



MEDWAY EPFRAC MEETING
Medway High School (Guidance Area)
7:00 P.M.
Minutes
November 02, 2016

Committee Attendees: Dr. Richard D’Innocenzo, Ellen Hillery (FinCom Alternate), Mike Francis (Open Space), Paul Mahoney (CPC), Cathy Morgan (Friends of Choate Park), Mark Diebus, David Travalini (CONCOM), David Blackwell (CONCOM), Michael Schrader (FinCom).

Other Attendees: Allison Potter, Tom Holder

Committee Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

High School Baseball and Building Improvements-

Thomas Holder: Funds were repurposed at the last year town meeting for the high school baseball and building improvements. Proposal to build a storage facility (grounds maintenance and athletic equipment) will be part of the improvements project. Town is in negotiations with RAD and has an active contract with them. Intent is to perform this work through a change in work order. The estimate for the building improvements came out higher than anticipated. Portion of the proposed project is baseball field enhancements. The estimate for the baseball field improvements came out close to the estimate put together by Gale Associates. Town is comfortable to move forward with that change order. Work on baseball field needs to be done when the ground is not frozen. Mr. Holder stated that DPW intends to move forward with the baseball fields improvements and will take a closer look at the building improvements project. Idea is to get the baseball fields ready by spring. CPC funds will be used to fund this project and the validity of these funds don’t expire.

GALE Associates-

Michael D. Farias (LDD Collaborative), Sean T. Boyd (Lead Civil Engineer, Gale Associates), John M. Perry (Senior Civil Engineer, Gale Associates)-

- Small landscape architecture park planning firm. Staffed with 12 people and have 10 years of experience.
- Good history of working with Gale Associates.
- Gale Associates has more than 100 qualified professionals. They have vast experience in sports and recreation projects (tennis courts, tracks, Baseball, and Soft ball fields) and Synthetic turf consulting.
- LDD Collaborative accomplished over 100 award winning park projects across the globe including work in China. Lot of projects were done in Massachusetts and Rhode Island.
- Mr. Farias is committed to work with the town point of contact from the beginning to the end of the project. Mr. Boyd and Mr. Farias will attend all of the project related meetings

with the town. Mr. Farias will be the principal in- charge and lead park designer and Mr. Boyd will be the lead Civil Engineer.

- Idea is to build the project with universal design principles embedded.
- Sub-Consultant will be doing the survey work and landscaping.
- Mr. Perry will oversee the structural and wetland engineering components of the project.
- GALE Associates has past experience working with the Town of Medway.
- Mr. Boyd stated that universal design principles will be used to design the play equipment. Described the firm's experience working in Medway and their familiarity with the three existing sites. He reminded the members about their work at Medway High School.
- Mr. Farias explained LDD's role in the project they did for Wynn Resorts. He eluded to their firms experience dealing with Gaming Commission complexities. They did six park projects in the city of Everett. He briefly went over some park projects they have done in the past.
- Mr. Farias described the various steps that will take place during the design process.
 1. Step1: Communications
 2. Step2: Consensus Building
 3. Alternative Conceptual Design Internal Review
 4. Alternate Conceptual Design Public Review- Second public meeting.
 5. Step5: Preferred Conceptual Design Internal Review- Third Internal meeting. Dollar value of each alternative including operations cost will be determined. The preferred alternatives will be presented to the public.
 6. Step6: Third public meeting- review of preferred conceptual designs and costs.
- He went over few examples related to the design of multi-use recreation areas, splash pad & play structures based on age.
- He elaborated on each of the above steps. Initial meeting will identify the stake holders, and town point of contact will be established. Inside consensus will be sought before the ideas/ design is shared with outside entities. Usage of the current facilities will be reviewed. Input from the potential users will be sought. Methodology of alternative evaluation was described.
- Project budget and operational expenses will be evaluated as part of the design process.
- He talked about the aggressive schedule on project design but stated that LDD/ GALE will be able to complete the design within the time frame.
- Team will look into the programming needs before recommending the alternatives. Questionnaire will be different for different sites.
- Latest trends in Parks & Recreational facilities was discussed and described.
- Mr. Farias touched on the topic of construction administration & oversight experience. He stated that the project team will handle all site related construction activities.

Paul Mahoney- Stated that Medway does not need more fields. He said the potential consultant's responsibility will be to inform the Committee on workable options for each of these sites.

Mr. Schrader- Asked about ADA component in splash pad option,

Project team thanked the town and the Committee for giving them the opportunity to present and informed their commitment and excitement to work on the project.

