

PHASE 1

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT EVALUATION

Prepared for:

Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board



January 9, 2014



RJSCB – PM EVALUATION

OUTLINE/TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Introduction
2. Interviews
3. Metrics
4. Commentary
5. Observations and Recommendations

B. INTERVIEWS

1. Individual Interview Summaries
2. Individual Score Sheets
3. Exhibit B – PM Performance Evaluation Matrix Summary

C. OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

D. APPENDIX

1. RJSCB Communication to Stakeholders
2. Interview Roster
3. Exhibit A – Issues Commentary
4. PM Evaluation Matrix
5. Selected Schools (#17, #50)
6. Project Highlights



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In August 2013, Bergmann Associates (BA) was retained by the Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board (RJSCB) to evaluate the performance of the Program Manager (PM) during Phase 1 of the Joint Schools Construction Project. The following report contains our findings. The scope of this evaluation is not intended to be comprehensive and was limited to providing a representative sampling of performance. The goal was to bring issues to light that would benefit from additional consideration as this project moves into succeeding phases.

In consultation with RJSCB representatives, we identified 34 PM scope/tasks include in the contract, examining their impact on Program success. We also identified a list of stakeholders that would be interviewed by BA staff.

Interviews

Prior to meeting with each stakeholder, we provided the list of scope/tasks we would be discussing (See Exhibit A- Issues Commentary). Interviews were organized in such a way that they allowed an initial conversational focus on issues each stakeholder felt strongest about. This was followed by a discussion more specifically focused on the 34 common scope/task items scheduled for evaluation. An outline summary of each interview is contained in the body of this report.

Metrics

At the conclusion of each interview (or in some cases systematically during the interview), stakeholders were asked to rate the PM's performance via a performance rating summary, giving a score related to each designated issue. A scale of "5" to "1" was utilized with score assigned as follows:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

The scores were tabulated and utilized to draw preliminary observations (see Exhibit B – Comprehensive Matrix). This matrix was partitioned by stakeholder group for further clarity. The following is an overview of PM performance satisfaction by group:

- **RJSCB:** Moderate → low.
- **PM:** High → very high.
- **City:** Very high.
- **RCSD:** Mixed: Moderate → very low.
- **Consultants/Contractors:** Mixed: High → very high.



Based on these overall results, PM scope/tasks exhibiting a significant level of consistency in terms of “need to improve” were identified. An average scope of 2.75 was selected as a threshold scope in focusing our observations and recommendations.

This resulted in 13 of the 34 PM scope/tasks being so designated. Observations related to these are listed in the “Observations and Recommendations” section below followed by recommendations as applicable.

Commentary

Before reviewing specific observations regarding PM performance, we believe it important to note several over-arching situations and circumstances that had a significant bearing on how stakeholders approached the evaluation process. These included:

- Unusual circumstances related to initiating the Program. A protracted delay in funding approvals and project start-up significantly affected project design and construction schedules.
- A major change in RCSD leadership resulted in the subsequent shifting of project design goals. This impacted philosophical direction, funding strategy, and design/construction schedule.
 - Several of the stakeholders interviewed thought that, while the new RCSD leadership appreciated the magnitude of the project, they were not acutely aware of the complexities residing in previous commitments to the Phase One projects. The previous administration focused on converting schools to a K-8 model. The new leadership changed direction, objecting to this model’s functionality and cost. It seems that the new RCSD leadership would also have preferred to focus on fewer buildings, completing them top to bottom. To a significant extent, the PM was put in the middle of these shifting expectations which complicated their ability to perform.
- A sense of disenfranchisement on the part of RCSD Facilities staff that significantly impacted their participation in the design/construction process.
 - The staff, having been responsible stewards of RCSD Facilities over a long span of time, had misgivings about having the Program administered by the Joint Board. It was apparent that RCSD Facilities staff would have wanted this to be much more of an infrastructure project, making the necessary upgrades to existing buildings to improve their status and function.

We found that these over-arching factors has a significant effect on stakeholder perception of PM performance (depending on whether those interviewed made allowances for these project circumstances). With some of the issues being discussed, those interviewed felt that the PM could have controlled these circumstances more effectively. In these cases the comments reflected this. In other cases, those interviewed made a judgment that these circumstances were beyond the PM’s control. In these instances, the evaluation was more favorable due to the PM’s ability to overcome these obstacles.



Observations and Recommendations

Independent Document Review

Observations:

- Independent review was not required by legislation; it was something the RJSCB valued and wanted performed.
- Due to a Variety of circumstances, this document review was delegated to the architects.
- For Phase 1A projects, the process was rushed.
- There was general agreement that the project did not see the intended benefit.

Recommendations:

- Provide language in the PM contract clarifying what is to be coordinated vs. actually performed (and by who). If possible specify what entity would be expected to perform delegated tasks.

Review of Construction Documents for Errors and Omissions

Observations:

- It was generally felt that the CMs are best suited to do these reviews. They are experienced at taking into account things like construction sequencing, phasing, scheduling and coordinating the work.
- While the PMs did not need to have 100% understanding of all the details there was a sense that the PMs should have had a firmer overall understanding of the project allowing them to participate more fully in the review.
- Several stakeholders put the PM's review of CD's for E/O into context, noting that this review was rushed. The CM did not come in early enough.

Recommendations:

- Clarify the expectation that the CMs will provide this service. Anticipate this in the overall consultant fee scope/budget.
- Accelerate selection of CMs to be closely linked with architect selection.
-



Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning

Observations:

- The PM delegated this almost entirely to the CMs. During Phase 1A, the RFP for commissioning occurred too late in the process. The CM and the Architect for each school project pulled the Commissioning Agent (CxA) into wherever they were in process. This occurred whether the project was in the design or halfway through construction. It was apparent that the design of the first four schools, was completed before the CxA's were hired.
- There was a general sense that having this be a part of the PM's scope, other than to monitor that it is being done, was not necessary.
- Different commissioning agents had different approaches, procedures, forms. CM's ended up taking on the coordination role.

Recommendations:

- Assign the Commissioning Agent at the beginning of the design process.
- Clarify in the PM contract that this service be delegated to the Architect and CM.
- Standardize commissioning agent expectations regarding approach and procedures.

Constructability Reviews

Observations:

- The actual review work associated with this task was fully delegated to the CM.
- The PM role was limited to coordinating the review and distributing of comments.
- There were different levels of responsiveness and quality from the CMs.
- There could have been a more unified front coming from the PM in communicating what is specifically required the CM and the associated staff expertise.

Recommendations:

- Specifically assign the CM's associated with each project to perform this task; contractually designated it as part of their scope of work.
- Require that this review be done as early as practical.

Standardization of Process

Observations:

- There was a general expectation that, since the PM had deep experience with this type of project, they should have brought their "process" with them. Instead, standard forms; standardized specs, etc. were slow to develop.
- RCSD Facilities staff spoke of their standards, but several of those interviewed found them to be incomplete and sometimes inconsistent.



- On several occasions RCSD Facilities Staff toured projects under construction and questioned why “non-standard” products are being used.
- The PM prepared the procurement RFP’s. They had to invent the process but once completed, it seemed to have served the Program well, with few modifications necessary and generating tight bids and well defined work scopes.

Recommendations:

- A comprehensive review of recognized Program protocols should be undertaken with the objective to create an easily referenceable resource.

Coordination with RCSD Internal Groups

Observations:

- Coordination with some District internal groups ended up happening at the building level with principals, teachers and staff. The PM coordinated this through the Building Advisory Committee. During this process coordination with RCSD facilities staff seems to have been sporadic and inconsistent.
- Security coordination has been good. The PM’s involvement in terms of placement and product has all gone well.
- Food Service – The changes to RCSD leadership resulted in design changes, which cost design time and increased cost associated with additional equipment. But overall this has gone well.
- Transportation – Coordination and review has been straightforward.
- RJSCB’s technology consultant worked closely with District staff in specifying new phones, electronics, sounds systems, etc.
- Teaching & Learning – This is occurring at the building level. The District made some decisions without letting others know and this created issues for the PM and the Architects.
- The PM’s management of the Building Advisory Committees has generally been found to be very effective. Some community groups have gone better than others.

Recommendations:

- Develop a mechanism for making sure decisions are being made globally at both the District and Joint Board level, not at the building level (in terms of needs, wants and desires).

Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website

Observations:

- There was little original clarity regarding what RJSCB’s expectations for this were.
- There was initially a web site set up early on, but it has not been substantively updated until recently. To date, it has not been used to manage the project, only as an informational site.



Recommendations:

- More thought should be given to this website for the next Phase. The project web page is currently maintained by RJSCB for Board operations. Possible uses include:
 - Resolve where W/MBE firms can go to learn about the project or where contractors could download lists of bidders, schedules, etc.
 - Resource for the Community inquiries.
 - PR initiative utilizing YouTube video or internal video where we have people interviewed about the project.
 - Project coordination via secure access.
 - Updates portraying overall Program progress.

Quality and Timeliness of RFP's

Observations:

- Several stakeholders noted that the PM could have been more proactive in forecasting workable timelines for issuing RFP's and awarding contracts.
- Much of the actual work associated with this task has been shifted to RJSCB staff. It was anticipated that they would draft the RFP's and then pass on to RJSCB to proof read.
- The "lessons learned" from previous RFPs were not consistently carried forward.
- The timeliness and process for writing RFP's needs improvement. Reviewing submission and awarding contracts has gone well.
- In general there is a sense that the results have been good, but the process to get there could have been smoother and more consistent.

Recommendations:

- Assign a single person to this responsibility.

Procedures Manual

Observations:

- A Project Procedures Manual was developed only recently. The PM understands that this task/activity was highly valued by RJSCB staff. It is unclear to many of the stakeholders how this is currently being utilized/implemented.

Recommendations:

- Undertake a general review of the existing procedures manual developed by the PM. Incorporate suggested improvements, by consensus, based on input from stakeholders.



Front End Specifications – Standardization and Consistency

Observations:

- There has been a lack of consistency in the standardization of front end specifications.
- Development of front end specs was characterized by many as a struggle involving lots of legal review.

Recommendations:

- The PM established a “front end specification committee” which the Architects and CMs participated in.

Project Closeout/Turnover

Observations:

- This process was taking place concurrent with the stakeholder interviews. At the time no manuals were ready to be submitted. It remains to be seen how this will play out. Because the projects are late, much of the base contract work is not yet complete.
- Separate punchlists were being prepared by the PM and RCSD Facilities staff. Given the time/schedule pressures, this has made the process less efficient and more costly.

Recommendations:

- Facilitate a better relationship between the PM and RCSD Facilities staff. One suggestion was for these two groups to meet once a week and walk the job together to form a common understanding.

Management of Construction Schedule/Turning Over Schools on Time

Observations:

- RJSCB staff did not learn until June/July that there were significant problems with the Charlotte project. Corrective measures were taken so that substantial completion was done, CofO paperwork signed and sent to SED and the school opened on time. However, there was a sense that these problems should have been recognized and dealt with much earlier.
- The primary goals of the project are: to finish the school projects on time; stay within budget and to do this safely

Recommendations:

- Establish more stringent guidelines for key management staff experience and skills.
- Evaluate the viability of project schedule assumptions.



Construction Document Review for Accuracy and Completeness

Observations:

- This seems to have been fully delegated to the CMs. There was an expectation that the independent review would catch a lot and the CMs would catch a lot. There was a sense that the PMs should have known the drawings as well as the CMs and this was not the case.

Recommendations:

- Clarify expectations regarding the level of document familiarity in the PM contract.

Incorporation of RCSD Standards into Specifications

Observations:

- Projects being complete have not strictly adhered to District standards.
- RCSD Facilities staff have 25+ years experience with the building stock. During the early design of the initial projects, RCSD Facilities were not consulted to the level they might have been.
- Stakeholders coordinated project review did not begin until some of the later designs. For these projects they did meet with Facilities throughout the Design Development Phase and CA Phase.
- There was a lot of contentiousness regarding the waiving of District standards in the interest of maintaining the project budget.

Recommendations:

- RCSD should review the procedures manual published by the PM for accuracy and completeness. The District should provide a specific set of standards for these projects that acknowledge the practical cost limitations of the overall schools modernization program. The recommended modifications should be reviewed by the PM and RJSCB followed by the incorporation of agreed changes.
- Establish a protocol for listing items that deviate from program standards and the reason for the deviation.
- There should have been much more communication and review and of the documents.



In addition to the specific issues designated via the scoring matrix, there were several others that we believed were worthy of comment.

Scope of PM Involvement:

Observations:

- Many tasks that were outlined in the PM RFP were delegated to others. There is a sense that this may have added additional unanticipated extra cost to the Program. It is apparent that there should be tighter controls on what is in the PM's scope and how this specifically impacts their fee. The PM pushed much of what might have been expected to be their work down to CMs.
- The Joint Schools Master Plan was completed as part of Phase 1.
- The number of tasks delegated to CM's, Architects, specialists (such as Move Managers, etc.) may reduce the PM role to more "coordinate what is in place" vs. "self-perform."

Recommendations:

- Consider how each PM scope/task item should be modified, in subsequent phases, to capture efficiencies and acknowledge changing needs.
- A reduction in scope matching actual involvement would be appropriate in future phases.

Insurance:

Observations:

- Very high coverage amounts driven down to subcontractor level. This decision came late, after project buy-outs. It became very burdensome in terms of enforcement and recordkeeping and ended up working in opposition. It apparently became impractical for some subcontractors to comply.

Recommendations:

- Reconsider insurance coverages in light of wide Program goals.

The ROAR Program:

Observations:

- There were 1000+ applicants. Approximately 400 were accepted and 200 graduated. Those graduating possessed skills but not those needed at the time, given project circumstances.
- One of the CMs wanted to use ROAR graduates to build out their offices on Clinton, but was told by PM that this could not be permitted due to an insurance issue.
- Compliance w/NYS Dept of Labor regulations was an issue.



Recommendations:

- Review potential changes to this Program, adjusting expectations in accordance with practical constraints and allowing greater placement of qualifying graduates.

