

Pepperell Building Committee

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, August 17, 2021

1.0 Call to order

The meeting was called to Order by C. Lundeen at 4:01 pm via ‘Go to Meeting.’

2.0 Attendees

2.1 Present

Catherine Lundeen, David Scott, David Stairs, Andrew MacLean, Brian Borneman, Taya Dixon Mullane, David Querze, Joe LoBuono

Others: Bryan Jarvis, Bryan Fors, Jon Lemieux, (all Vertex)

2.2 Absent

none

3.0 Acceptance of Minutes

Approved minutes of 6/29/21. Motion by B. Borneman. Seconded by D. Stairs. Unanimously approved by the committee.

4.0 Action Items

A. Designer Selection Team Recommendations

C. Lundeen asked if there were any questions or comments by the selection committee. A. MacLean asked Vertex to explain the process. B. Jarvis noted they received multiple responses, and the selection committee short listed Tecton, Context, HKT. Interviews were held the Wednesday and Thursday of last week. Each team presented, then answered questions developed by the selection committee. The selection committee ranked the firms at end of each interview, and then recommended a firm. Vertex followed up with reference checks.

B. Fors – based on scoring by the selection committee, Tecton was ranked first, Context ranked second. Vertex contacted references provided, as well as representatives from other projects. All references provided high recommendations. Wilbraham gave an excellent reference. Dighton referenced one issue with mechanical systems but it involved a sub not included in Pepperell’s proposal. Lexington’s (not on reference list) facilities director said the management was well done. Wilbraham noted that you would never know the firm was

from out of state and never missed a meeting. B. Jarvis noted Vertex has worked on a project with them in West Natick and had a good experience. Overall take away from interview was they were also excellent presenters and enthusiastic about the project.

B. Borneman agreed with all statements, and noted it was a close decision for each firm. Tecton was ranked slightly higher than the other firm, and their presentation got deeper into the project before they were even awarded the project. Felt it as a better fit and referenced Wilbraham with their smaller community experience.

J. Lemieux - Vertex has worked with Tecton seven times, and twice with Context. Tecton's project manager explains projects well.

J. LoBuono indicated he viewed the interviews and agreed Tecton had good presentation ability and did their homework and seemed like a good fit. Noted Context was a close second.

D. Querze also reviewed both interviews, and arrived at the same conclusion. He appreciated the hypothetical proposals that they came up with for discussion.

D. Stairs noted he had Context ranked higher than Tecton, and appreciated their statements on site selection. He was not concerned with the travel from CT.

J. Lemieux noted that with new opportunities for virtual meetings, communications are very easy now. Next steps would be to ask for a cost proposal and then see if there is anything of concern. Can always go to #2 choice if an agreement cannot be reached, but is confident an agreement can be worked out.

A. MacLean recommend a vote for recommendation; then Jon and Andrew can start the fee negotiation.

A. Maclean moved to recommend entering into negotiations to hire Tecton for public safety project. If unsuccessful, then enter into negotiations with Context. B. Borneman seconded. Unanimously approved.

B. Messaging to the Public

Communication Plan- C. Lundeen asked how we notify the public of the status of the project. A. MacLean noted this should be at a public meeting, but would like to wait for a signed contract. Will engage with D. Scott to work on developing communications

J. Lemieux can begin conversations today on negotiations, and see a written fee proposal. This will probably take about week or week and a half.

A MacLean will give update to Select Board on Monday and ask for a separate meeting.

C. Lundeen – Thinks the firms suggested that Jersey Street was not a good site. J. Lemieux noted that this discussion will occur first, and then decide at a meeting if one site is preferred over another. Could ask for pros and cons of each site.

5.0 Next Meeting/Adjournment

Next Meeting: October 28, 2021 via 'Go to Meeting 6:30 pm.

B. Borneman motioned to adjourn. Seconded D. Stairs, and unanimously approved by the committee. Meeting adjourned at 4:26 pm.