

MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

DECEMBER 6, 2017

1. Bertram Field Phase 2 Renovations (RFQ #T-11) Designer Interviews

Attendance: Jenna Ide (JI), Ashley Green (AG), Mike Lutrzykowski (ML) attended all interviews. List of attendees for specific interviews are attached.

\odot 1:00-2:15 Beacon Architectural Associates (Beacon)

- Overview JI provided overview of agenda and process of selection moving forward. Stated that references were being called, and that the committee would make a recommendation to the Mayor. If the Mayor approved, then the City would request the price proposal and start negotiations. The timetable is slightly behind, and would be adjusted during contract negotiations.
- Introductions JI, ML, and AG introduced themselves and their role. Michael Sullivan (MS), Principal Architect from Beacon started introductions for his team:
 - Rick Campbell and Scott Henriques Weston and Sampson Structural, MEP, and Fire Protection
 - Pamela Welch Welch Surveyors
 - Matthew Zirolli Sherwood Consulting Civil
 - Dana Etherington RDK Engineers Sustainability
 - MS stated Richard Ryan and Jessica Houghton from Beacon who are on his team were unable to attend.
- Designer Presentation 30 minutes
 - Overview of company and subconsultants
 - MS from Beacon discussed their company and previous work examples. Beacon had handouts. They discussed how they choose their team and the importance of this project.
 - MS discussed the press box and addressing the accessibility issues
 - MS discussed the importance of a new facility for elevating the school's programs and spectator experience. Potential revenue from tournaments.
 - o Discussed concession planning and impact on project
 - Discussed plumbing variance
 - Discussed types of amenities buildings and cost implications
 - Discussed the entrance, importance of branding, gateway, half time, etc.
 - Highlights of project experience specific to this project
 - Beacon highlighted experience at Xavier School, Connell Memorial Rink in Weymouth, and Boston University Locker Facilities.
 - MS highlighted work of W&S on Danvers Highschool Athletic facility and pool facilities.



- Highlights of project approach specific to this project
 - Establish Maintenance Plan for existing new renovations
 - Confirm Program
 - Get variance early, site visits to local
 - Alternatives, areas to consider:
 - Accessibility, amenities
 - Schematics
- Specific Areas of Discussion Beacon highlighted:
 - Accessibility
 - Zero Net Energy/LEED approach Would work to make it ZNEB ready and where solar might be integrated in.
 - Operations and Maintenance
 - Code
- Q+A
 - ML asked if they were open to other options from the layout they proposed in feasibility.
 - MS responded that they think that is an important part, and that they will look at this with fresh eyes, and their subs are new to this.
 - AG asked about options for storm water
 - Matthew Zirolli from Sherwood discussed options for LID, but that the ledge does add some complexity.
 - JI asked for more about their approach to funding.
 - MS discussed architect as prime salesperson. The would support City and Boosters. RDK mentioned alternative funding for green energy.
 - JI asked about more information about approach to survey, specifically about the many different parcels. Pamela Welch (Welch & Assoc.) discussed approach, including very detailed systems. Might do aerial of all parcels, then hone in on areas where more information is needed.
 - ML asked about the importance of accessibility to this site.
 - \circ $\,$ MS responded that they included Deb Ryan so that this could be addressed more.
 - JI asked about potential for larger considerations for universal design, and Beacon's experience.
 - MS mentioned visual cues in signage, changing textures, and sound systems for those with disabilities.
 - ML asked what Beacon and the structural thought were they most challenging aspects of this project.
 - MS stated everything, that there were many challenges that need to be overcome.
 - W&S replied that there was nothing standing out as particularly difficult from a structural perspective.
 - Interview concluded at 2:15



Attendance Beacon:

12/6/17 Sinita DSC - Bertram Field Phase 2 Name Complosed E-mail Jenna I de City of Salern ; i degsalern, com RICK CAMPBELL Weston & Sampson campbell rewseinc.com Scott Henriques Westow & Sampson henriques So wserfice.com PAMELa Welch Welch Surveyors pwelch welchinc.com J. Michael B. EACOL! JHS Cheacon orch. corr MATIHEN ZIROLLI SHERWOOD CONSULTING Matte Osherwood.com Dana Etherington RDF Engineers detherington. OrdFongineerson Mussel LongKouski COS Ashley Green DPCD Richard Schefford Citizens rugsteacher@hotmail. Sohen Part & Rel Jee Condelarin



o 2:30-3:45 CBI Consulting, Inc. (CBI)