MBE/WBE Goals:

Observations:

- Stakeholders indicated that the volume of projects and participation percentage exceeded local capacity. Some stakeholders noted that this does not actually help grow and nurture local small MBE/WBE businesses and may, to a certain extent, be destructive.
- COMIDA requirements limited resources to the immediate nine county area.

Recommendations:

- Review MBE/WBE goals based on Phase 1 experience. Adjust as necessary to reflect a workable balance.

Schedule:

Observations:

- Unrelenting schedule pressure affected Phase 1 projects in several respects.
- The project schedule did not adjust when major scope changes initiated by RCSD (K-8, AC, etc.). This resulted in projects being delivered “on time” but not completed to anticipated standards.
- Projects were so rushed that many important parts of the process were not adequately completed, or were compromised.

Recommendations:

- In succeeding phases, allow sufficient time for comprehensive and strategic scheduling.



PLA:

Observations:

- This was touted as success but several stakeholders noted shortcomings.
- The provisions contained in the PLA significantly limited available qualified bidders.
- One provision requiring that a second shift work at no extra charge ended up causing a significant schedule problem. Its result was that no contractors wanted to work a second shift because they would receive no premium.
- The PLA preserved the flexibility to have project construction issued as single prime contracts – but yet this was not taken advantage of in Phase 1.

Recommendations:

- Review the Phase 1 PLA based on Phase 1 experiences and Program goals and make adjustments accordingly.

Task Management:

Observations:

- Given the structured assumptions about division of responsibility, and how this was reflected in both legislation and policy, several key work scopes may not have been performed by those best suited to the task.

Recommendations:

- Make adjustments to the PM scope of work directing, specifically, who is expected to deliver key elements of the Program

Coordination vs. Execution:

Observations:

- There was a lack of clarity with regard to what the PM was responsible to make happen vs. do (with their own staff or with sub-contracted personnel).

Recommendations:

- Keeping in mind that the PM was hired for professional services (not construction), make very clear in the RFP for Phase 2 services what is being asked for and how any deviations will be measured/allowed.



RCSD:

Observations:

- The Phase 1 Program was significantly impacted by RCSD making large decisions/changes late in process (i.e., K-8, AC). Several stakeholders advised that the District needs to more fully understand their role in impacting Program cost.

Recommendations:

- Both RCSD Central Admin and PM should more closely consider RCSD Facilities advice and input regarding:
 - Decisions with a view to long term District interests.
 - Material/systems longevity.
 - Effect on operational costs.

SED Approvals:

Observations:

- Several stakeholders indicated that the PM did not exhibit the level of sophistication with NYSED funding mechanisms that RCSD and RJSCB management expected. This included the management of proposed construction scope with regard to maximum cost allowance (MCA) and incidentals.

Recommendations:

- With the completion of Phase 1, specific goal should be agreed upon and captured as a Basis for Design Strategy in future phases.

Conclusion:

Phase 1 of the RJSCB Program faces several unique challenges that affected the ability of the PM to meet stakeholder expectations. In the interest of improving the Program Manager performance, there are several areas that might be addressed as projects move into succeeding phases. We have highlighted those that were evident based on our evaluation methodology but others may be worthy of consideration. Some interviews contained interesting opinions that were beyond the scope of our work to pursue in detail. These, too, might be considered in more depth by RJSCB.



STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS - INTRODUCTION

Stakeholder interviews were conducted by Bergmann Associates staff and a meeting summary was drafted for each. The following individual meeting summaries paraphrase the key content of the interview, as judged by the interviewer.



EXHIBIT B
RJSCB Project Manager Performance Evaluation Matrix - SUMMARY

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Scope/Task Description	RATING																							AVG	*
	RJSCB				PROGRAM MANAGER				CITY			RCSD			CONSULTANTS/CONTRACTORS										
	Renauto	Gray	Abdella	Avg	Roger	DiPaola	Hermanson	Avg	Garwood	Johns-Price	Saxe	Avg	Keysa	Hansen Wheatcraft	Avg	Rebholz	Trott	Squires	Buckley	Bell	Rollins	Vargas	Avg		
Independent Document Review	2		3	2.50	1	4	3	2.67			3	3.00	2	2	2.00		2		1	3		2.00	2.36	x	
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	1		3	2.00	1	3		2.00				1	2	1.50		3		1	3		2.33	2.00	x		
Administration of the Bidding process	2	4	2	2.67	3	4		3.50		3.5	3.50	3	2.5	2.75		4	3	2	3	1	3	2.67	2.86		
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	3		3	3.00	4	5		4.50	4	4	3	3.67	3	3.5	3.25	3	4		2.5		2	2	2.70	3.29	
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	3		3	3.00	3	3	3	3.00				3	2	2.50	2			1		1		1.33	2.40	x	
Constructability Review	2		3	2.50	2	3	3	2.50		3		3	1	2.00				1	3			2.00	2.33	x	
Meetings and Coordination with SED	3.5		3	3.25	4	4	4.5	4.17			4	4.00		5	5.00	5	4		3			4.00	4.00		
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	2.5		3	2.75	2	3	3	2.67	3	4	4	3.67	2	2	2.00	2	2	3.5	2	3		2	2.42	2.69	x
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	1		3	2.00	3	3	2	2.67	2	2		2.00	1	1	1.00	3	2	3	2			2	2.40	2.14	x
Quality and timeliness of Direction	3		3	3.00	4	4	4	4.00	4	4	4	4.00	3	2	2.50	4	5	3	1	3	2.5	3.5	3.14	3.35	
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	3		3	3.00	4	4	3	3.67	4	4	3	3.67	1	2	1.50	3	4	2	2	3	2.5	3	2.79	2.97	
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	3		3	3.00	3	4	4	3.67	4	4	3.5	3.83	1	1	1.00			2		2	3.5	2.50	2.92		
Internal PM coordination	2		2	2.00	3	3	4	3.33		3	3.5	3.25		3	3.00	3		3	2	3		4	3.00	2.96	
Meeting Documentation	3		3	3.00	3	3	2	2.67	4	5	4	4.33	3	2	2.50	3		3	4	3	3	3.20	3.20		
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	2.5		3	2.75	4	3	3	3.33		3	3.5	3.25	3	3	3.00	2	3	3	1	2	2	3	2.29	2.75	x
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	2.5		3	2.75	4	3	4	3.67		4	3	3.50	3	2	2.50	2	4	2	2			2.50	2.96		
Implementation of a project procedures manual	1	2.5	2	1.83	3	4	4	3.67						2	2.00		3	3	1	3		1	2.20	2.46	x
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	2.5		2	2.25	3	3	4	3.33			3.5	3.50	2	2	2.00	2	3	3	2	2	2		2.33	2.57	x
Managing and tracking expenditures	2.5		4	3.25	3	4	4	3.67								2	3		2				2.33	3.06	
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	3		4	3.50	4	4	4	4.00	4	4	3.5	3.83	2	2	2.00	3	3		1		2	2	2.20	3.03	
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	3.2			3.20	3	3	3	3.00	2			2.00	3	2	2.50	3							3.00	2.78	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	3		3	3.00	4	3	4	3.67	4	3		3.50	1	2	1.50	3	4				3		3.33	3.08	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	3		4	3.50	3	3	4	3.33					3	2	2.50	4	3		3	3	1		2.80	3.00	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	2.5		2	2.25	3	4	3	3.33		3	3.5	3.25	3	1	2.00	4	3		2		4		3.25	2.92	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	3		3	3.00									2		2.00				1	1			1.00	2.00	x
Coordination of Construction Managers	3		3	3.00	3	3	3	3.00			3.5	3.50	3	2	2.50	3			2				2.50	2.85	
Management of construction schedule - turning over schools or time	2		3	2.50	2	3	4	3.00		4	3	3.50	3	1	2.00	3	3	3	1	2		1	2.17	2.53	x
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	2		3	2.50	1	3	3	2.33					1	1	1.00	3	3		1	2			2.25	2.09	x
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	2.5		3	2.75	4	3	3	3.33		3		3.00	1	2	1.50	3	4	2	1	3	2	3	2.57	2.63	x
Risk Management	2		3	2.50	3	4	4	3.67			4	4.00	2		2.00	3	3	3	2			3	2.80	3.00	
Monitoring contract compliance	2.5		4	3.25	3	4	4	3.67					3	2	2.50	4	3		2	3	2		2.80	3.04	
M/WBE compliance	2.5	4	3	3.17	4	3	4	3.67	4		3	3.50	3	2	2.50	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2.71	3.03	
PLA administration	3		3	3.00	4	3	4	3.67	4		4	4.00	3	2	2.50	3		3	2	3	3		2.80	3.14	
Workforce Diversity Goals	2	4	3	3.00	4	4	4	4.00		3	3	3.00		2	2.00	3		3	2	3	3		2.80	3.00	

Percentage of Scope/Task Descriptions Scoring 3.0 and above 41% 75% 82% 100% 93% 83% 94% 100% 62% 13% 78% 88% 87% 9% 73% 25% 61%

* Scores below 2.75 threshold

Interview w/ Tom Renauto

August 27, 2013

Interviewer: Jim Durfee

Overall Comments / Observations

- As the owner, I had envisioned this position to be a line of communication to the Board, bring issues and preparing for the Board meetings and periodically involved in projects where they have a high level questions. Instead, I'm involved on decisions which literally involves nuts and bolts and that has been frustrating to me. I do it because I want the project to be successful, but it has also become a crutch for Gilbane. It is helpful for me to know what is happening daily on the projects and, it's good to have this information, but the PM is constantly calling me for direction and a solution to questions. Gilbane should, instead, offer some of their own solutions and discuss it with me for final approval.

Definition of Responsibility

Independent Document Review

- There is some history to this. When we first were going through the design process for the Phase 1A schools and we were hiring the architects to design those projects, we had asked for their pricing for scope items that were required per contract, and additional scope items that we thought might be required. One of the questions was whether an independent document review would be required. My understanding was that this was to be part of the Gilbane Contract. I am not sure why this ended up being delegated to the architects. Gilbane has an independent document review group within their (wider) organization. There was a conflict of interest issue that counsel needed to address. There was concern regarding the limiting of Gilbane's work performance on the project. Ultimately, we talked to Counsel and they said the architects could not hire Gilbane to do the independent document review. They did not feel it would be appropriate due to the verbiage in the legislation. So, the architect's then went out and found other firms to do that service. We included that cost in the architect's contract. Independent review was not required by legislation; it was something the RJSCB wanted.
- On average it cost \$20-\$40,000 per project and if it picked up a couple of things, we were lucky. With the errors and omissions we've seen, that was not money well spent.
- For Phase 1A projects, the process was rushed. I don't know how many of the comments were incorporated into the final set. It wasn't as timely as it could have been; I don't know that we saw the intended benefit.



Review CD's for E/O

- The CD review process was delegated to the CMs. The CMs went through them for constructability and they identified about as many things as the actual independent document review did. I don't think there was enough time given for a full, in-depth review. It came down to the limited time we had for each of the different phases.
- The CMs are best suited to do the review. They are looking at things like construction sequencing, phasing, scheduling and coordinating the work. Certainly the CM had an interest in finding problems. I don't think the PM representative assigned to each job was really "in tune" enough with the documents to provide the same level of service.
- The PMs did not need to have 100% understanding of all the details. But, in terms of an overall understanding of the project, I would have liked to have seen the PMs know more about the project and participate more in the review.

Administer the Bidding Process

- This was mostly delegated to the CM and Architect. The PM was responsible for making sure that the Instructions to Bidders were ready and coordinated the pre-bid walk thru. But in terms of getting the documents together, getting them to print houses, writing front end, assigning scopes of work, all of those efforts were done by the CM in coordination with the Architect. This was ok but I would have liked more PM involvement with those groups in making sure everything is running smoothly. One of the issues we have had is that we didn't have a standard set of specifications. You learn from the first job, and you have addendums from that job. It carries over to the next and you learn from those. We did not see this kind of progressive refinement of the process. Some changes were made but not others. The bid documents should have been better coordinated. That clearly was the PM's role.
- There was no administrator of this kind of system. The PM had enough resources that they could have assigned someone to do this. I do not think this was a priority for them.
- There should have been a higher level of awareness to bidders on the projects. We have the PLA, the diversity goals, etc. Goals which require extra payments for Rochester careers in construction, for example. There were also requirements resulting from the PLA, such as tag a long provisions; having to pay dues on employees. There were a lot of things that were different from how a more standard project might be run. There wasn't a clear communication to the construction community regarding what would be required. For the first five schools, what was required on bid day wasn't absolutely clear. We were getting bids which had missing or incomplete documents. They either weren't told or didn't know what was required.
- We recently had to rebid a project because of the way the bids came in and other issues. We had to reject the bids and that cost us a lot of time. We also didn't have the kind of participation and competition we were expecting. Many construction firms and trades were not clear how to bid. As a result, they weren't as interested in bidding.



Plan and Coordinate Swing Space Logistics including Build Out, Moves and Occupancy

- We hired a move management consultant which worked well. Why this wasn't part of Gilbane's service I don't quite understand. RJSCB ended up hiring the consultant when we thought this should have been done (paid for) under the PM contract. The move manager's contract is close to \$1M – through the 2nd year of moves; that's significant.
- I think each of the PMs have worked with the move manager very well.

Swing Space Logistics

- The PM was responsible for the strategic designation of swing space, but they hired a move manager to coordinate and physically make it happen. The move manager probably has six people running these different moves, both in-house and field staff handling both ends of the move. The PMs staffing plan did not anticipate the volume of work associated with this key part of the effort. One of the reasons Gilbane was selected was for their experience in this regard. They just came off of a major school district program; they knew that swing space strategy drives this whole thing. We hired them for their expertise and then the staffing plan did not address these items that are necessary to run the project.

