

DUXBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

School Building Committee Minutes

Thursday, September 3, 2026 – 4:00 PM

Location: Alden Elementary School Room 104

I. Call to Order

Action Required

The meeting was called to order at 3:38 PM by Chair Jon Lemieux.

Attendance and quorum requirements were reviewed.

Present: Christine Monaghan, Hutton Collin, Jon Lemieux, Josh Cutler, Barbara Bartlett, Katie St. Clair, Lisa Freeley, Matthew Roberts, Rene' Read, Rebecca Long, Laurel Deacon

Absent: Danielle Klingaman, Renè Read

The Committee Chair outlined the evening's format: a 20-minute presentation and 30-minute question-and-answer session with each of the three OPM finalist firms, followed by committee deliberation and a vote.

II. Public Comment

No public comment was offered.

III. OPM Interviews

A. Colliers – Mike Carroll, Derek Osterman, Cesar Collado, Suzanna Yeung, Charlie Kanouff

Presentation

- The team introduced themselves and went over their various experiences in architecture, public school construction, Earthwork, and general construction.

Project Understanding and Community Engagement

- The team discussed the Alden School's current enrollment
- The team emphasized open communication and community engagement, with a focus on making the community feel involved at every step of the project.
- The team shared its experience on comparable projects, including the Whitman Project, Killam Elementary School, Consentino Middle School, and Bartlett High School.

MSBA Process and Project Approach

- The team explained the MSBA process, detailing the first phase (Modules 2 through 5) and the importance of forming a project team, conducting the feasibility study, and funding the project.
- The team discussed the importance of understanding the educational plan, sustainability, and traffic, and of breaking the project into manageable pieces while involving stakeholders and the community.
- The team described its approach to site selection and the three options required by the MSBA: renovation, addition, and new construction.
- Susanna Young provided an example from a Reading elementary project, explaining the evaluation process and the importance of considering all options.

Value Engineering and Financial Responsibility

- The team discussed the importance of value engineering in reducing project costs while maintaining quality, including an example where a proprietary control system was specified at the request of the facilities team to avoid a learning curve.
- The team emphasized financial responsibility and the ability to manage projects within budget and on schedule, sharing examples of cost-effective projects and high-quality buildings delivered at reasonable cost.

Question-and-Answer Session

- In response to committee questions regarding criteria for a successful feasibility study and community trust, the team emphasized that the committee will be fully informed and involved in the decision-making process, and that the community will have access to summarized information.
- The team discussed holding meetings in different locations and using varied communication methods to reach a wider audience, and stressed transparency and building trust with the community.
- On risk management, the team discussed regular communication with the facilities team, constructability reviews, a detailed project schedule, and value engineering throughout the project.
- The team discussed the temporary nature of the modular classroom solution, noting it is not permanent despite some parents' misconceptions, and referenced a logistics meeting regarding removal of the temporary structures.

- On the owner's advocate role, the team discussed advising the owner even when recommendations are unpopular, including an example of advising a mayor to reconstruct a historic facade for cost and sentimental value, and course-correcting designers to keep them within the owner's objectives.
- On balancing educational priorities and budget constraints, the team provided examples including a technical school with expensive shops not justified by enrollment or participation, and value engineering an elementary school cafeteria to save costs while meeting educational requirements.
- On maintainable systems, the team emphasized simple interfaces for building automation controls, involving facility staff early in design, training them on systems, and avoiding systems that require specialized knowledge to operate.

B. LeftField - Jim Rogers, Andy Vo, Trevor Fuce, Justin Jones, John Bates, Adele Sands, Terence Connolly, Josh Brewster, Brendan Walsh

Presentation and Project Understanding

- The firm introduced its team and its relevant experience in public K-12 projects and public-authority/public-realm work.
- The team discussed the challenges of the Alden School site and the importance of keeping existing school operations running during construction.
- The team described the feasibility study process and community engagement, emphasizing thorough public outreach and transparency, and shared examples of successful community engagement events and presentations on other projects.
- The team proposed a feasibility study with a preliminary design plan by June 2027 and schematic design by fall 2027.

Question-and-Answer Session

- The team highlighted its in-house MEP specialty team, which provides comments at every phase of the design process, including practical design-review comments (e.g., identifying isolation loads and routing issues) and hands-on inspection of infrastructure above ceilings.
- The team emphasized engaging key facilities staff — plumbers, electricians, and directors — at proper milestones and startups, and including training hours in specifications to ensure appropriate training for facilities staff.

