

Attendance Roster

Board Members		
----------------------	--	--

Bill Harvey	Christian Carpenter	Randy Karg
-------------	---------------------	------------

Others		
---------------	--	--

Maurice Goulet	Nick Milano	Tracey Klenk
----------------	-------------	--------------

Environmental Partners Group:	Eric Kelley	Paul Millett
Woodard & Curran:	Renee Lanza	Scott Salvucci

Agenda

- Water treatment project review

Agreements

1. The Board agreed that additional, more frequent meetings are necessary to effectively manage oversight of the project.

New Action Items

#	Item	Responsible	Due
1.	Create a project schedule with all phases in GANTT chart format for the next meeting	EPG	Done
2.	Send EPG's proposal to R. Lanza	M. Goulet	Done
3.	Review EPG's proposal and provide a professional assessment of cost, scope and overall project schedule	R. Lanza	Done
4.	Provide a critique of the current contracting strategy whereby instrumentation and control engineering services are provided as an independent contract versus incorporating the I&C services as a subcontract to EPG's construction services contract.	R. Lanza	Done
5.	Review the OPM role with the Permanent Building Committee to get their guidance regarding our OPM critiquing work product delivered by the same company	B. Harvey	Done
6.	An action item was taken by W&C to review the proposal for completeness and deliver a control narrative for the facility.	Woodard & Curran	Done
7.	Schedule meeting for next week	B. Harvey	Done

Summary Notes

Meeting began: 14:05

Meeting concluded: 15:14

B. Harvey opened the meeting by making the following statement for remote meetings.

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting of the Medfield State Hospital Development Committee is being conducted via remote participation. No in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted, but every effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings as provided for in the Order. A reminder that persons who would like to listen to or view this meeting while in progress may do so by following the instructions on the agenda and meeting notice. This meeting is being recorded.

Water Treatment Project Review –

B. Harvey opened the meeting by stating the sole purpose is to review the water treatment plant project. The focus of the review is the professional services proposals submitted by Environmental Partners Group, EPG, and Woodard and Curran, WC.

C. Carpenter suggested that the results of preliminary archeological survey field work and the impact on the project schedule should also be reviewed. The issue was tabled. However, the discussion identified a need for an overall timetable for the project in all phases. The preconstruction archeological survey work duration is longer than anticipated and a change order for this work has been submitted by EPG to the Town. The impact of the extension on the overall project schedule has not been fully explored which raised the issue of who is currently fulfilling the project management role to assure that the project is completed on time and on budget. Discussion on this topic indicated that once the construction phase is entered, the Town Owner's Project Manager takes on this responsibility. EPG took an action item to create a project schedule in GANTT chart format for the next meeting.

R. Karg expressed concerns about the overall project duration and the cost of professional services proposed by EPG. P. Millett responded that the construction timeline is consistent with their experience with similar projects. B. Harvey stated his concern about the cost of EPG's proposal as well as coordinating the scope of work outlined in the EPG and W&C proposals. He prefers to use a 'turnkey' project with a single point of contact with the Town.

C. Carpenter was neutral on the price of the EPG proposal and shared concerns about coordinating the two separate contractors performing the work.

P. Millett explained the rationale for the staffing levels that are the basis for their construction services proposal. He also explained that W&C proposed I&C scope of work was used for budgeting purposes.

B. Harvey requested R. Lanza to conduct a review of EPG's construction phase engineering services proposal and provide her professional assessment of cost and scope in her role as the project Owners Project Manager. In addition to that assessment, he also requested that she provide a professional opinion of the relative merits of an alternative contracting strategy whereby the instrumentation and control engineering, I&C, services provided by W&C are incorporated as a subcontract into the scope of work managed by EPG.

The issue of whether or not it is advisable or prudent to ask R. Lanza to review and critique services provided by another department of her own company was discussed. M. Goulet stated that Town Counsel has approved this approach. C. Carpenter is comfortable with it also. P. Millett and S. Salvucci stated that this practice is not unusual and has not presented any obstacles to successful project implementations in their experience. B. Harvey took an action item to review this situation and gain guidance from members of the Permanent Building Committee.

Review of the I&C proposal raised questions regarding scope of work, the incorporation of equipment supplier provided automation systems and control narratives. The proposal has explicit equipment items and activities listed, and assumes that the control narrative and operational strategies are delivered by EPG. E. Kelley confirmed that control narratives that describe how the equipment will operate are included in Division 13 of the design package. An action item was taken by W&C to review the proposal for completeness and deliver a control narrative for the facility.

Motion to adjourn- Motion: C. Carpenter Second: B. Harvey Unanimous Roll Call