Assist With and Coordinate Building Commissioning

- The PM delegated this to the CMs. We did an RFP for commissioning and this occurred too late in the process. We hired local engineers as commissioning agents (CxA) and assigned them to the different school projects. In terms of schedule, the CM and the Architect for each school project pulled the CxA into wherever they were in process. This occurred whether the project was in the design or demo phase, or halfway through construction. We finished the design of the first four schools, before the CxA's were hired. In the future, we will need to assign the Commissioning Agent at the beginning.
- It is not necessary that this be a part of the PM's contract other than to monitor that it is being done.

Constructability Review

- This was delegated to the CM to get this done. The PM didn't physically do the review. The PM coordinated the review and distribution of comments.
- There were different levels of responsiveness and quality from the CMs. One firm had a very good estimating staff, but they weren't so strong in the constructability review and vice versa. We clearly saw the shortcomings of each CM as they ran their projects. We should have a more unified front coming from the PM in communicating what is specifically required and the associated staff expertise.



Standardization of Process

- I think that's been one of the shortcomings of this whole program. The expectations were that Gilbane had done this before. We hired them based on their experience, you'd expect they would have brought a process. Even after these first project, there still are no standard forms; standardized specs, furniture, colors, etc.
- The District told us that they had standards, but we found them to be sparse, incomplete, and inconsistent. So the PM has had to consistently go back to Facilities and ask "what do you buy for this and that?" The Architects do not seem to have been held accountable by the PM to follow the few standards that we do have. RCSD Facilities has toured projects under construction and questioned why "non-standard" products are being used. The PM should have managed that part of the project better, at least in enforcing the Districts standards.

Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.

Meetings and Coordination with SED

- SED is aware of the disproportionate size of this program, so I think they are willing to help out by expediting their reviews. Tom Roger has developed an effective relationship with Carl Thurnau at SED. And Pepin from Savin Engineers has worked with Carl for more than 10 years on NYC projects. The PM seemed to have established a very good relationship with SED. They were able to make certain agreements with SED that expedited the review process. The PM would sit and review projects with them throughout the design process, shortening the approval process. SED understood the projects and the strategy behind them throughout the process. From the completion of CD's, we've been experiencing about a 4-week approval process from SED, which typically can take months. With so many large projects starting every summer, it is particularly critical that the SED reviews be timely and well planned. That process has gone very well.
- The PM's coordination with the architects was effective. The PM's understood the timelines, when meetings with SED were critical, form submission deadlines, etc. for each particular project. This was all coordinated well in terms of budget and schedule.

Coordinate with District Internal Groups

- I think Central Office appreciates the magnitude of what we're doing, but the new personnel probably feels a disconnect from the current project. They also feel, in two major respects, that the project has taken a different course than what they would have selected. The previous administration focused on converting schools to a K-8 model. The new leadership does not want this. They don't think they function well, and cost too much to build. Conversions require science and technology, larger gyms, lockers, rooms, etc. as an example. It's also harder to staff K-8 schools. The new leadership at Central Office probably would have preferred to focus on fewer buildings, done them complete top to bottom, and spent all the money in those projects instead of "spreading the wealth." This is completely different thinking than previous. The PM is being put in the middle of that and it has been a struggle.



- The District, specifically the Facilities Group, did not like having the project taken from them and then run by the Joint Board. While the Facilities staff at RCSD has remained constant, Central office has completely turned over in the last two years, bringing in different thinking. Facilities wants this to be an infrastructure project and do things to make it a good and functional property. They would not tend to spend on neighborhood, or City components. They would also downplay what a principal or a teacher might want in their building.
- Coordination with District internal groups ended up happening at the building level with principals, teachers and staff. The PM coordinated this through the Building Advisory Committee. My sense is that coordination with RCSD facilities staff was sparse, sporadic, inconsistent, and incomplete. I think it's gotten better, but there's a sense of distrust and lack of communication with the PM in doing what Facilities believes to be the "right thing."
- Security coordination has been good. Upgrades to cameras and systems. The PM's involvement in terms of placement and product has all gone well.
- Food Service – RCSD has changed leadership and this has resulted in design changes. Changes had been made at some schools which cost design time and increased cost associated with additional equipment. But overall this has gone well.
- Transportation – Design have modified or added bus loops improving drop off and pick up. Coordination and review has been straightforward.
- IM&T – We have a technology consultant, Millennium Strategies, who works closely with District – new phones, electronics, sounds systems, etc. Upgrading every building in terms of technology – this is going well.
- Teaching & Learning – This is occurring at the building level. Going forward we need to make sure decisions are being made globally at the district level not at the building level in terms of needs, wants and desires. We need to involve the Zone Chiefs, with the PM and the Central Office. The District makes some decisions without letting others know and this creates issue for the PM and the Architects.
- The PMs management of the Building Advisory Committees have been very effective. Whenever you get a large group of people together with differing of opinions, and there's only so much money to go around, you are going to have some complications. Some community groups have gone better than others.

Establishing Dedicated Project Website

- There was initially a web site set up early on, but it wasn't until within the last 2 months that it's been updated with new information. I'm not sure what the original intent was. We could use it for public project updates or, if it was to be more broadly used, in coordinating the projects via secure access. To date, it certainly has not been used to manage the project, only as an informational site.
- More thought should be given to this website for the next Phase. The web page that is maintained is maintained by me and for Board operations. What we want to happen on the project website is perhaps a place with WMBEs can go to learn about the project, contractors list of bidders, schedules, etc. The website could be a resource the Community could look to for answers to their questions.



- In Phase 2 we might utilize a YouTube video or internal video where we have people interviewed about the project. We would like to see the program manager provide this as a service next time, to do more community relations on each of the projects.

Quality and Timeliness of Direction

- Each of the PMs has had a different approach to handling providing direction to project team members and stakeholders. Some come to me and want me to make decisions “soup to nuts”, others take it upon themselves and occasionally overstep their bounds. It would be better if there was an understanding of which issues should be handled directly vs. those requiring a higher authority for direction. School 17 started off poorly last year, because one of the PMs did not give clear and timely direction. The PM recognized this and made a change, which was good. However, the person who they assigned to the project had to split their time. Neither project got full attention. They’ve since hired a new person who took that responsibility back, but it took six months to do it. The PMs have a wide range of experiences and knowledge. The new person that they hired for #17 comes from a construction management background and that has been hugely important. My preference would be to have more CM experience in the PM role.

General Communications

- Overall communication has gone very well. The PM conducted bi-weekly project meetings with the CMs and Architects. Everyone is there and we talk about all the issues. We, of course, have individual project meetings through design and construction. We also have Owner, Architect, CM meetings on each specific project, and I attend those (cost, schedule etc). The District is involved and invited to every one of those meetings.
- One of the things that should be addressed is the tendency for the District to talk directly with the Architects without consulting the PM. Sometimes changes are made that Gilbane and I find out about through a second or third party.

Quantitative Evaluation of Project Issues and Costs

- There is a continual struggle between the Facilities “wants and needs” and the rest of the project “wants and needs”. I know that Facilities is not necessarily happy with what they’ve gotten.
- From the standpoint of designing the project that has a huge wish list; and managing who gets what, I think they’ve done a pretty good job with that. Not everyone is going to be happy. However, once the projects proceed, encountering those who want to change this and that, and I think they’ve struggled to push back and say “no”. I feel the project is continually jumping through hoops to make last minute changes and that’s hard to manage. You want to make the building user happy but you have a cost and schedule to maintain. It’s difficult to manage.



- The program has taken a lot of direction from the school principals, and when school leadership changes it's difficult.
- The PM has responded to items they think that are reasonable to finish and/or change at this late date. We're trying to keep the projects functional. When staffing changes it does make the project difficult. The PM has been doing the things they can while keeping the costs down.

Internal PM Coordination

- AT the outset of Phase 1, the PM conducted a standing internal meeting which then was discontinued for several months. Recently we have reengaged about project issues and coordination. I see a continuing theme where we "break new ground" on a certain project and this is not communicated to other school projects. They go through the same growing pains unnecessarily. There should be better communication between the projects; standardization of protocols would help. Details might be different, but protocols need to be the same.

Meeting Documentation

- The PM has documented the minutes for Phase 1 and 2 working groups. One comment about those meetings – I think there are too many items that are documented in the minutes that are inaccurate. I think it's because the person taking the minutes doesn't understand the context.
- For the individual project, this was delegated to the CMs and the Architects. The PM doesn't produce meeting minutes.
- It's ok that they delegated, but there should be a standard format for producing.

Issues Related to Standards and the Consistent Definition of Project Work Scope.

Quality and Timeliness of RFPs

- The PM has not been proactive in forecasting workable timelines.
- I've co-written almost every RFP that has gone out. My expectation would be, that the PM write it, they know the project requirements. Then it should be passed on to me to proof read. That hasn't been the case. I have hours and hours of meetings and revisions, constant revisions and corrections. The lessons learned from the last RFP never gets carried forward to the next one.
- The timeliness and process for writing them hasn't been great. Reviewing them and the awarding of them has gone OK. I've been involved in review process and negotiations, descopes and they've all gone pretty well.
- Suggested Improvement: Each RFP has been written by a different person, someone should have been specifically assigned to do them all.
- In general, the results have been good, but the process to get there could have been smoother, easier and more consistent.



Establishing and Holding Closely to Well-Defined Scope

- I would have liked to have had a better scope of work from the Architects in their RFP so that there weren't so many extras later.

Implementation of a Project Procedures Manual

- There is no manual in place.

Front End Specifications – Standardization and Consistency

- There has been a lack of consistency in the standardization of front end specifications.

Managing and Tracking Expenditures

- Evaluating expenditures as they specifically relate to the District comprehensive plan.
 - The PMs don't adequately understand their own budget. Tom Roger is the overriding controller of the original budget and the available contingency. He establishes different fund accounts for different items, (i.e. furniture, swing space).
 - The PM and the CM never really know if they are on track with budget. Tom Roger collects the information from each of the projects and plugs it in to a spreadsheet. The teams should know that information to manage the project better.
- Changes to the contract.
 - Changes to contract for construction. We've talked a little bit about that. The PM's relied on the CMs and the Architects to be the first line of defense. This is appropriate, but on occasion there have been issues with scope change requests.
- Report formatting and consistency.
 - Standardized forms and reports, would be nice to have.
- Value engineering.
 - There is an opportunity for the PM's to be more assertive in working through divisive issues that result from cost cutting.
- Monthly progress reports.
 - I very seldom get a copy from the CMs. The CMs do their report, then give it to the PM. I receive a one-page summary of the monthly report that the PM writes for each project. I think it would be better to receive both versions of the reporting. The District has requested those as well. I don't really know who is reviewing these documents for corrections/changes from Gilbane. Some of the budget categories do not make sense. It doesn't tell you how we're tracking against the budget.
- Establishing a master schedule and tracking it.
 - There was a schedule when I first started in 2011 that was being updated by one of the PMs. I don't think they've used it recently because now it's based on the individual project schedules.



- The master schedule should now be tracking other things besides when the projects starts and ends. It should include things like legislation for phase 2, RFPs for Phase 2, other events not related to construction, and overall milestones.

Issues that Relate to Budget and the Strategic Application of Funds

Managing and Tracking Overall Project and Schedule:

- We've learned a lot on the Phase 1A. These renovations have been very difficult in terms of the amount of unforeseen items we are finding. They're old buildings, maintenance has been good based on the limited budget that the District has had. There's a lot to fix and we're not able to touch everything that we can see, let alone all the unforeseen conditions. What really has happened is that we've taken projects that should be a 14 or 16 month project and we're forcing it into a 12 – 13 month schedule. On top of this, we have added millions of dollars worth of added work (reflecting unanticipated program shifts) that must be accomplished in that same time frame. So a project that is \$20M to start is \$23-25M by a year later due to unforeseen conditions, design changes, work claims from contractors, etc. We're not extending the date because the schools must open on time. No extensions. Charlotte, 17 and 50 were the first projects. School 50 went the best out of all three. I think it was managed as well as it could have been. The major obstacle there was that half way through the design of the project, the District added full air-conditioning to the project, so that was almost a \$2M change. We added a massive amount of work and still pulled it off. School 17 on the other hand, was the flip side of that; everything that could go wrong, did.
- We also had poor GC performance. Even though we had the same GC for Schools 50 and 17, we had different staff and the quality of the staff at School 17 was not up to par. The GC went through several staff changes. The PM also went through a staff change because of lack of direction and efficiency in terms of that person's capability and role on the project having not been fulfilled properly.
- The PM took someone from another project and added School 17 to their plate, which I think was probably excessive for that person to handle and it wasn't until roughly March that they brought on a new person and were able to redistribute the projects accordingly. I think that a couple of things happened as a result of that. School 17 suffered tremendously and in the end we achieved our Subt. Completion four weeks later than we should have. We're still seeing the costs associated with that through vendors and suppliers extras. We're still commissioning the building, we're not complete with base contract work, punchlists are 1,000+ of items, so I don't think School 17 went well. Additionally, that resulted in the Charlotte project suffering. The person who took over for School 17 was the Charlotte PM. They had to split their time, and eventually that person completed their transition over to School 17. The new person that Gilbane brought in took over Charlotte. So it was kind of a round robin of personnel.
- The original PM's performance at 17 started the spiral that was not recoverable. I think the person that covered for 17 and the person they hired to take over Charlotte were capable. If it wasn't for them, both the projects would have failed. Corrective action was taken, but this



created a huge issue for both projects. Both projects received their CofO, both projects as in use today, but the problems will go on for months as a result of what took place, and the related costs.