- The team discussed balancing system complexity and cost, citing a past project where a \$450,000 lighting control system was cut, and emphasized advising the owner on long-term costs to steer the design toward cost-effective solutions.
- On project risks, the team identified the risk of a light-touch renovation that does not solve educational programmatic goals, and the risk of taking school space out of service, including the use of modulars and the need for clear communication with the community.
- On community trust, the team emphasized unanimity of understanding among all stakeholders and described public communication as a team effort built through clear, concise public forums.
- The team assured the committee that the current project team will remain intact over the next five years.

C. PCA 360 - Thomas Kerwin, Brian Laroche, John Abbott, Alex Lioukas, Casey Hochheimer, Steve Parent

Presentation and Project Understanding

- The firm introduced its team and its approach as the owner's advocate and project manager.
- The team emphasized its extensive experience with MSBA projects and its cost-effective approach, including collaboration with architects and designers.
- The team discussed sustainable design, value engineering to balance educational priorities and budget constraints, and transparent community engagement.
- The team discussed the challenges of integrating historic protections into the project and the need for careful planning and stakeholder communication.

Question-and-Answer Session

- The team discussed managing the design process with regular cost estimates to keep the project on budget, and maintaining a robust project schedule.
- The team emphasized involving the facilities team in decisions and ensuring that systems are practical and maintainable, and keeping the public informed through the project website.
- On the owner's advocate role, the team discussed giving unpopular advice when necessary and pushing the designer and contractor to deliver better solutions on the owner's behalf.

IV. Deliberation and Vote

Action Required

- The committee deliberated on the three finalist firms, discussing each firm's technical expertise, community engagement, and long-term cost management:
 - **PCA 360** was noted for its cost-effective approach and collaboration with architects, and was commended for its experience and strong project management.
 - **LeftField** was praised for its in-house MEP team and detailed design reviews, and for its understanding of the community and the project's complexities.
 - **Colliers** was commended for its experience with small communities and clear project timelines.
- The committee discussed the importance of practical, maintainable systems, early design involvement, and thorough MEP expertise.
- Concerns were raised regarding one firm lead's public speaking skills and the need for a strong project director who can articulate the project's needs and address community concerns; the committee suggested checking references for firsthand feedback.
- The committee discussed the prescriptive nature of the MSBA process and the importance of documenting how evaluation results were derived, referencing the evaluation matrix.
- Committee members completed individual scoring sheets, and the results were averaged:
 - **PCA 360:** 3.65 (Rank 1)
 - **LeftField:** 2.9 (Rank 2)
 - **Colliers:** 2.45 (Rank 3)
- The committee agreed that a vote needed to be taken the same evening due to the MSBA submission deadline.
- **Motion to enter into cost negotiations with PCA 360 as the highest-ranked OPM respondent, subject to successful completion of reference checks; if negotiations with PCA 360 are unsuccessful, to enter into cost negotiations with LeftField as the second-ranked firm, subject to favorable reference checks.**

Motion: *Lisa Freeley*

Second: *Barbara Bartlett*

Motion passes 10-0 — no opposition.

- The committee agreed to conduct reference checks for PCA 360 prior to finalizing the OPM selection, in coordination with the MSBA OPM review panel process.
- The committee noted the applicability of M.G.L. Chapter 149 to the procurement and confirmed the next steps in the selection process.
- **Action items arising from this discussion:**
 - Enter cost negotiations with PCA 360 as the highest-ranked OPM respondent, subject to favorable reference checks.
 - Complete reference checks for PCA 360 before finalizing the OPM selection.
 - If PCA 360 negotiations are unsuccessful, enter cost negotiations with LeftField, subject to favorable reference checks.
 - Collect the committee's completed evaluations and submit the required OPM evaluation package to the MSBA.
 - Send the committee an email confirming the upcoming OPM review-panel dates and potential meeting dates, including October 15 and October 29.

VIII. Adjourn

Action Required

- Follow-up meetings were scheduled to complete reference checks and continue the selection process.
- The meeting was adjourned.
- **Motion to adjourn - 8:07 pm**

Motion: *Rebecca Long*

Second: *Lisa Freeley*

Motion passes *10-0*

Respectfully Submitted,

Christine Monaghan

Alden School Building Committee