Tisbury School Building Committee Town of Tisbury 51 Spring Street Vineyard Haven, MA 02568

AUG 2.9 2019 q: us My J. Hillery Conklin Tisbury Town Clerk

Meeting Minutes August 14, 2019

Emergency Services Facility, lower level conference room 215 Spring Street, Tisbury, MA

TSBC Members Present: Rachel Orr, Harold Chapdelaine, John Custer, Peter Gearhart, Rita Jeffers, Alice Robinson, Mike Watts

TSBC Members Participating Remotely: Reade Milne, *Jim Rogers

TSBC Members Absent: none

Others: Melissa Ogden, Emily Levett, Jay Grande, Paul Lazes, Natalie Krauthamer, Janet Packer, Angie Francis, Keith Fullin, Maria Metters, Rick Brew

* Late arrivals or early departures.

The Tisbury School Building Committee (TSBC) was called to order at 5:07 PM. (Recorder's note: discussions are summarized and re-grouped for clarity and brevity.)

Owner's Project Manager (OPM)

- Status report from Jay Grande, Town Administrator: Last day for questions is Friday, August 16; RFQ's are due by 2:00 PM on Wednesday, August 21. Three companies participated in the site visit on July 31, all of whom are very familiar with the building: P3, Daedalus and Atlantic Construction & Management. Thank you to Melissa Ogden, Associate Principal, for assisting with the site visit along with Mr. Grande, Marie Maciel, Tisbury Contract Specialist and Kirk Metell, Tisbury Facilities Manager. Mr. Grande would like a committee member to join himself and Mr. Metell on 8/21 at 2:00 PM at the Public Works office when the bids are time stamped and logged in, when they will be opened and reviewed for completeness. John Custer was suggested and agreed to participate. Rita Jeffers and Alice Robinson volunteered to also be present to provide administrative assistance in getting the digital information from each respondent to TSBC members, should it be necessary due town staff absences. Mr. Grande invited committee members to be present at the opening of bids, if they so desire. He also suggested that the committee consider contingencies if there are not three respondents.
- Review of rubric to be used for short-listing of candidates: Rachel Orr shared a spreadsheet prepared by Amy Tierney, MV Public School Business Administrator, that could be used to rank the respondents both when committee members are reviewing the submission packets and at the interviews. Ms Orr and Mrs. Robinson volunteered to update the form and make sure that the categories on the ranking form match the RFQ categories. Copies will be emailed to committee members as soon as possible. It was also suggested that committee members could check out the websites of the

companies who participated in the site visit and/or the respondents to identify projects that might be similar to Tisbury's project.

 After a discussion, the committee agreed that there is a need to organize and vet interview questions for the short-listed candidates. Mr. Custer shared that in the previous project's OPM interview process, all the interviewees made a presentation to the committee, and answered all the questions during their presentations.

Committee members should email their interview questions to Michael Watts, cc. Jay Grande, by Monday, August 19. Mr. Watts will collate the questions and Mr. Grande will vet them for legal appropriateness.

 Two areas of contract "must-haves" for the OPM were identified, above and beyond the company's technical skills. The first: clear and accessible communication with town voters, specifically an easily navigated and user-friendly website. The second: the ability to find alternative funding sources.

Approval of minutes of July 24, 2019 meeting:

Moved to approve by John Custer, seconded by Rita Jeffers.

8 Ayes (1 by remote participation), 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions

Approval of minutes of July 29, 2019 meeting:

Moved to approve by John Custer, seconded by Rita Jeffers
7 Ayes (1 by remote participation), 0 Nays, 1 Abstention (due to absence from 7/29/19 meeting)

Accessibility Survey

After a discussion, the committee agreed that the ADA Accessibility Survey report should be brought to the attention of the OPM after the firm is selected. It was further agreed that the report should be included in packets of background information for the Architect.

Architect Request for Proposals

(Jim Rogers joined the meeting through remote participation during this discussion)

Through discussion, the committee agreed that this TSBC is small enough that there is no need for a separate subcommittee to begin focusing on the details of the RFQ for the project architect. It is part of the OPM's job to assist the committee with the selection process, which John Custer said in his experience made the architect RFQ discussion much simpler than the OPM discussion. Committee members are encouraged to begin thinking about what particular skills and expertise we're seeking in an architect and to begin formulating questions for the architect interviews.

The lack of a firm project budget was once again discussed.

Harold Chapdelaine voiced concern about the potential cost of net-zero design. Others felt we should continue to have net-zero as a priority and noted that there are potential

grant opportunities to fund the green energy component of the project.

Tisbury School Committee (TSC) report from Michael Watts:

There was a joint meeting of the TSC and the Board of Selectmen (BOS) on Tuesday, 8/6/19.

There have been several meetings this summer concerning the current conditions in the building, including Monday, 8/12. Mr. Rogers verified that the BOS got an update at their 8/13 meeting. Testing for asbestos should be conducted on 8/15 or 8/16/19. Results should be presented within 5-10 business days. Lead testing will take place on approximately 8/20/19. Results should be available by Friday. All classrooms will be included in the evaluations and testing. Radon testing will not take place until the heat is on in the building this fall. Mr. Custer has been actively investigating alternatives should any of the testing require students and staff to be relocated for health and safety reasons. There is an awareness that any renovations must focus also on proper hazardous waste removal and disposal.