- Tom Roger is running School 50, the GC's performance there has been satisfactory. The CM, Pike Company, is the same on both 17 and 50. I think they did an extraordinary job on both projects.
- The person they hired to take over Charlotte, had a more of a CM background. He took things over as was completely in the work and tried to salvage as much as they could and coordinated the work. I think that the Architect and CM at Schools 17 and 50 were excellent. Charlotte needed help. We really needed the PM person to take that additional steps to do what had to be done, and they did.
- The GC at School 17 was not good at planning and coordinating with all trades. They changed the project manager and superintendent at least two times that I'm aware of before they finally settled on a team. The person they put on the job initially was not capable of handling the job, the skill set was not there. But the other side of that, that was a huge factor. The way that they chose to run the job was flawed. They essentially had the CFO running the job from behind the scenes. So even when they finally got the right team in place, that team was somewhat handcuffed from the main office. This didn't allow the team in the field to make timely decisions.
- I would recommend that we require a single dedicated PM to be in charge of each project. This would insure better focus and better attention to details on a daily basis. We should also look at the CMs staffing and how they proposed to manage multiple projects. In this first phase of projects we allowed the awarding of two schools to a CM. Each CM had addressed it different ways in terms of how they staffed it; whether it be a Sr PM with a regular PM, maybe one administrator for two projects. The volume of paperwork here is tremendous. One administrator could never handle two projects. We've seen the CMs add staff to process change orders and to push other things through. Having field supervision from the CMs at each project instead of having a person jumping between multiple schools would be an improvement. Engaging Facilities sooner and understanding what their needs are would be an improvement. What we're seeing now is, as the projects are finished, the Facilities personnel are walking through the halls and saying, "you didn't take care of this, or that", creating a long punch list. The response to that is going to be "that wasn't part of the design. We weren't going to replace that." So now we have to deal with additional scope items. I think if we have better communication with Facilities, so they understand what they're getting it will go a long way in the future.
- In terms of the overall project, it would be an improvement if there's a clearer understanding and definition of the timeline.

Pursuit of Alternate Funding Sources

- I don't know that actual community and business dollars have been pursued. We are going after things like NYSERDA funding and E-Rate grants for technology. In the first year we were declined for E-Rate, and we reapplied for the second year. We also have the Excel Aide that we're using. We have gained some real dollars from those to put towards the projects (Excel



was about \$16M). The Legislation is written such that we cannot go above \$325M, so the \$16M in additional funding comes off the \$325. So that minimizes the borrowing and minimizes the local share, but it's all within the \$325. It would be important to see if Phase 2 legislation would allow this.

- We reached out to both City Council and the Mayor's office when we were looking at projects, to see if they would help fund some of those projects through their sources. We were denied each time. City However, it should be noted that the City did put up the initial \$29M "seed funding" enabling us to start the project. The money was paid back when we received our bonds. But in terms of the City actually putting dollars in to a Rec Center or some adjacent to projects, we haven't seen that.
- We will need to continue to work with the Mayor's office to determine where there may be opportunities; we should coordinate our planning early.

Determining Aid/Eligibility – Minimizing Local Share

- To me, this has to do with how well the PM worked with the Architects and the Building Advisory Committee (BAC). Aid eligibility shifted with the design process. It's not until you submit your final reports and final designs to SED, that you understand what aid you will get for the project as it's designed. The architects are well aware of the calculations and formulas and try to maximize the aid where possible. The nature of some of the projects just did not lend themselves to aid eligibility. Where we changed schools to K-8 (from K-6), gyms and locker rooms, etc. needed to be added. The aid, in these cases, is much less than where you're changing or adding a classroom or a special-ed classroom. We're not seeing the 98% reimbursement that the District had hoped for because the projects do not lend themselves to aid criteria. The other thing is that the capitalized interest is not aidable, so that comes right off the top and that's worth 2 or 3% right there.
- What probably should have been done in the Phase 1 designs is to have determined a maximum cost allowance and to stay within that allowance when you design the project. That wasn't done for Phase 1 projects.
- As an example, take Schools 17 or 50, if you have a \$15M max. cost allowance and you have a \$20M project, the delta is currently the local share. With the previous leadership, the goal was to finish these elementary schools, so the max. cost allowance wasn't a hard target. In Phase 2, we've been very clearly told that the goal will be for each project to fit within the MCA. That's one way to minimize share. As a result, the high schools will require a second phase project. If the building needs \$50M worth of work and can only afford \$20 - \$25M in this phase (because of our cap), we'll probably come back with a Phase 2 project for another \$25M. But that Phase 2 project must fit within the new cap to be determined for the Phase 2 program and legislation.
- The way that the projects have gone is: we know what the local share cap is, we obviously want to stay under the cap, and anything we can do to keep the local share as small as possible we want to do that. But the projects have been designed over their MCAs, I don't know how exactly how or why these projects were designed millions of dollars over their MCA that was before my time.



- The original master plan showed how much MCA was available and it also showed how big of a project you needed given the work at a specific school. They don't necessarily align. I think the idea coming out of the original plan and when the schools were selected for this first phase was to get as many schools done as we can in one shot; Schools 17, 50 and all the elementary schools. We were not expecting to go back to those school later. In Phase 2 there will be some schools we will have to go back to because we want to stay focused on the MCA and we cannot do the whole project within that number.
- So back to the local share piece, I think the District is frustrated with the projected local share for Phase 1 because the previous Administration didn't see this as a priority. For some of the projects it came right down to, "do you want a new gym or not?" This is a choice the District had to make, not the PM. For Phase 2, there will be a very different strategy on how the projects will be handled.

Evaluation and Authorization of Change Orders

- This has to do with what can be done relative to the contingency for each project. The only thing the PM can do is to manage the contingency that they have now. To the extent that a project is over its MCA, every time we spend contingency dollars, its local share.
- The process has relied on the CMs and their management of the contractor's pricing. The Architect would do a design change or change bulletin, due to an unforeseen condition, for example, and this would result in a contractors' claim. But it really is the CMs responsibility to evaluate the contractor's pricing. I think Gilbane has been involved to a certain extent on professional service amendments, but maybe not so much on the construction change orders. I think once they get their numbers from the CMs they're relatively satisfied that the numbers are vetted. I don't think they are digging into the number. They tend to trust that the CM has done that.
- One of the things that will help in Phase 2 would be greater stability at the District. The new leadership has gotten involved now. Plans that had been previously pushed aside are now coming back to life because they fit with the new thinking.
- This scope of work has been delegated to the CM's from a contract review standpoint. The CM does 80-85% of the due diligence; then the PM looks it over and passes it on to me. Professional Services "extra" reviews have been mixed.

Issues Related to the Administration of CM's and Architect Responsibilities

Consistency of PM Coordination and Utilization of CM's

- There's no real consistent message to the CMs in terms of the overall program, vision, directive and process. When we first hired the CMs there was a lot of confusion in terms of what forms were to be filled out and what processes were to be followed. Each CM individually would come to me and ask me how they should do this or that. The PM should deal with this. They should determine the process. They did not start out well, but as things progressed, they did get more focused.



- There has been confusion on when to use CCD or COR (to get work going) versus a change order and who is authorized to sign the documents. I have authority to sign for certain dollars amounts for CCDs or COR, not change orders. But I still have change orders going to the Board with my name on them. Every month I'm crossing out my name and writing in the Board Chair. The PM should correct those things.
- I think there are certain PMs that have done an excellent job and have taken over and have filled in for the deficiencies of the CM. However, I think that other PMs have delegated so much that they are too distant from the projects.
- In pre-qualifying PM staff, I think they should come with a CM mentality. There's a gap between someone who has a PM background and someone who has CM background. If they had GC experience, that would be helpful as well.

Project Close-out/Turnover (O&Ms, As-Built Drawings)

- We are just getting to the start of this process now, getting ready to turn documents over to the District. The CMs have been collecting the warranties, O&M, etc. as they've been collecting the paperwork for the project, but we do not have right now, a manual or book that is ready for any of these projects to be turned over to the owner. We don't have any final as-builts yet. The assumption is that all of the field drawings, posted drawings will be turned over to the architects, so that they can turn over a hard copy and a CD at the end. It remains to be seen how this will play out. Because the projects are late, the base contract work is not yet complete. Punch lists are long. The District has yet to do their own punchlist. The problem is that you can't get your contractors back 2, 3 or 4 times. I don't think there's any reason why the District can't do a coordinated punch list with Gilbane. This is very difficult, inefficient, and costly. It isn't in the contractor's scope to do these kinds of multiple punchlists. This could impact the flow of aid, because it's all based on final cost reports and certificates of completion.
- In Phase 2, I hope there is a better relationship between the PM and Facilities. Perhaps they could meet once a week, walk the job together to form an understanding. When the District inspects the project at the end, they're expecting it to be 100% done. We know that they're not. But I would also say, at Schools 17 and 50, there was no reason why those buildings could not be walked through.

Coordination of Construction Managers

- I think the CMs and PMs have good relationships. They've worked very well together in managing these projects.

Management of Construction Schedule – Turning Over Schools on Time

- We found out that Charlotte was a problem in June or July and it was right at the end. We never heard that it was "off the rails" until it was way off. In the end, substantial completion was done, CofO paperwork signed and sent to SED and the school opened on time; that's the



primary goal. It was a dash to the finish and I don't think that it had to be that way. I think the better preplanning, coordination, and communication this could have been a much smoother project.

- Ultimately the primary goals of the project are: to finish the school projects on time; stay within budget and to do this safely. If we didn't turn over a school on time that would be a monumental failure. It's very important. If we were to go over \$325M, that would be a failure, that can't happen. If "Project A" goes way over budget and we have to cut scope out of "Project B", that's not great either.

Construction Document Review for Accuracy and Completeness

- This was delegated to the CMs. The hope was that the independent review would catch a lot and the CMs would catch a lot. The PM didn't really do a review and costs were expended to the project. They were responsible for this in their contract. I think the PMs should have known the drawings as well as the CMs and they didn't. In many cases the CMs were brought into the project during the design development phase, but the PMs had been there from the beginning.

Issues Related to Quality

Incorporating of RCSD Standards into Specifications

- I think the District does have standards; the Architect should follow them and the PM should hold them accountable. I know that there are projects being completed that have not adhered to District standards. I don't think the Architects and the PMs have been responsive to that.
- Tom Keysa has been here for 25+ years, he knows what he wants. During the early design of the first Phase 1A projects, Facilities were not consulted to the level they should have been. There should have been much more communication and review and of the documents. After I got here, that started to happen more frequently. It didn't solve all the problems, but at least they were engaged.
- The District should have a full set of standards on these projects. Either they should give it to us or the PM should develop it with their input. We are going to do 40 more buildings and we should not be guessing at what we should be putting in. They've got the startings of it at Facilities. I would like to see them finish it, or if they can't, the PM should engage them in helping to finish them
- The idea of a coordinate project review began to happen in some of the later designs. For these projects they did meet with Facilities throughout the Design Development Phase and CA Phase.
- I think we need to get to establish a list of items that deviate from our standards and the reason for the deviation.



Risk Management

- I don't think there has been enough attention paid to safety. We have had some projects with very few if any incidents. We've had other projects with double digit accidents. We've had other projects in between. I asked that the PM start to have a corporate safety person walk each of the projects and prepare an evaluation. In some cases, we actually have had the GC and the CM replace their field superintendents as a result of the number of accidents at each of their jobs.
- Essentially the way the program is set up in the specs, the PM puts in a representative safety plan with standards so that bidders understand the guidelines. In some cases the standard exceeds the OSHA standards. When the contractors are hired, they are required to submit their safety plan for the CM to review. Then their PM reviews the plans and approves or rejects. We now require that the primes who have more than 20 persons on site to have a full time safety rep. That was not enforced off the start. It took some time for those companies to actually put someone on site.
- We've also started enforcing drug tests and the review of drug cards. There is a related cost that needs to be clearly communicated to everyone bidding on the project. If we had done all this from the beginning that would have been easier.
- The project has very high expectations when it comes to insurance limits and the language in the policies. We ask for the primes to carry it and we ask for the same language and levels to be carried by the subs. We discovered that a lot of the firms being used as MWBEs could not afford this type of insurance coverage. (Sometimes the coverage costs more than their contract.) In these instances, it was not practical, so we reduced some of the limits for the subs. This eliminated about 90% of the problems.

Issues Related to Labor

M/WBE Compliance

- It is the Independent Compliance Officer's responsibility to track this. The PM really hasn't done anything in terms of tracking it. They're certainly interested and concerned if the goals aren't being met, but they left it up to Windell and his group to deal with the contractors.
- When we receive bids, the contractor comes in with their plan, their team goals. After the contract award, when firms come off the list, and it's up to the compliance officer to understand. "Why are you taking the firm off the list? How are you proposing to replace them and with what scope of work?" The ICO manages this. Where I think the PM should be more involved, is in monitoring and maintaining the diversity goals through the end of the job, based on the contract. In the end, even accounting for change orders, the goals must be met. We've had some big change order numbers and where it is possible to utilize MWBEs they should be. When I see a report from the ICO, and it shows a contractor is exceeding goals in their M and short in the W, the PM should try and help out.



- I don't think there's a lot of communication between them all, other than the pay reqs come with the updated diversity forms. The PM's accountant and the ICO make sure the paper work is in order and is coming in. In terms of how the goals are met or if are being met, the PM hasn't been involved in that.

Project Labor Agreement Administration

- The PLA and Workforce Goals are monitored by the Union (the majority of the workforce assigned to the project).
- The PM and I worked very closely with Union to develop the PLA. This resulted in a good PLA. We've learned a lot over the first year of construction in terms of what the PLA doesn't speak to. It's difficult to anticipate all issues that might come up. Our relationship with the Union is good. We meet monthly with them and work out issues as they come up.
- One of the parts that I'm disappointed with is the administration of the PLA. The PM is supposed to be the PLA Administrator. So a couple of items I have an issue with: First, I don't think the PMs have a working knowledge of the PLA; and, second, as a consequence, I don't think that the PLA has been properly communicated to the CMs and to the contractors, so that they understand it.
- Part of my concern is that they don't have staff people to manage these things and I'm afraid that if I don't manage it, it won't get taken care of. It has to be done. If we don't get workers paid, or if we have trouble between the trades, the consequences are unacceptable.
- I think if the PM had one person who was a PLA and compliance person, that would be "one stop shopping." They could then pull me in as needed.

Diversity Workforce Goals

- Similar to MWBE Compliance, this has fallen to the ICO to monitor, to track, and to raise the issues with the contractors. I think all the things we said about the MWBE and Gilbane process could apply to this as well.
- The original PM proposal included a consultant who was going to put on the workforce pre-apprentice training program. For whatever reason, it was only minimally included when their contract was signed, and by the time it came to hiring that firm to implement the program, the PM recommended that the Joint Board hire them directly. The PM ended up having no involvement in that process. It was me interfacing with the training folks and the Union to try and execute this Program. The PM provided safety equipment, rented chairs and tables, etc. But it was not to the level that was originally proposed to the Board.