- JI provided overview of agenda and process of selection moving forward. Stated that references were being called, and that the committee would make a recommendation to the Mayor. If the Mayor approved, then the City would request the price proposal and start negotiations. The timetable is slightly behind, and would be adjusted during contract negotiations.
- Introductions JI, ML, and AG introduced themselves and their role. Michael Teller (MT), Principal Architect from CBI mentioned that they have Structural, Building Envelope, Accessibility in CBI. MT started introductions for his team:
 - \odot Steven Ventresca Nitsch Engineering, Civil and Survey
 - John Pierga BLW MEP
 - Bill Scanlon BLW
 - Andrea Willet CBI Project Manager
- Designer Presentation 30 minutes
 - o Overview of company and subconsultants
 - MT noted the CBI does many renovation projects, and specializes in the small to the large. CBI solves problems. They also do OPM work, and understand the owner's perspective.
 - \circ Highlights of project experience specific to this project
 - MT had boards and highlighted East Boston Stadium renovation and addition, Frasier Field in Lynn, Lawrence Veterans Stidum. They thought that Lawrence showed how you can redo an entrance.
 - \circ Highlights of project approach specific to this project
 - MT discussed how they looked at the site and decided to approach it differently than the previous architects. They looked at using the area under the bleachers, increasing the size of the entrance area, and consolidating program into one or two buildings. They discussed a "promenade" under the bleachers, or spaces to have concessions.
 - \circ Discussion of how you work as a team
 - CBI discussed kicking off with the City and starting with some key information and workshops. They highlighted the need for global workshops.
 - \odot Specific Areas of Discussion –CBI highlighted the following important considerations:
 - Zero Net Energy/LEED approach
 - SMMA presented the development of a whole building model, understanding the target energy use per kbtu, and then reducing that. They discussed confidence this could be zero net energy ready. They identified some areas for solar, including on top of new building or a parking deck, which they said might be too expensive. Mentioned potential for using PassiveHaus standards. CBI also mentioned that one building made it easier for insulation.



- MEP
 - BLW discussed low energy, LED lighting, heat pumps, VRFs. Biggest concern was ventilation. Possible energy recovery.
- Civil/Site
 - Nitsch discussed water and sewer and grading issues on the site.
 - Structural. CBI noted that they did not see any issues at this time, but did need to review the stands for structural for press box or other uses.
- Operations and Maintenance
- Q+A All 20 minutes
 - o ML asked about accessibility and how they would approach that.
 - MT responded about all of their work on public housing projects, and that is a major component of many of their projects
 - JI followed up concerning ideas for universal design. They discussed visual signage and other opportunities.
 - \circ AG asked about storm water, opportunities for LID.
 - Nitsch responded that it was an option, and that the only issue was ledge, but they could work around that.

• JI explained the issue of the multiple lots that make up this site, and how they would approach survey.

- Nitsch responded that they would conduct a detailed survey of the site. They added that a drone survey could be conducted of the other areas.
- \circ JI asked how they would approach the community process.
 - MT responded that they listen. Brought up an example in North Reading.
- ML asked about how they mentioned this could be integrated into Salem "placemaking".
 - Andrea from CBI expressed ideas about incorporating a "streetscape", the uniqueness of the site, colors, etc. that could give it identity.
- ML asked MT and the structural engineer, John Pierga, what were the most significant challenges they saw.
 - Pierga stated he did not think there was any significant challenges.
- Interview concluded at 3:45



Attendance CBI:

BI 12/6 SignIn , Bertran Field Phose Name (ompany Jenna Ide City of Salen Ashley, Glean City of Sakin inde Es · Longkauste C Citryin Kuhard Stafford Solen Parks Rec Se Condelaria Steven Ventresca Nitsch Gng sventrescale nitschong.com John Rierga BLW Engineers he jpiergae blwengineers.com MICHAEL TELLER CBI CONSULTING MTELLER @ CBICONSULTINGINC Bill Scanlon BLWEngineers, Inc. com bscanlon@Unengineers, Com Andrea Willet CBT

In addition, in response to an inquiry, Michael Teller confirmed the following were also in attendance, but did not sign in.

Wayne Lawson, CBI, wlawson@cbiconsultingllc.com Liz Galloway, SMMA, <u>egalloway@smma.com</u>

Prepared by JI

120 Washington Street, Salem, Massachusetts 01970 ♦ Tel: 978.619-5699 ♦ www.salem.com