

**Concord Middle School Building Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**August 8, 2019**

**PRESENT:** Susan Bates, Court Booth, Heather Bout, Justin Cameron, Frank Cannon, Dawn Guarriello, Kate Hanley, Laurie Hunter, Jon Harris, Pat Nelson, Charlie Parker, Chris Popov, Matthew Root, Jared Stanton, Russ Hughes

**ABSENT:** Timothy Hult

**OTHERS:**

**Call to Order**

Ms. Guarriello called the meeting to order at 7:43 AM in the Hearing Room at the Town House.

**Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Guarriello stated that she and Mr. Hult would review the draft minutes from 7/11/19 and Dr. Hunter stated that her office was working on the draft from the 7/25/19 meeting. Ms. Guarriello stated that they would approve both minutes at the next meeting.

**Review of Site Visits**

Ms. Guarriello stated that there were 2 site visits: Galvin Middle School in Wakefield and Beverly Middle School. Mr. Booth noted that the Galvin School has been in operation for 5 years and had experienced trouble with their footings. He also noted a default in the instructional approach: clustered and team based, as well as the importance of the furniture choices at each school. Mr. Booth stated that they liked Beverly's building more, due to the softness of the buildings, but noted that this drives the cost of the project up. Ms. Guarriello noted that the use of new materials in design is up and coming. Mr. Booth stated that their security measures weren't openly apparent.

Ms. Bout stated that there was an apparent difference between both schools in materials used, as well as finish, noting that Wakefield was more traditional and Beverly had more of a warm feel to it. She also noted the inviting design of trying to bring nature into the classroom. Mr. Booth stated that Beverly had no air conditioning, but used de-humidification. Ms. Guarriello questioned if the buildings were both very large and Mr. Cameron stated that they both felt very big. He stated that both buildings housed 5<sup>th</sup>- 8<sup>th</sup> grades and noted how they made last minute room changes. Mr. Booth stated that guidance and counseling were housed differently at each school and Mr. Cameron noted that the schools created project based rooms, but were unable to use them as planned. Ms. Guarriello noted the adjustment period that occurs with new spaces. Mr. Booth stated how valuable the visits were, noting that they produce a more critical way of thinking. Ms. Guarriello questioned the natural light and Mr. Hughes stated that the natural light was very impressive in both buildings. Mr. Cameron stated that the custodians can be very helpful in site visits since they have a lot of institutional knowledge. Dr. Hunter noted that they are working on making the photos they took accessible to the committee.

## **Future Site Visits**

Ms. Hanley questioned if it made sense to go on more site visits. Ms. Guarriello stated that they received an invitation to visit one of the Cambridge schools on August 23<sup>rd</sup>, and Ms. Hanley noted that she was one of the last people to make the list before it reached capacity. Dr. Hunter stated that the short list of visits included: Hanscom, Scituate, and Duxbury. Ms. Guarriello recommended visiting one of the schools designed by the appointed OPM, once decided upon. The committee agreed that late September visits would make sense. Mr. Booth stated that he felt it advantageous to not have students in attendance during visits.

## **Communications Update**

Ms. Guarriello shared a document titled “Working Structure Discussion Document”, outlining how the committee would function in relation to the subcommittees. The document reviewed the general responsibilities of the subcommittees, including: Management Team, Design Subcommittee, Sustainability Subcommittee, Educational Strategy Subcommittee, Finance Subcommittee and Communications Subcommittee. Ms. Guarriello also reviewed the potential assignments to each subcommittee. Mr. Root noted his concern about sustainability, design and educational strategy being compartmentalized and suggested folding the three groups into one. Ms. Bout suggested looking at them as a hybrid model where they occasionally meet together but remain freestanding entities in regards to workload. Ms. Guarriello stated that the intent is to be able to get into the weeds and bring options back to the bigger group, noting that the designer and OPM can interweave all of the information. Mr. Booth noted the increase in communication burden with specialized subgroups. Ms. Bates noted that the fact that the subcommittees will need to post meetings would give others interested the opportunity to attend.