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Thomas Renauto
August 27, 2013

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Jim Durfee	Date: 8/27/13	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	2	Not performed by Gilbane, Architects
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	1	Did not perform this function.
Administration of the Bidding process	2	Bid docs differed on each project, items not updated.
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	3	
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	3	Hired Cx's.
Constructability Review	2	Not performed by Gilbane, CMs.
Meetings and Coordination with SED	3.5	Well planned and timed.
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	2.5	1A. Did not go well, poor communication. 1B. Was better but seemed incomplete.
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	1	Started a web page – never updated, not used.
Quality and timeliness of Direction	3	Most PMs were engaged in their projects, but required alot of direction from E.D.



Interview w/Thomas Renauto

August 27, 2013

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	3	
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	3	
Internal PM coordination	2	
Meeting Documentation	3	
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	2.5	
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	2.5	Often pulled in directions from Facilities, Principals and others.
Implementation of a project procedures manual	1	Still have yet to see one.
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	2.5	See Bidding. Inconsistent from project to project.
Managing and tracking expenditures	2.5	PMs don't know what their budgets are, all by Tom Roger.
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	3	
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	3.2	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	3	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	3	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	2.5	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	3	Difficulty managing RCSD expectations of turnover.
Coordination of Construction Managers	3	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	2	
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	2	See IDC and E/O Review. Not performed by Gilbane.
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	2.5	
Risk Management	2	
Monitoring contract compliance	2.5	For primes this was monitored by the CM.
M/WBE compliance	2.5	For M/WBE this was monitored by the ICO.
PLA administration	3	Attended meetings, but most items went through E.D.
Workforce Diversity Goals	2	For M/WBE this was monitored by the ICO.



Interview w/ Tom Roger

September 16, 2013

Interviewer: Jim Durfee

Overall Comments / Observations

- The Phase 1 program was significantly impacted by a new School Board administration coming into power. Previously agreed upon direction and decisions were revisited and changed very late in the design process.
 - Previous superintendent strongly advocated K-8 schools (vs. elementary K-6, and middle schools 6-8). Incorporating older age groups triggered additional program and space requirements; was not as easy a fit with some buildings.
 - New Administration pushed for the addition of air conditioning in the modernized facilities greatly increasing the cost and complexity of the mechanical systems and generating significant additional construction coordination issues.
- There were a number of categories that Mr. Roger characterized as under-performing at first, but improving over the duration of this phase, including:
 - Internal District communication
 - Building Advisory Committees
 - Internal PM staff meetings
 - Procurement process
 - Project procedure manual
 - Front end specs
 - Documentation of District standards

Definition of Responsibility

- Gilbane originally thought they could provide Independent Document Review as an add service, as they had done in New Haven; RJSCB attorneys said no. Performed an overall review of documents utilizing RediCheck, but not an in depth review. Considers this step valuable.
 - Noted that the scale of the RJSCB program has the affect of saturating the local market for skilled design services, and yet those entities still had pressure on their design fees.
 - There appeared to be an over commitment from the limited number of local M/WBE design subconsultants. These subconsultants tried to staff up to meet obligations but were not always successful and this affected the quality of some of the documents.
- Bid processes went well; had 2-3 bids at least for all contracts. Administered diversity requirements at this phase; exceeded those goals (VII A)
- Swing space logistics were a huge challenge. Gilbane established a 10 year move plan; always anticipated hiring a move manager.



- Although commissioning was defined in the PM agreement, the district still needed to be encouraged to execute this work. Informed board members with a construction background assisted with this.
- Gilbane had similar issues with constructability reviews as with E/O review. The difficulty of working in existing buildings with limited ability to do destructive exploration during design (buildings occupied, hazardous material present) was also noted. Also, the schedule in Phase 1a had no float; could not be allowed to slip. This limited the ability to more thoroughly address this topic.

Communications and Coordination

- The program's working relationship with SED is excellent. Gilbane started review discussions early, and sought to have all milestone submissions go smoothly. The Program Manager acknowledges the benefit of RCSD having a good reputation and relationship with SED; the Modernization Program was able to utilize and build on that.
- Coordination and communication with District Internal Groups did not get off to a good start but improved over the course of Phase 1. In particular the program had difficulties accessing Teaching and Learning and then getting timely, firm programmatic decisions. This working relationship was improved by the current administration (COO).
- Having a highly-functioning Building Advisory Committee for each location is critical.
 - All stakeholders should be identified early in the process
 - Participants should be carefully selected, to ensure they are good contributors
- At times, the Facilities Department's strong objections on a topic (vetoes) were worked around by bringing issue up to the RJSCB, per advice and input from RJSCB Exec Director.
- There is no formal structure to communication at a high / Board level; RJSCB, City School Board, City Council, Superintendent, Mayor. To some extent the RJSCB *is* the means of communication through representation, but a more direct exchange could be beneficial.
- Use of a dedicated project website never reached full potential. Public awareness of project activity and project success could have been much greater. Websites not used for internal project communication; FTP sites used for project information exchange.
- The Program Manager understands the critical importance of reaching timely decisions on project scope, resulting in a clear project scope by end of schematic. The ability to reach these decisions and have them hold was impacted by changes in RCSD administration.
- The PM feels it did a good job providing quantitative evaluation of project issues and costs, particularly as it related to late direction regarding adding A/C which had a very large cost impact, affecting previously planned construction scope and changing the balance of local share costs.
- Weekly meetings were held:
 - With the PM Team
 - With the PM Staff
 - At the Architect / CM level



- Generally speaking the entity that organized a meeting had the responsibility to take meeting minutes.

Standards and Consistent Definition of Work Scope

- Gilbane prepared the procurement RFP's. They had to invent the process but once completed it served the program well, with few modifications necessary and generating tight bids and well defined work scopes.
- A Project Procedures manual was developed in the last six months. Gilbane understands this was a high value activity, and noted it was not a contractual obligation.
- Development of front end specs was characterized as a struggle; lots of legal review.

Budget and the Strategic Application of Funds

- Mr. Roger feels that Gilbane did an excellent job of tracking and accounting.
- Gilbane assisted with the pursuit of NYSERDA grants.
- In working to minimize the local share of costs, Gilbane supported the District's initiative to create a new project - District Wide Technology. Some scope from the Modernization Program was shifted to this project and a new 'bucket' of incidental costs was created. This resulted in significant savings to local share. The local share burden was impacted greatly (increased) by decisions made by district to add scope that was not aid-able by NYS; such as air conditioning, or program elements that was added as neighborhood enhancement.
- Change orders were thoroughly reviewed; there was some push back from some CM's.

Administration of CM's & Architects

- Difficult at first to corral 4 CM's each with own procedures and process. There was a need to define the program's process. The Program Manager was open to suggestions from CM's, but if agreed to, the suggestions became part of the program's standards common to all CM's
- Project close-out and turnover still going on; can't yet evaluate.
- While the PM had procedures in place for coordination of CM's, Mr. Roger acknowledged that there could be room for improvement.
- Gilbane observed inconsistent schedule performance by some CM's. In the future there may need to be a mechanism where the PM steps in and takes over scheduling if the CM gets behind and does not demonstrate progress on a recovery plan.



Quality

- District standards did not fully exist at start; Gilbane worked to develop, document, and host.
- There were issues of insurance and safety practices that were difficult to enforce at the subcontractor level. Gilbane had to bring on additional personnel to monitor this and improve performance.
- Gilbane was successful with writing contracts that outlined measurable deliverables.

Labor

- Gilbane has worked to encourage W/MBE participation; communicating with the compliance officers and implementing procedures to try to ensure that there are qualified W/MBE contractors that can perform the work. They have been meeting or exceeding goals but it has not been easy as the local labor market is not set up to fully support this program.
- The PLA has been working successfully; no major issues have come up that needed to be resolved.
- One of the major successes related to workforce diversity was the ROAR training program. Gilbane suggested and got the RJSCB to support it.



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Thomas Roger
September 16, 2013

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Jim Durfee	Date: 9/16/13	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	1	
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	1	
Administration of the Bidding process	3	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	4	
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	3	
Constructability Review	2	
Meetings and Coordination with SED	4	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	2	
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	3	
Quality and timeliness of Direction	4	
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	4	



Interview w/Thomas Roger

September 16, 2013

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	4	
Internal PM coordination	3	
Meeting Documentation	3	
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	4	
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	4	
Implementation of a project procedures manual	3	
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	3	
Managing and tracking expenditures	3	
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	4	
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	3	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	4	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	3	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	3	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	N/A	
Coordination of Construction Managers	3	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	2	
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	1	
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	4	
Risk Management	3	
Monitoring contract compliance	3	
M/WBE compliance	4	
PLA administration	4	
Workforce Diversity Goals	4	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\04 Roger_Score Sheet_09-16-13.docx



Interview w/Bob DiPaola (Gilbane)

November 21, 2013

Interviewer: Jim Durfee

Overall Comments / Observations

- We are constantly looking for ways to improve our processes and management strategies. We have a program to survey client feedback which we have already utilized here.
- Moving from Phase 1A to 1B we re-wrote the definition and scope of CM services. Phase 1A was too passive.
- We conducted weekly staff meetings where we worked on improvements and communication of “lessons learned.”
- It was a challenge working with the District Facilities staff. There was adversarial and it set a tone for the project work environment.

Definition of Responsibility

- Independent document review responsibilities were delegated to the architects per their contract scope.
- Review of CD’s for E/O was delegated to the CM’s per their contract scope. They provided a written report with issues for follow up.

Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.

- Our PMs had a great relationship with SED.
- Changes in personnel were handled well.
- Building Advisory Committee meetings were well managed.
- There was a “built in conflict” with the District Facilities Group.
- The Program website was used for bidding/notification/etc. It was primarily used by bidders and contractors.
- The late addition of A.C. to Schools 17 and 50 caused complications and schedule pressures that were very well managed under the circumstances.
- The monthly reports we issued provided a very good and useful communication tool.
- Community outreach via Town Halls and Building Advisory Committees was effective.
- We conduct bi-weekly meetings with City and District Facilities staff.



- We monitored the budget. The CM quantified costs.
- Our internal coordination is now improving. We have weekly staff meetings (Gilbane & Savin) with Tom Renault.
- Meeting document needs improvement (quality & timeliness).

Issues Related to Standards and the Consistent Definition of Project Work Scope.

- Once the procedures manual was established, it was very useful.
- Early on the front end specifications were not great. We have worked with Peter Abdella to improve this but this still needs more work.

Issues that Relate to Budget and the Strategic Application of Funds

- We were very effective at tracking schedule and budget. At East High we reduced the schedule 26 mos to 15 mos and saved \$3.5M.
- The specs contain rigorous closeout requirements. These are too tough and impede schedule. This needs to be more practical and orderly.
- There was a significant disconnect between the Master Plan and Program elements introduced by the new District leadership.
- For change orders, we relied on the CMs, but still evaluated them at a high level.

Issues Related to the Administration of CM's and Architect Responsibilities

- We worked with the CMs and reviewed the quality of their work. We coached them to a higher level of performance.
- We need to rewrite the CM scope globally to enforce greater standardization and consistency.
- Our management of the construction schedule is improving. The project deliverables are more stringent regarding scheduling.
- We relied on the CMs for CD review (accuracy and completeness).



Issues Related to Quality

- There was a lot of contentiousness regarding the waiving of District standards in the interest of maintaining the project budget.
- For job safety the CMs were responsible for due diligence while the PMs checked on this.



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Bob DiPaola – Gilbane
November 21, 2013

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Jim Durfee	Date: 11/21/13	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	4	
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	3	
Administration of the Bidding process	4	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	5	
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	3	
Constructability Review		
Meetings and Coordination with SED	4	Great relationship with SED
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	3	Conflict with District Facilities dealt with well.
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	3	
Quality and timeliness of Direction	4	Late addition of A.C. to Schools 17 and 50; managed well
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	4	



Interview w/Bob DiPaola – Gilbane

November 21, 2013

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	4	
Internal PM coordination	3	
Meeting Documentation	3	
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	3	
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	3	
Implementation of a project procedures manual	4	
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	3	
Managing and tracking expenditures	4	
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	4	
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	3	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	3	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	3	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	4	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)		
Coordination of Construction Managers	3	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	3	
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	3	
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	3	
Risk Management	4	
Monitoring contract compliance	4	
M/WBE compliance	3	
PLA administration	3	
Workforce Diversity Goals	N/A	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\DiPaola_Score Sheet_11_21_13.docx



Interview w/Steve Rebholz and Michael Kuz (SWBR)

November 26, 2013

Interviewer: Jim Durfee

Overall Comments / Observations

- Tom Roger is very capable.
- School 17 had problems with the PM initially assigned. Claude Watt was a nice guy but not very capable. Wayne Hermanson is a nice guy and very capable.
- \$325M is spread over 13 buildings and is unsustainable from a building aid standpoint.
- SWBR advised, early on, that the School 17 project (as designed at SD) was over budget. The PM using “cost advisor” refuted this. Eventually the project was proven to be over budget. This became a big problem. Over budget = local share expenditure.
- The PM’s most valuable attribute was their ability to “read the landscape” and keep things moving forward.
- The PM could improve by doing a better job of selecting staff.

Definition of Responsibility

- The PM did not perform an Independent Document Review (IDR). The A/E Agreement 2.4.2 identifies the IDR as a “reimbursable expense.” Gilbane approached SWBR to offer IDR services as a sub-consultant. We obtained a quote from Gilbane and submitted it in an amendment request. This amendment request was denied based on RJSCB/attorney interpretation that Gilbane should not be a sub-consultant to the A/E’s. SWBR obtained a second quote from “Redi-Check” and these services were done as an amendment to the A/E Agreement.
- The PM did not perform a quality assurance review (review of CD’s for E/O). The PM delegated this to the IDR as a reimbursable expense to the A/E and to the CM.
- In terms of administering the bidding process, the bid documents were issued through CM/Dataflow. All bid questions were submitted electronically and forwarded to Tom Renauto and the CM and A/E. I’m not sure how much the PM was involved in this. The CM ran the bid opening.
- The PM did high level planning and delegated the space planning and move logistics. RCSD identified swing space candidates and each A/E did swing space planning for the swing space building identified. SWBR did SD’s and CD’s for Hart Street and then for Jefferson. Move Manager (Vargas) did detailed move logistical planning.



