finish to guide the project to success.

Mr. Caira interjected at this time and noted that some of the committee members had not part of the firm interview process for the Senior Center, and asked the Colliers team members to keep that in mind when responding to the interview questions.

Mr. Ruggiero had Question #2 and commented that Mr. Guyette had addressed his question during their last slide of key differentiators. Mr. Hooper asked if they could expand on the information. Mr. Guyette described a project they did recently with a healthcare agency, where they were able to leverage through Superintendent round-tables the ability to help bring students back to school after COVID.

Ms. Allen asked Question #3, and added that social media today played a large role in the community. She asked about the Facebook Project page that had been mentioned during the presentation and said she thought that would be helpful for Wilmington's particular project. She asked if the firm may be able to work with the Town's website with regard to outreach, perhaps to have a place for the community to ask questions, which could then be answered as part of an FAQ.

Mr. Guyette referred to the rule of thirds; that a third of the community will like the project, a third will dislike and a third that could feel either way. He felt that final third was the constituency that they would need to reach for support. He provided an example of a project they completed for a regional district on Cape Cod that involved 12 towns. They got the community involved by using various forms of social outreach and social media, and were able to achieve a 75% approval vote to complete the project. He also mentioned that the firm had a social media manager who would monitor their project page and respond directly to questions and concerns with correct information. Mr. Palumbo added that they had created an email address for another project where questions could be sent, and were then added to the project website with responses, along with Zoom public forums and regular online surveys to collect feedback.

Mr. Doherty asked Question #4.

Mr. Guyette responded by saying that ideally they would have the architectural firm estimate the project cost, and reconcile that with the project owner's estimation to help define the scope and come up with an appropriate cost that would align with the budget, and by doing that at each of the key design phases, they could test the numbers throughout the process to avoid mistakes during the planning stage.

Mr. Melaragni noted that Mr. Dalessio had covered the answer to Question #5 in his presentation, and asked if anyone would like to add to the information. Mr. Guyette responded that the team would look to be firm, but fair, on change orders to ensure that the General Contractor was not taking advantage of the project owners.

Mr. Caira asked Question #6.

Mr. Guyette shared an example of a project in North Adams, MA that ran behind schedule due to various issues. The firm stepped in to right the project, get it back on schedule and met the contract requirements. Mr. Palumbo responded by sharing some examples of hazmat issues, where they made sure they had the geotechnical surveyor on-site to help combat unfair and unreasonable change orders and track progress.

Mr. Holloway asked Question #7.

Mr. Guyette responded saying that they utilize a selection matrix, and that they would create an online survey to review rated criteria and options, allowing the committee to respond with what their preferred project process would be. The survey would provide visual results for the preferred solution, which would help to develop the preferred site selection, based on those results.

Mr. Melaragni asked Question #8

Mr. Palumbo responded by providing information about the process the firm used to identify the sites for the Hadley Senior Center, which was to be on the same lot as the Library, and Fire Substation. Their firm worked with the Library project team, the architects and civil engineer to get both projects approved by the planning board and to ensure that each project achieved

success. He added that while they own the project as the OPM, ultimately, all projects belong to the town they were working in, so it was important to them to make sure the community voices were heard.

Mr. Ruggiero asked Question #9.

Mr. Palumbo stated that they would work with the committee and, if there was one, with the designer selection subcommittee. He noted that they would begin the conversation and provide criteria used on past similar projects within the past decade, along with references from the same timeframe, as well as determine the different criteria points from the building committee to build the evaluation matrix.

Mr. Hooper asked Question #10, asking if there were any other issues that had not been discussed that the firm's team felt might be important to cover.

Mr. Guyette asked what the main concerns were with regard to the project.

Mr. Hooper commented that, since the project is a combined Town Hall and School Administration building, it would be important that it be functional and stand the test of time.

Mr. Melaragni added that it was important to him that the firm keep in mind that the Town Hall usually defines the Town Center.

Mr. Caira asked if the team they were speaking with would be the same team throughout the project, and that consistency was important to him. Mr. Guyette confirmed that continuity throughout the project was important and that, barring any circumstances out of his control, the core team would carry the project throughout.

Ms. Allen echoed Mr. Melaragni's comment, saying that they all wanted to see what was best for the Town and to leave something they could be proud of.

Mr. Hooper asked for any other input. Seeing none, he thanked the firm members and they departed the call at 8:35pm.

Mr. Hooper asked the committee members for additional comments before moving on to Public Comments. Mr. Caira commented that he hoped his request for the firm members to elaborate on their responses given during their previous interview for the Senior Center didn't appear rude. Mr. Hooper commented that his request had been reasonable and that he also liked Mr. Caira's question about the continuity of the team throughout the project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments

At the conclusion of the discussion, and there being no further business to come before the Committee, a motion was made by Mr. Doherty, seconded by Mr. Melaragni, and it was unanimously and by verbal roll call:

VOTED: That the Town Hall/School Administration Building Committee adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 8:37 pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Recording Secretary