Regarding communications, Dr. Hunter stated that the school based PR consultant, Tom Lucey, can draft a report summary of the meetings to distribute to the Journal and webpage, noting that the webpage will be just informational. She stated that they can look into linking emails for questions/comments as well as other mechanisms such as distribution lists. She noted that the subcommittee could meet on an as needed basis when they are ready for forums, etc. Mr. Booth noted that the community wants to be kept current. Ms. Bates noted that Erin Stevens should be included as well. Ms. Bout questioned if having liaisons may make more sense than a subcommittee and Ms. Nelson stated that the subcommittee would be for planning face to face with the community. Ms. Bout recommended calling it community relations instead of a communications subcommittee. Ms. Bates stated that Kaari Tari is very knowledgeable of open meeting bylaws. Dr. Hunter stated that she would bring a specific list of proposals for habitual, routine communications. Ms. Hanley questioned when/how the subcommittees would begin meeting and Ms. Guarriello stated that they need to first get an OPM and designer and work on when they need decisions made.

## **OPM Selection Process**

Mr. Stanton stated that they received 9 responses at the closing of the bid process on Monday, August 5<sup>th</sup>. He stated that the subcommittee met on Tuesday to review the responses and scored them as a group, noting that they narrowed them down to 6. Dr. Hunter stated that they felt the reference information should be brought before this committee to collectively decide who to bring forward for interviews. Ms. Guarriello questioned if they were going to refer to them by name and Dr. Hunter stated that they hadn't been using the names in public, noting that she recommended not using names until they are finalists on

the short list. Ms. Guarriello stated that they would speak to them in terms of numbers in the order in which they received their proposals and people in terms of roles.

Mr. Stanton reviewed Applicant #1, noting that he received 3 references, noting that he used the MSBA reference guidelines to score them. Mr. Stanton shared the 6 questions asked of the references, noting that the questions remained constant for all applicants.

The committee discussed how the actual people who interviewed may not be the ones who would end up working on the project. Mr. Booth noted hearing the difficulty in closing the projects during the site visits and Mr. Stanton stated that they would discuss this during the interviews with the candidates. Although Mr. Stanton received positive feedback on Applicant #1, Ms. Guarriello noted that she had received some negative feedback through business peers. The committee discussed that there may be variations on references, based on whether the reference comes from the school side or professional side of the OPM process. Ms. Guarriello reviewed what the information she had regarding Applicant #1.

Mr. Stanton reviewed Applicant #2 through #6, sharing the scores received from references as well as any other applicable information. Ms. Guarriello also shared any experience/information she had on each applicant. Mr. Stanton noted that he didn't call any references on Applicant #3 since he had worked with them, and shared his experiences with them.

Ms. Guarriello shared her overall scores on each applicant and Mr. Stanton stated that his biggest concern was load, but noted that all of the applicants had very good references. Dr. Hunter noted that Applicant #2 had some history of issues with swapping OPMs and Ms. Guarriello noted their responsiveness to problems. Mr. Booth questioned what contractual obligations the OPMs have to honor their commitments and Ms. Guarriello stated that the OPMs would have to have approval for major changes. Ms. Nelson noted the importance of whether or not the employees were contracted or staff employees. Ms. Guarriello stated that based on highest ratings, the scores from highest to lowest were: Applicant #2, Applicant #3, Applicant #6, Applicant #5, Applicant #4, and Applicant #1. The committee discussed how many applicants to interview, agreeing upon the top 5. Mr. Booth questioned if the rankings would follow the applicants through the interview process and Ms. Guarriello stated that the rankings determined who to bring in for interviews, but that they would have a clean slate after that.

A motion was made by Ms. Bout, seconded by Mr. Popov, to invite firms referred to as Applicants 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 in for interviews. Ms. Guarriello noted that the firms should come prepared to speak to: key personnel and commitment of key personnel. Mr. Stanton stated that the interviews would take place on Wednesday, August 14, 2019 with the OPM Subcommittee, which would then bring a finalist recommendation to the CMS Building Committee meeting the following day, August 15, 2019. The committee discussed the recording of the interviews and when it would be broadcast. The motion was unanimously approved.

### **Update on Design Selection Process**

Mr. Stanton stated that he has been looking into drafts of Design RFPs. He stated that the Design RFP is very different from the OPM RFP, noting that once an OPM is onboard, they would be able to help with the Design RFP.

**New Business**

Ms. Hanley stated that she hasn't been receiving all of the emails and wanted to ensure she is included in the email list.

**Questions and Comments**

Ms. Bout stated that she received an email from a citizen questioning trees on the site at Sanborn and ensuring existing trees are protected.

A motion was made by Ms. Bout, seconded by Mr. Booth, to adjourn and the meeting adjourned at 9:58 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Higgins  
Recording Secretary

Approved 9.19.19