- Commissioning agent brought on board late (after construction contract award). Different commissioning agents had different approaches, procedures, forms. CM's ended up taking on the coordination role.
- The constructability review was delegated to the CM. For School 17, this happened very late in the CD process. School #50 was just ahead of School #17 with same CM. Our estimate and constructability review was late in process. The CM's constructability comments were received just before the project went out for bid.

Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.

- Meetings and Coordination with SED were handle very skillfully.
- Coordination with District internal groups was uneven due to a poor relationship with District Facilities staff. The PM's efforts were apparent but the results were not.
- The PM was clear and accountable in how they handles quality and timeliness of direction.

Issues Related to Standards and the Consistent Definition of Project Work Scope.

- Quality and timeliness of RFPs needs improvement. RFPs were often late. The separate food service consultant performed well.
- The PM had some difficulty holding to a well-defined scope. It is possible that most of the shifts in scope were out of their control, but this was a problem for the project. The addition of a gymnasium to the project is an example of this.
- Managing and tracking expenditures needs improvement. The CM performed well. Much of this was delegated to the CM. Changes in allocations were not communicated and updates to the overall project budget were not consistent (big picture unclear).

Issues that Relate to Budget and the Strategic Application of Funds

- Pursuit of alternate funding sources: The PM secured added funds through District-wide technology which was very beneficial.
- Additional funding through EPC grants should not be pursued in the future. They take too much time and energy for the amount awarded.



Issues Related to the Administration of CM's and Architect Responsibilities

- Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time – projects are premised on unrealistic timeframes. Recommend different strategy.



Performance Rating Summary

Interview w/Steve Rebholz and Michael Kuz (SWBR)

November 26, 2013

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Jim Durfee	Date: 11/26/13	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	N/A	
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	N/A	
Administration of the Bidding process	N/A	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	3	
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	2	
Constructability Review	N/A	
Meetings and Coordination with SED	5	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	2	Dysfunctional relationship with Facilities staff
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	3	
Quality and timeliness of Direction	4	
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	3	



Interview w/Steve Rebholz and Michael Kuz (SWBR)

November 26, 2013

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs		
Internal PM coordination	3	
Meeting Documentation	3	
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	2	
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	2	
Implementation of a project procedures manual	N/A	
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	2	
Managing and tracking expenditures	2	
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	3	
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	3	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	3	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	4	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	4	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)		
Coordination of Construction Managers	3	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	3	
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	3	
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	3	
Risk Management	3	
Monitoring contract compliance	4	
M/WBE compliance	3	
PLA administration	3	
Workforce Diversity Goals	3	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\08 Rebholz and Kuz_Score Sheet_11_26_13.docx



Interview w/Wayne Hermanson

November 25, 2013

Interviewer: Jim Durfee

Overall Comments / Observations

- Communications need to improve; currently they are in silos.
- RCSD Facilities staff did not have the ear of Central Office; inconsistent messages.
- Wayne came “late” to the project after it had been going for a year.
- Communication with RCSD has improved now that Mike Schmidt is the designated point of contact.
- RCSD Facilities demonstrates consistent friction with PM.
- The PM brought a wealth of experience; systems and practices that were proven but they were not allowed to use them.
- PM was not allowed to self-perform any work which took a significant management tool away.

Definition of Responsibility

- Independent Document Review was delegated to the architects to sub-contract.
- The Review of CD's for E/O should be put into context. This review was rushed. The CM did not come in early enough.
- The Building Commissioning Agent should have been hired up front.
- We hired the CM to do the constructability review.

Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.

- Meetings and Coordination with SED was very effective.
- Coordination with District internal groups has a lot of room for improvement. The District often focused on “playing gotcha”; and the relationship was strained.
- Establishing dedicated project website “not that important.”
- Internal PM Coordination was very good. We had regular staff meetings where we shared lessons learned.

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\09 Hermanson_Summary_11_25_13.docx



Performance Rating Summary

Interview w/Wayne Hermanson (Gilbane PM for School #17)

November 25, 2013

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Jim Durfee	Date: 11/25/13	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	3	
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	N/A	Joined project later.
Administration of the Bidding process	N/A	Joined project later.
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	N/A	Joined project later.
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	3	Should have been hired up front.
Constructability Review	3	
Meetings and Coordination with SED	4.5	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	3	Variability in performance with each group (average)
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	2	
Quality and timeliness of Direction	4	
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	3	



Interview w/Wayne Hermanson (Gilbane PM for School #17)

November 25, 2013

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	4	
Internal PM coordination	4	
Meeting Documentation	2	Better admin staff quality required.
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	3	District standards "loose"
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	4	
Implementation of a project procedures manual	4	
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	4	
Managing and tracking expenditures	4	
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	4	
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	3	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	4	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	4	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	3	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)		
Coordination of Construction Managers	3	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	4	Opened on time "against all odds"
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	3	
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	3	
Risk Management	4	
Monitoring contract compliance	4	
M/WBE compliance	4	
PLA administration	4	Proactive performance
Workforce Diversity Goals	4	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\10 Hermanson_Score Sheet_11_25_13.docx



Interview w/Bret Garwood

November 20, 2013

Interviewer: Jim Durfee

Overall Comments / Observations

- Bret worked with Brian Rulon, Carolyn Battaly, and Alex Castro at the City.
- RCSD was generally thinking about schools in isolation and not about their potential cooperative use for the community.
- Bret proactively inserted the City in to the process, contacted the School District and helped set up Building Advisory Committees.
- They looked at every possible portion of the school design that could add to the quality of life in the surrounding neighborhood.
- Bret began attending weekly meetings with Tom Roger to lay down some general guiding principles.
- There was not enough time to adequately deal with all of the potential that resided in the design of the schools in relation to their surrounding communities.
- Bret utilized School 28 as an example: was there another way to accomplish the school's needs, without taking "backyards" of the surrounding residential context?
- For Phase 2 the Joint Board and the School District should take the design principles established in Phase 1 and take it to the next level.
- Tom Roger did very well in dealing with conflicts between the Central Office and the Facilities Group, who are rarely on the same page and required guidance.
- The guiding principles should include the following:
 - Identify elements of the school programs that could be shared spaces.
 - Maximize the use of green space instead of favoring large fields of parking.
 - Coordinate with the Economic Development Division within the City in terms of their goals for the community.

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\Garwood_Summary_11_20_13.docx



Performance Rating Summary

Interview w/Bret Garwood

November 20, 2013

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Jim Durfee	Date: 11/20/13	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	N/A	
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	N/A	
Administration of the Bidding process	N/A	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	4	
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	N/A	
Constructability Review		
Meetings and Coordination with SED	N/A	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	3	
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	2	
Quality and timeliness of Direction	4	
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	4	



Interview w/Bret Garwood

November 20, 2013

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	4	
Internal PM coordination	N/A	
Meeting Documentation	4	
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	N/A	
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	N/A	
Implementation of a project procedures manual	N/A	
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	N/A	
Managing and tracking expenditures	N/A	
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	4	
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	2	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	4	Managed the limited amount of local share well.
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	N/A	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	N/A	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	N/A	
Coordination of Construction Managers	N/A	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	N/A	
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	N/A	
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	N/A	
Risk Management	N/A	
Monitoring contract compliance	N/A	
M/WBE compliance	4	
PLA administration	4	
Workforce Diversity Goals	N/A	



Interview w/Brian Trott (Architect for School #50)

November 21, 2013

Interviewer: Jim Durfee

Overall Comments / Observations

- Tom Roger was excellent. His main goal was to make sure we had the “right project.”
- The initial plan (from the Master Plan) did not work.
- The Principal (Tim Mains) called for many Program adjustments requiring a new plan.
- When the Schematic re-design began, no CMs had yet been hired.
- Tom Roger did Schematic estimating and was very open to Tim Mains’ suggestions.
- The changes in scope were handled very efficiently.
- CPL took it from Schematic Design forward.
- Tom Roger’s assistant was not very effective.
- Tom Roger encouraged dialogue between the designers from SWBR, Labella and CPL to establish common strategies from the K-8 model.
- Tom Keysa has a different vision for School #50 and was reluctant to meet with Tom Roger who continued to try to invite Facilities into the design process without success.

Definition of Responsibility

- CPL hired Redi-Check to do document review at 100% CD’s.
- Pete Buckley and Mike R. from Pike were very good; we teamed well with Pike.
- The PM was skillful and strategic in dealing with issues related to swing space logistics, built out, moves and occupancy.
- LaBella was hired as Commissioning Agent.
- Pike performed the constructability review.

Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.

- There was potential for the project website to be much more valuable.
- The PM double checked requested for “extras.”



- The PM “found money” by creatively evaluating alternatives.

Issues Related to Standards and the Consistent Definition of Project Work Scope.

- The re-definition of the project scope was very well handled. After that, holding closely scope was adequate.
- The implementation of a Project Procedures Manual was delegated to Pike.
- The PM established a “frond end spec committee” which we participated in along with the other architects.

Issues that Relate to Budget and the Strategic Application of Funds

- Early meetings and agreement with SED was very beneficial in dealing with aid/eligibility and minimizing local share.

Issues Related to the Administration of CM’s and Architect Responsibilities

- Project closeout has not gone well but this has much to do with the District Facilities group’s lack of availability for efficient coordination. District Facilities staff had chosen not to attend punch-list walkthroughs due to “lack of adequate completion.”

Issues Related to Quality

- The PM checked the deliverables at each phase.

Issues Related to Labor

- The PM checked for M/WBE compliance.



Performance Rating Summary

Interview w/Brian Trott (Architect for School #50)

November 21, 2013

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Jim Durfee	Date: 11/21/13	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	2	CPL hired Redi-Check at 100% CD's (not very valuable)
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	3	
Administration of the Bidding process	4	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	4	
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	N/A	
Constructability Review		
Meetings and Coordination with SED	4	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	2	
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	2	
Quality and timeliness of Direction	5	
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	4	



Interview w/Brian Trott (Architect for School #50)

November 21, 2013

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs		
Internal PM coordination		
Meeting Documentation		
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	3	
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	4	Initially a "3" but then improved
Implementation of a project procedures manual	3	
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	3	
Managing and tracking expenditures	3	
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	3	
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	N/A	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	4	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	3	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	3	
Project Close-Out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)		
Coordination of Construction Managers	N/A	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	3	
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	3	
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	4	
Risk Management	3	
Monitoring contract compliance	3	
M/WBE compliance	3	
PLA administration	N/A	
Workforce Diversity Goals	N/A	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\14 Trott_Score Sheet_11_21_13.docx



Meeting With Carl Thurnau (SED Director of Facilities - in Albany)

December 3, 2013

Interviewer: Jim Durfee

Overall Comments / Observations

With regard to the PM's performance to date, Mr. Thurnau had the following observations:

- In general, the interface with the PM left a lot of room for improvement.
- The PM had a "steep learning curve" in formatting project submissions so that they would be in conformance with SED expectations. SED is accustomed to having the architects as the interface.
- Debbie Johnson noted that most submissions were incomplete.
- The amount of incidental costs applied for was "huge". SED has given a lot of leeway to "Big 5" NYS urban districts (evens out the disparity with suburban districts) but this went far beyond that.
- District-wide technology costs were assumed (by the PM) to be aidable, but, in fact, many of the costs might not have been. SED Position: If they did not allow the costs, it was apparent that the District would have to pay them. SED realized that, as a result of this, the costs would reduce the amount of capital improvements. Accordingly they were more liberal with the interpretation of "aidable." Mr. Thurnau felt like the PM was playing RCSD off against SED.
- SED was not happy with the amount of incidental costs and how they were allocated.
- SED allowed master planning fees/costs to be included in district-wide technology expenses. Mr. Thurnau felt that this scope went far beyond what he expected; especially since RCSD had already had this well in hand.
- Mr. Thurnau has respect for Tom Keysa and his staff. He feels that, over the years, he has delivered very good value. As a result, the Rochester building stock was in far better shape, to begin with, than other districts.
- Mr. Thurnau questioned the need for a PM, from his standpoint. The master plan is complete and the mechanisms in place for the balance of projects to proceed with architects and "enlightened" CM's.

Note: No rating sheet was provided by Mr. Thurnau.

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Interviews\Thurnau 12-3-13\Carl Thurnau Interview 12-3-13.docx



Interview w/ Tom Keysa RCSD Facilities

October 9 and 15, 2013

Interviewer: Jim Durfee/Tom Castelein

Overall Comments / Observations

- Concerned that Modernization Program Funds are not being spent and managed strategically to maximize the best long-term benefit to the District.
 - Program Manager did not have a good working knowledge of NYSED funding mechanism. Maximum Cost Allowance formula, and how Incidental Expenses are treated
 - Program is consuming incidental allowances; will limit District capital activities in the future.
- Extent of program inefficiencies being masked by:
 - Creating Districtwide Technology project
 - RCSD had \$16m in Excel funds remaining; got applied to Modernization
- Concerned that decisions being made without long term view of what happens when program is complete.
 - Material choices and building system selections – what is lifespan?
 - Will the modernized schools have increased, burdensome operational costs?
- An opportunity to create a detailed inventory of FF&E is being missed during current move management activities. Everything being boxed and moved, then moved back; could be inventoried, condition evaluated and recorded.
- RCSD Facilities Department felt they were marginalized in this process, with their input either not sought or ignored; but ultimately the modernized school buildings will be their responsibility to maintain.