The Educational Program update is going on, which Mr. Custer is coordinating.

Mrs. Robinson asked if there had been any discussion about the TSBC's mission statement, which has yet to be formulated. Mr. Watts will bring that up at the next TSC meeting.

Topics not reasonably anticipated by the chair within 48 hours of the meeting.

A question was raised by Harold Chapdelaine about the possibility of hiring a grant writer with the OPM's help. It might require a separate contract that the town might undertake. Mr. Rogers suggested that the Board of Selectmen (perhaps in tandem with the TSC) approach the Martha's Vineyard Commission for assistance, since that is one of the MVC's stated functions. He will continue to bring that up at a BOS meetings, when more details are known as to the type of grant.

Several members referenced concerns that arose during the previous project and that there should be an effort to avoid any "surprises" such as occurred with the identification of the sewer system wicks after considerable project planning had already taken place. It was suggested that once the architect is hired, that a meeting with representatives from all appropriate town boards be arranged to make sure there are no town-wide obstacles with the new project.

Questions from the audience:

Q: Is it the plan of this committee to have a plan ready to present to Town Meeting in April?

A: That is the committee's ideal goal, but there is a realization that a project plan may not be ready by that time and a special town meeting, and therefore a special election, may need to be held.

Q: Is the only project being considered by this committee for a renovation and addition?

A: The committee is bound by Warrant Article 9 from the April 2019 Town Meeting for focusing the project as a renovation and addition. The mandate is not to explore other building projects but is for renovation and addition of the existing building. It is possible that the OPM, in their professional opinion, may recommend a different type of project, which might have the result of presenting that information to the BOS and TSC and perhaps, ultimately to Town Meeting.

<u>Motion to Adjourn</u> at 6:40 PM: made and seconded, unanimous vote (including 2 votes by remote participation.)

Next TSBC meeting: Friday, August 23, 2019, 5 PM, at a site to be determined. Agenda focus will be OPM finalist selection.

Attachments: OPM scoring spreadsheet

Minutes respectfully submitted by Alice Robinson.

Alice Robinson – Recording Secretary

Rachel Orr - TSBC Chair

Dute

Minutes approved by TSBC 8/28/19

Tisbury School RFQ Owner's Project Manager

As Reviewed by.

b) Satisfactory Working Relationships	eous 7-10 Points -6 Points us 1 Point Ainimum Criteria 0 Points	nance Ited Performance	Total Possible Company Name: Points
Highly Advantageous 4-5 Points Advantageous 2-3 Points Not Advantageous 1 Point Does Not Meet Minimum Criteria 0 Points 2) Knowledge of Codes and Regulations Advantageous 2-6 Points Not Advantageous 1 Point Does Not Meet Minimum Criteria 0 Points 3) Knowledge of Procurement Laws Highly Advantageous 4-5 Points Advantageous 2-3 Points Advantageous 2-3 Points Advantageous 4-5 Points Advantageous 4-6 Points Advantageous 4-6 Points Advantageous 4-7 Points	egulations segulations to Points to Points to Points	ationships O Points O Points Laws O Points	s deficients 10 Points 10 Points 10 Points 11 Laws 10 Points
egulations s t D Points t Laws	egulations segulations t Depoints t Laws t Depoints	o Points o Points o Points Laws D Points	o Points ationships o Points gulations Laws Depoints
egulations solutions t Doints	lationships 10 Points egulations s 10 Points t Laws	o Points O Points gulations Debints Laws	o Points ationships gulations O Points Laws
egulations s n 0 Points	egulations s O Points s O Points	o Points O Points gulations O Points	o Points O Points gulations O Points
of Points egulations	lationships 10 Points egulations	o Points ationships O Points igulations	o Points ationships 0 Points igulations
0 Points	lationships 0 Points	0 Points Points	o Points ationships
	ory Working Relationships	0 Points ationships	e 0 Points ationships

Tisbury School RFQ Owner's Project Manager

As Reviewed by_

Company Name:	Total Possible Points		
5) Key Personnel			
Highly Advantageous 7-10 Points Advantageous 2-6 Points Not Advantageous 1 Point Does Not Meet Minimum Criteria 0 Points	10		
6) Capacity and Skills			
Highly Advantageous 7-10 Points Advantageous 2-6 Points Not Advantageous 1 Point Does Not Meet Minimum Criteria 0 Points	10		
7) Current Workload			
Highly Advantageous 7-10 Points Advantageous 2-6 Points Not Advantageous 1 Point Does Not Meet Minimum Criteria 0 Points	10		
8) NE-CHPS and LEED-S			
Highly Advantageous 7-10 Points Advantageous 2-6 Points Not Advantageous 1 Point Does Not Meet Minimum Criteria 0 Points	10		
9) Life Cycle, Cost Estimating, Value Engineering			
Highly Advantageous 7-10 Points Advantageous 2-6 Points Not Advantageous 1 Point Does Not Meet Minimum Criteria 0 Points	10		

Tisbury School RFQ Owner's Project Manager

As Reviewed by__