After the team exited, Chair, Dr. Innocenzo asked the members how they wanted to proceed in finalizing the firm; rank them individually and do a tally of the numbers at the end or have an open discussion and reach a consensus.

Members agreed to evaluate the three presentations on the four questions and rank them. They discussed the size and capabilities of each of the firms that presented at the two EPFRAC meetings.

*****Evaluation Form is available at the bottom of the document. Member's evaluation/ranking and votes on each of the criteria is available on the next page.**

DRAFT

		LDD	CBA	CDM Smith
Category 1: Expertise of assigned staff, based on education, experience, and common shared experience of team members as a team. Preference will be given to firms with multi-disciplines.		4votes- ADVANTAGEOUS 3 votes- HIGHLY ADVANTAGEOUS	All votes- ADVANTAGEOUS	All votes- HIGHLY ADVANTAGEOUS
Category2: Direct experience of the firm in designing, permitting, and construction oversight of municipal parks and recreation projects.		All Votes- HIGHLY ADVANTAGEOUS	All Votes- HIGHLY ADVANTAGEOUS	All votes- HIGHLY ADVANTAGEOUS
Category3: Quality of previous similar projects based on references, awards, and other achievements.		All Votes- HIGHLY ADVANTAGEOUS	All Votes- ADVANTAGEOUS	All Votes- ADVANTAGEOUS
Category 4: Familiarity with the project site and project requirements.		3 votes- ADVANTAGEOUS	All Votes- HIGHLY ADVANTAGEOUS	All Votes- ADVANTAGEOUS
Category 5:		All Votes-	All Votes-	All Votes-

Interview/ Presentation		ADVANTAGEOUS	HIGHLY ADVANTAGEOUS	HIGHLY ADVANTAGEOUS
----------------------------	--	--------------	------------------------	------------------------

- Overall, LDD/GALE received 12, CBA- 13, 1and CDM Smith 13 votes. Members felt CBA's design was innovative. There was some general concern on the small staff size, and being able to adhere to the tight timeline. After further discussion on how the firms did on Interview/ Presentation questions, members selected CBA as the finalist for this project (CBA- 5votes, CDM Smith- 2votes, and LDD- 0). CDM Smith was ranked at two after CBA.
- To a question on bidding, Ms. Potter stated the project will be put out for bids and the lowest bidder will be awarded the project.
- It was agreed that Medway staff will take the lead on negotiations of fee.
- If needed, appropriate information could be shared with the press.

A motion was made Mr. Diebus to adjourn the meeting at 9:35 PM, seconded by Mr. Travalini. All were in favor.

Next EPFRAC meeting is on November 22, 2016

	References	Expertise of assigned staff, based on education, training, and experience and common shared experience of team members as a team. Preference will be given to firms with multi-disciplines.	Direct experience of the firm in the designing, permitting and construction oversight of municipal parks and recreation facility projects.	Quality of previous similar projects, based on references, awards and other achievements.
UNACCEPTABLE		Proposal fails to indicate a well-established firm/applicant with proximity and availability of staff with applicable expertise to complete the work. Limited to no shared team experience. No evidence of capacity to complete the project within Town's schedule.	Firm has fewer than five similar projects in the past ten years.	No positive references, awards or other achievements.
NOT ADVANTAGEOUS		Proposal fails to provide evidence of a well-established firm/applicant, with proximity or availability of staff with applicable expertise to complete the work. Limited shared team experience. Insufficient evidence of capacity to do the project within the Town's schedule.	Firm has between 5 and 7 similar projects in the past ten years.	One positive reference, award or other achievement.
ADVANTAGEOUS		Proposal provides a history of firm/applicant with proximity or availability of staff with applicable expertise to complete the work. Proposed team has some shared team experience. Proposal provides adequate evidence of capacity to complete the project within Town's schedule.	Firm has between 8 and 10 similar projects in the past ten years.	Two to three positive references, awards or other achievements.
HIGHLY ADVANTAGEOUS		Proposal provides a detailed history of the firm/applicant that indicates a well-established firm/applicant with proximity and availability of staff with appropriate expertise to complete the work. Proposed team has frequent shared team experience. Provides clear evidence that the firm/applicant has capacity to complete the project within the Town's schedule.	Firm has 12 or more similar projects in the past ten years.	Four or more positive references, awards or other achievements.
SCORE	(3, 2, 1, 0)	(3, 2, 1, 0)	(3, 2, 1, 0)	(3, 2, 1, 0)

--	--	--	--

HIGHLY ADVANTAGEOUS = 3

ADVANTAGEOUS = 2

NOT ADVANTAGEOUS = 1

UNACCEPTABLE = 0

DRAFT