Issues Related to Definition of Responsibility

- The PM appeared to do very little independent document review; relied on CM's.
- Facilities Dept. given documents very late to be able to appropriately review and comment – an example of the schedule challenges evident throughout Phase 1 projects.
- Facilities Dept. advocated that proper swing space planning is a key element for this program's success. To be fair to PM, it seemed that the RCSD Administration did not fully listen to this advice and grasp the importance.

Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.

- Questioned some of the qualitative evaluation of project issues and costs, or project scope decision making. Some aspects of schools were recently upgraded as part of energy saving initiatives, yet these recent improvements were in some cases replaced again as part of Modernization. Yet other items that



Facilities considered a pressing need (boiler replacement, roof replacements) were not included. Again, to be fair to PM, there were scope decisions driven by the RCSD Administration that Facilities did not agree with.

Issues Related to Standards and the Consistent Definition of Project Work Scope.

- Tom Keysa had been directly involved in preparation of the Program Manager RFP, and had included what he felt were required tasks. He was then surprised to see some of these tasks issued as supplemental service RFP's - should have been included in Gilbane's scope.

Issues that Relate to Budget and the Strategic Application of Funds

- Pursuit of alternative sources of funding such as NYSERDA was not as applicable to Rochester's Modernization program than say in Buffalo or Syracuse because Rochester Facilities had done a lot of this type of work prior to RSMP.
- The District Wide Technology did not increase the overall amount of modernization funding, just created different categories so that the large incidental costs could be handled.
- The PM should have had a better understanding of the NYSED funding mechanisms and how the MCA formulas work.

Issues Related to the Administration of CM's and Architect Responsibilities

- Facilities raised strong concerns over the negative impact of the tight project schedules. Felt that the PM expended much more effort in defending the schedules than actually examining the stated concerns.

Issues that Relate to Quality

- Facilities Department has a wealth of information on standards, materials, preferred methods in the group's institutional knowledge if not fully documented. These standards were successfully utilized in the construction of five new schools administered by Facilities in the 1990's. This information could have been shared if asked for.

Issues Related to Labor

- The PLA appears to have worked to lock up the Modernization projects as Union projects. Ideally the PLA should have resulted in greater benefit to the District – enabling multiple shifts, greater flexibility with small contractors.



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Tom Keysa

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Tom Castelein	Date:	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	2	
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	1	
Administration of the Bidding process	3	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	3	
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	3	
Constructability Review	3	
Meetings and Coordination with SED		
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	2	
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	1	
Quality and timeliness of Direction	3	Did what needed to get them done. Not crazy about results.
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	1	



Interview w/Tom Keysa

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	1	
Internal PM coordination		
Meeting Documentation	3	
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	3	Happens quickly. Motivation deflects their responsibility.
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	3	
Implementation of a project procedures manual		
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	2	Facilities provided input on consistent front end – ignored. Allowed CMs & A/E to pursue own.
Managing and tracking expenditures		Not seen by Facilities.
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	2	Not shared. Schedule – projects behind.
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	3	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	1	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	3	Slow in evaluation.
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	3	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	2	Still in process.
Coordination of Construction Managers	3	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	3	Some work not done.
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	1	
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	1	
Risk Management	2	
Monitoring contract compliance	3	
M/WBE compliance	3	
PLA administration	3	
Workforce Diversity Goals		Minorities in demo – not in finish.

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\16a Keysa__Score Sheet.docx



Interview w/ Gary Squires; Manning Squires Henning

December 4, 2013

Interviewer: Tom Castelein

Overall Comments / Observations

- MSH had specifically targeted this Modernization Program as a good opportunity and took steps to place the company in what they believed was a good position to take advantage of it. They won bids for the first two projects (17 & 50) and immediately began finding the experience a struggle and a challenge beyond their expectations due to budget and schedule pressures.
 - MSH was the only bidder on School 17 and the project was over budget at bid opening. MSH was asked to find potential savings and began the project by reducing their contract value by \$150k.
 - Projects had legitimate increases in scope, for both unforeseen conditions and changes made by RCSD, but MSH found the Change Order process to be arduous with consistent push back to reduce the dollar value on every quote submitted.
 - The projects started with very tight, difficult schedules with no float that were then greatly impacted by major scope changes without appropriate adjustment of the end dates.
- As a General Contractor, most of MSH interaction with project management was with the next tier up, the CM's. But in general observations of Gilbane personnel Mr. Squires found them to smart, savvy and firm but fair.
- Mr. Squires noted that construction team members at all levels would have benefited from a presentation that explained the big picture of the overall goals of the Modernization Program and how their particular project fits into that larger vision. Perhaps as part of an initial project kick-off meeting.

Issues Related to Definition of Responsibility

- Independent document review not observed by MSH.

Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.

- Project communication, direction, and approvals seemed to be encumbered by the layers involved in the program structure. Communication from Manning Squires Henning as a GC would go to the project CM who would in turn pass to Gilbane and then it would go to the RJSMB. The path back to MSH would run through the same chain of command; process was time consuming.



Issues Related to Standards and the Consistent Definition of Project Work Scope.

- Project procedures appeared consistent to MSH

Issues that Relate to Budget and the Strategic Application of Funds

- Manning was under constant pressure to cut costs and in the end felt that they had sacrificed a great deal as a company.
- Mr. Squires was surprised that the contracts were put out to bid without asking for unit prices for elements of work that were at risk to become additions to the project scope, such as: poor soil excavation and replacement with structural fill or asbestos remediation beyond scope indicated on the documents. Both of these examples became significant adds to the projects MSH worked on. It is recommended that unit prices and/or allowances be thoughtfully established at time of bid on future projects.

Issues Related to the Administration of CM's and Architect Responsibilities

- It appeared to MSH that the quality of the construction documents suffered from schedule pressure. They did not seem to be as complete as they could have been and it also seemed as if the final cost estimates were not based on the final documents, but an earlier version which contributed to the project budget issues.
- As a GC, MSH had developed schedules and manpower plans that were in response to the challenging initial overall project schedule. These were “blown out of the water” by major scope changes and the project schedules never truly recovered.

Issues that Relate to Quality

- The insurance requirements and their application to all subcontractors created problems and difficulties on these projects.

Issues Related to Labor

- The PLA provision that second shift would be provided at no additional cost was not realistic. No personnel were willing to actually provide second shift labor without additional compensation.
- MSH viewed the MBE/WBE goals as large and stringent. It is their belief that the magnitude of M/WBE goals for this program alone exceeded the available capacity of qualified M/WBE firms in the area. In terms of effective business planning and development, Mr. Squires believes firms could actually be



more effectively nurtured by goals more closely fit to local capabilities as opposed to these firms being overwhelmed by workload that exceeds capacity or prudent growth goals.

- The ROAR program was something MSH heard a lot about but ultimately was not able to take advantage of. The workers produced were trained in finish trades that were not needed at the time the program was completed. When such work was being performed on the projects, considerable time had elapsed and the candidates were difficult to locate.
- *I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\17a Squires Summary 12 04 13.docx*



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Gary Squires

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Tom Castelein	Date:	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	N/A	Don't know if happened.
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	N/A	
Administration of the Bidding process	3	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	N/A	
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	N/A	
Constructability Review	N/A	
Meetings and Coordination with SED	N/A	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	3.5	MSH took some on at end out of necessity. Schedule impacted.
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	3	MSH did use Board Mtgs. C.O. approval –project schedule
Quality and timeliness of Direction	3	Came from CM
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	2	Personal perspective



Interview w/Gary Squires

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	N/A	No observed from this role
Internal PM coordination	3	
Meeting Documentation	N/A	Did not see from Gilbane – worked for CM
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	3	
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	N/A	
Implementation of a project procedures manual	3	Did not see but experienced uniformity
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	3	
Managing and tracking expenditures	N/A	
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	N/A	
Pursuit of alternate funding sources		
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	N/A	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	N/A	Limited exposure to Gilbane interaction.
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	N/A	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	N/A	
Coordination of Construction Managers	N/A	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	3	Very challenging up against. It happened but how well? Not comfortable for anyone. But not their fault.
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	N/A	
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	2	
Risk Management	3	Some challenges with insurance program.
Monitoring contract compliance	N/A	
M/WBE compliance	3	
PLA administration	3	
Workforce Diversity Goals	3	



Interview w/ Nancy Johns-Price; City of Rochester

December 2, 2013

Interviewer: Tom Castelein

Overall Comments / Observations

- Ms. Johns-Price has been involved in four modernization projects and has been impressed with the Program Manager.
- The PM has been good at making sure the community was involved and has been attentive to parent's concerns.
- The PM has done a good job of handling negative PR issues and soothing potentially irate people caused by the actions of others (RCSD)
 - The change of schools from K-6 to K-8 caused great concern among neighbors
 - RCSD prematurely published information related to land acquisition.
- The PM did an excellent job of listening and responding to questions and concerns raised at public meetings.
 - Had information needed to evaluate; make decisions
 - Did not allow projects to stray off track
 - Communicated limitations of funding
 - Informed the public how District and SED standards framed available options
 - Skilled at handling "wish lists" with bid alternates
- Projects are affected by the level of understanding and participation by the principal of the subject school; greater involvement tends to equal greater success.



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Nancy Johns-Price

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Tom Castelein	Date:	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	N/A	
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	N/A	
Administration of the Bidding process	N/A	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	4	
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	N/A	
Constructability Review	3	
Meetings and Coordination with SED	N/A	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	4	Gilbane did good job bringing big picture issues down to lower level – RCSD did not help.
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	2	Ultimately not that helpful to many proponents.
Quality and timeliness of Direction	4	Kept things moving.
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	4	



Interview w/Nancy Johns-Price

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	4	
Internal PM coordination	3	Good internal communication
Meeting Documentation	5	Good info – useful throughout process – timely.
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	3	Appeared to flow.
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	4	Held to overall objectives.
Implementation of a project procedures manual	N/A	
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	N/A	
Managing and tracking expenditures	N/A	
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	4	
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	N/A	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	3	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	N/A	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	3	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	N/A	
Coordination of Construction Managers	N/A	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	4	
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	N/A	
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	3	
Risk Management	N/A	
Monitoring contract compliance	N/A	
M/WBE compliance	N/A	
PLA administration	N/A	
Workforce Diversity Goals	3	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\18 Johns-Price_Score Sheet.docx



Interview w/ Peter Saxe; City of Rochester

December 2, 2013

Interviewer: Tom Castelein

Overall Comments / Observations

- Gilbane/Savin personnel were “top-notch”; meetings were conducted efficiently and effectively.
 - Professional and respectful in interactions with the community
 - Got the sense that everyone took the project seriously; wanted to produce a great result
- Observed less participation from RCSD than he would have expected. Noted that working with the District can be challenging, their departments appear “silo’d”
- Believes that the Building Advisory Committees are critical to the success of individual school projects
 - Are all stakeholders properly represented?
 - Are they participating as they should? Speaking up, contributing, and understanding a long term vision.

Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.

- Mr. Saxe’s role was particularly focused on the flow of information between those running the projects and the community. He felt that overall the public was kept well informed as to what was being planned and how neighbors would be affected by construction activities.
 - He did feel that move logistics could have been better communicated to parents. Not knowing exactly what was going to happen and when can create anxiety in families. He noted that the RCSD had a lot of responsibility in this area that they could have handled better.



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Peter Saxe

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Tom Castelein	Date:	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	3	
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	N/A	
Administration of the Bidding process	3.5	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	3	Improvement at RCSD required.
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	N/A	
Constructability Review	N/A	
Meetings and Coordination with SED	4	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	4	
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	N/A	
Quality and timeliness of Direction	4	
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	3	



Interview w/Peter Saxe

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	3.5	
Internal PM coordination	3.5	Limited view.
Meeting Documentation	4	Alexandria – foreman’s job.
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	3.5	Limited view.
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	3	
Implementation of a project procedures manual	N/A	
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	3.5	
Managing and tracking expenditures	N/A	
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	3.5	
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	N/A	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	N/A	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	N/A	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	3.5	Pepe – good – limited view.
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	N/A	
Coordination of Construction Managers	3.5	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	3	Opened but not necessarily done.
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	N/A	
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	N/A	RCSD communication needs to be improved.
Risk Management	4	
Monitoring contract compliance	N/A	
M/WBE compliance	3	Great level of effort – tried diligently.
PLA administration	4	
Workforce Diversity Goals	3	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\19 Saxe_Score Sheet.docx



Interview w/ Peter Buckley; Pike

November 26, 2013

Interviewer: Tom Castelein

Overall Comments / Observations

- Working on this Program as a CM was difficult and exhausting.
 - Much more work than expected was delegated down to the CM's from the Program Manager.
 - Did not see Gilbane bring their considerable resources to this program.
- Program would have benefited from clarity of vision, linear decision making, and simple and direct processes. The opposite was experienced and in Mr. Buckley's opinion, the overall quality of the resulting projects are not as high as they could be or should be.
- The PM appeared to make decisions based on a political evaluation, rather than objective assessment of what was best for program outcome. Lacked the will to speak up or push back if necessary.
- RCSD contributed to the difficulties on these projects
 - Major scope changes by Administration made very late in the process
 - Should have resulted in altered completion dates. Schools opened on original targets, but a great cost and stress to all team members and rushed conditions at deadline.
 - Facilities Department appeared to deliberately hold back on their involvement on projects until the end when they stepped forward to state their dissatisfaction with the results.
- Mr. Buckley had direct experience with a recent large RCSD project of similar scale and complexity, but executed outside of the Modernization Program and finds the contrast startling; the process and end results at the School 33/Ryan Center project where much higher quality and satisfaction.

Issues Related to Definition of Responsibility

- Independent review was not performed by the PM

Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.

- The project budget was unclear. When a figure was given, the PM was asked specifically if project contingency was separate; yes was the answer. Then at 11th hour it was stated the budget needed to include project contingency and the CM and the A/E were given the task of fixing a 7-figure bust in the budget.

Issues Related to Standards and the Consistent Definition of Project Work Scope.



- CM had to write and issue Commissioning Agent RFP on School 50 as the project was out to bid and PM did not have a Cx agent on board. Similar lax approach, late action observed on testing agency and asbestos monitoring contracts. Problems created by lack of timely procurement exacerbated by tight scheduled of projects.

Issues Related to the Administration of CM's and Architect Responsibilities

- PM Coordination by Wayne Herminson on the School 17 project was good.

Issues Related to Quality

- The Gilbane Safety Plan obscured clean lines of construction site liability.
- High insurance requirements pushed down to all subcontractors added 25-50% contracts that were around \$40k – if sub could comply at all.

Issues Related to Labor

- The MBE/WBE goals for this volume of work in this area outstrips the available capacity.
- The PLA restrictions further works against the MBE/WBE goals.
- The ROAR program had very limited results of graduates actually placed in the field



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Peter Buckley

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Tom Castelein	Date:	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	1	PM didn't do - A/E CM.
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	1	Never did.
Administration of the Bidding process	2	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	2.5	Last min. impact at swing locations
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	1	6-8 mos. Late.
Constructability Review	1	Not done.
Meetings and Coordination with SED	3	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	2	Some fault lies with District.
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	2	Initially used then Dataflow.
Quality and timeliness of Direction	1	Abysomal.
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	2	



Interview w/Peter Buckley

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	2	
Internal PM coordination	2	
Meeting Documentation	3	
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	1	
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	2	
Implementation of a project procedures manual	1	Never saw one.
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	2	Peppin Saving
Managing and tracking expenditures	2	Not communicated.
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	1	Fell to CM.
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	N/A	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	N/A	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	3	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	2	Utilized the hell out of us.
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	1	Still happening.
Coordination of Construction Managers	2	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	1	Card trick schedule. workshop – nonsense/garbage. 2 mos delay.
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	1	Did not do.
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	1	
Risk Management	2	Insurance degrade – what did it accomplish?
Monitoring contract compliance	2	
M/WBE compliance	2	
PLA administration	2	
Workforce Diversity Goals	2	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\20 Buckley_Score Sheet.docx



Interview w/ Eric Hansen, Andy Wheatcraft; RCSD Facilities

November 14 and 18, 2013

Interviewer: Tom Castelein

Overall Comments / Observations

- Gilbane came here with success in similar programs elsewhere, but did not have a good understanding of the NYSED MCA funding system. Processes and procedures were not brought here. Did not exist at first; were made up along the way in this program
- PM was hired to do a job then appeared to then hire other people to do that job- and at additional cost. Important that PM position be rebid with clear RFP language and a stronger contract. There should be a clear sense of what is expected to be included in the scope of services, and if those services are sub'd out by the PM, their costs should still be within the contract not extra.
- Perhaps wanted to push for "quick" early success in program and then be positioned well to continue. Schedule pressures negatively affected work on all projects during all phases.
- Acknowledged that working with the District is difficult and that personalities at the leadership level may have contributed to a distancing between the PM and District Facilities.

Issues Related to Definition of Responsibility

- PM relied on A/E's to perform document review. Some sent to Redi-Check, some to T.Y.Lin. Ability to thoughtfully review and then incorporate comments was compromised by schedule constraints; occurred too close to bid time. District Facilities ability to review similarly affected; little time to review very large sets of documents, no provisions for actually incorporating comments if made. Later, if Facilities raised a concern, PM response would be: facilities was given these documents and had an opportunity to object then.
- Relatively few bids received on most projects; one had only one GC bid (School 17). Bidders possibly turned off by the short bid period provided for these large complex projects. Also suggest in the future that PM stagger project bids; do not swamp the marketplace, do not compete with yourself.
- All of move management sub'd out- a surprise to Facilities. Swing space issue was challenging and District flipped flopped on decisions, making things more difficult. Facilities aware that the move manager is now developing furniture standards.
- Commissioning had a rocky start, RFP's issued late. Facilities group skeptical this is adding value. They have not yet seen any commissioning reports.
- No constructability review performed; task pushed off to CM's

Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.



- Coordination and communication with SED handled very well by PM, particularly by initiating face-to-face reviews. PM had the benefit of building off of RCSD's good reputation with SED.
- Coordination with District internal groups did not happen satisfactorily. District silos were probably a factor but it is the PM's job to push and pursue needed information; critical to create acute program upon which design decisions are going to be based. Facilities should have been represented throughout coordination/programming process.
- Project website viewed as huge missed opportunity to showcase this very large, important program to the general public. Very thin; little updating. Shouldn't the Board meeting minutes be available?
- The sign-off "process" was never clear. Who is to sign off? There are multiple stakeholders on these projects. When to sign off? Rapid schedule meant project design phases not distinct.
- Communications hindered by lack of consistency to forms/process; each CM appears to be doing own thing. Some project information hard to come by, some comes too much (i.e.: a blizzard of construction test report results). Bi-weekly meetings initiated to improve program communication.
- Very little evidence of PM performing evaluation at a larger strategic level. Unwilling to push back; yes men, no political resolve to say no. The project at School 58 is an example of the results: big MCA formula problems, huge local share costs, end result compromised with no onsite parking, little open space, bad mix of construction types.
- Internal PM coordination had a range of success; some good, some bad. Varying levels of experience and skill were observed.
- Meeting documentation not always reaching Facilities. What does arrive is inconsistent in format.

Issues Related to Standards and the Consistent Definition of Project Work Scope.

- Program is generating large volume of RFP's with big scopes and very limited time: to review before releasing, to develop bid responses, to review responses and process. Everything seemed rushed.
- From Facilities perspective, the program seems like it has an open checkbook, generating an endless amount of change orders for construction work, professional services and Program Management.
- Facilities Department Administrative costs are not represented or accounted for in the Modernization Program.
- No evidence of there being a Project Procedures Manual,
- The project front end documents seemed to be a constant work in progress



Issues that Relate to Budget and the Strategic Application of Funds

- The PM was adept at shifting dollars around, but at the expense of some projects.
- Schedule was not managed; a very ambitious (short) schedule was developed, work fell behind, warning signs ignored and no recovery plan developed. None of the schools that are turned over are truly complete.
- A weak effort was made to pursue additional NYSERDA funds, but District had done enough energy related upgrades in the past that there was not much opportunity there anyway.
- PM did not understand the system of aid and eligibility at first; better now. SWBR had an excellent grasp and largely carried the ball. Aid issues got muddied by the District's late decision in K-8.
- Construction change order review appears to be farmed out to CM's; do not see PM weigh in.

Issues Related to the Administration of CM's and Architect Responsibilities

- Too much appears to be delegated to CM's. In doing so, PM gives up authority; CM is handling, therefore PM not critical, does not attend all project meetings – so what is being PM being paid for?
- Close-out has not happened, is in process now. Procedures appear unclear; Facilities watching with concern.
- PM should be much more active coordinating CM's and managing the schedule – particularly enforcing the construction schedule. Ask the hard questions, put feet to the fire. If not, what is the middle layer of PM management doing?

Issues that Relate to Quality

- Monitoring contract compliance appeared to be handed over to CM's.
- District standards not satisfactorily incorporated in to projects.

Issues Related to Labor

- PLA would have allowed single prime contract, but Gilbane elected to split into separate primes. PLA ended up reducing the number of available bidders.
- ROAR program's effectiveness questioned. At the request of a City Councilwoman, RCSD Facilities department conducted a job fair to try to capture some program graduates; difficult, participants had evaporated. Who ended up with jobs and at what cost?



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Eric Hansen and Andy Wheatcraft

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Tom Castelein	Date:	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	2	
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	2	
Administration of the Bidding process	3 (2)	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	3.5	
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	2	
Constructability Review	1	
Meetings and Coordination with SED	5	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	2	Really poor at the beginning.
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	1	
Quality and timeliness of Direction	2	
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	2	



Interview w/Eric Hansen and Andy Wheatcraft

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	1	
Internal PM coordination	3	
Meeting Documentation	2	
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	3	
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	2	
Implementation of a project procedures manual	2	
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	2	
Managing and tracking expenditures	N/A	
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	2	
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	2	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	2	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	2	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	1	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	N/A	
Coordination of Construction Managers	2	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	1	
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	1	
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	2	
Risk Management	N/A	What does this mean?
Monitoring contract compliance	2	
M/WBE compliance	2	
PLA administration	2	
Workforce Diversity Goals	2	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\21 Hansen Wheatcraft_Score sheet.docx



Interview w/ Windell Gray; Landon & Rian

December 13, 2013

Interviewer: Tom Castelein

Overall Comments / Observations

- Experienced issues of inadequate documentation in early stages of project. It seemed odd to the compliance officer who works on similar projects all across the state that processes were not in place to gather and document required information regarding the make-up of personnel on site. Eventually resolved this issue, but seemed unusual that it had to be requested.
- Gilbane/Savin personnel were professional and cooperative when asked for information and compliance documentation.
- When asked about multiple contractor comments on the challenges of meeting the MBE/WBE and EEO goals for this program, Mr. Gray noted that the compliance data shows that overall the program not only met its goals but actually exceeded them. This data, based on actual contracts and certified payrolls, would not support a lessening of goals for future phases.

Issues that Relate to Quality

- The required levels of insurance coverage and their application was a problem for smaller and newer contractors. Once the difficulties became clear and this issue was raised, accommodations were made.

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\22a Gray Summary 12 13 13.docx



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Windell Gray

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Tom Castelein	Date:	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review		
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions		
Administration of the Bidding process	4	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics		
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning		
Constructability Review		
Meetings and Coordination with SED		
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)		
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website		
Quality and timeliness of Direction		
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)		



Interview w/Windell Gray

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs		
Internal PM coordination		
Meeting Documentation		
Quality and timeliness of RFPs		
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope		
Implementation of a project procedures manual	2.5	Not present at first – developed.
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency		
Managing and tracking expenditures		
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule		
Pursuit of alternate funding sources		
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share		
Evaluation and authorization of change orders		
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs		
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)		
Coordination of Construction Managers		
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time		
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness		
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications		
Risk Management		
Monitoring contract compliance		
M/WBE compliance	4	
PLA administration		
Workforce Diversity Goals	4	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\22 Gray_Score Sheet.docx



Interview w/ Larry Bell, Bell Mechanical

December 13, 2013

Interviewer: Tom Castelein

Overall Comments / Observations

- This contractor found the MBE/WBE requirements on this program to be challenging; felt there was limited contract capacity in the area.

Issues Related to Definition of Responsibility

- Felt that the bidding documents could have been more complete; seemed “rushed”

Issues that Relate to Budget and the Strategic Application of Funds

- Worked on School 50, where the addition of air conditioning was a significant add to the project scope. The final dollar value of their change order is still unresolved. States that Bell’s interaction is all with the CM, not with the Program Manager.

Issues Related to the Administration of CM’s and Architect Responsibilities

- Close out process seems protracted. Stated has not had workers on the site since June, yet their contract is not yet closed out.

Issues that Relate to Quality

- Insurance requirements were very restrictive; made it difficult to secure subcontractors for smaller scopes of work.

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\23a Bell Summary12 13 13.docx



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Larry Bell

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Tom Castelein	Date:	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	3	
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	3	
Administration of the Bidding process	3	
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	N/A	Don't get involved.
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning		Cm taken care of this.
Constructability Review	3	
Meetings and Coordination with SED	N/A	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	3	
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website		Never looked at website
Quality and timeliness of Direction	3	
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	3	



Interview w/Larry Bell

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs		
Internal PM coordination	3	
Meeting Documentation	4	
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	2	
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	2	
Implementation of a project procedures manual	3	
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	2	
Managing and tracking expenditures	N/A	Not involved.
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule		Schedule has too much flex
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	N/A	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	N/A	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	3	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs		
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	1	Who takes responsibility? Owner, CM?
Coordination of Construction Managers		
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	2	Schedule is not rigid – float days?
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	2	Too many gray areas.
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	3	
Risk Management	N/A	
Monitoring contract compliance	3	
M/WBE compliance	3	
PLA administration	3	
Workforce Diversity Goals	3	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\23 Bell_Score Sheet.docx



Interview w/ Steve Rollins; Pike

November 25, 2013

Interviewer: Tom Castelein

Overall Comments / Observations

- Gilbane has been professional and good to work with, and is respected as an organization. However, were all of their resources fully brought to bear on this program? Many tasks were delegated to others, particularly the CM's who found themselves performing work beyond their original expectations.
- Lack of a program procedures manual was a big issue at the start. All forms and process documentation had to be created. Pike contributed significantly to the content of the now developed procedures manual.
- Schedule was a large challenge initially and the challenge only increased as projects progressed.
- Individual project budgets were not clearly communicated to the project team.
- Overall level of CM admin/PM effort required for these projects was much greater than anticipated. Bids for CM services on future RSMP projects will be at higher costs now that process/expectations are known.
 - Note: Various tasks and charges run through CM contracts, such as misc construction needs at swing space locations, large (\$40k) reproduction charges. No mark-up allowed, took 90 days min to collect.

Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.

- Poor relationship with District Facilities negatively affected projects. Appeared that Facilities did not get a seat at the table. Relationship with other RCSD departments seemed better.
- Large changes made late in the process (i.e.: addition of air conditioning) created significant time and effort investment on part of CM's to examine issues, develop costs and other information – never fully compensated for.

Issues Related to Standards and the Consistent Definition of Project Work Scope.

- Commissioning RFP's issued late; months into project, past when appropriate in design stage.
- Special Inspection services were dealt with "a la carte", in what appeared to be an effort to minimize costs. Should have been better planned for and approached without artificial budget constraints;
 - False savings; testing agencies and CM's had inefficiencies related to new testing personnel on site all the time, having to respond to each individual call as opposed to consistent assignments facilitated by a more holistic and appropriate outline of scope.



Issues that Relate to Budget and the Strategic Application of Funds

- CM's expended considerable effort in review of all change orders.

Issues that Relate to Quality

- The insurance “debacle” had a major impact on the projects and the workload of the CM's. Requirement mandating that all subcontractors had to meet high levels of insurance coverage was stated months after bids had been received. Gilbane had knowledge of front-end requirements, yet voiced no concern or opinion on the how this was being handled until *their* new risk consultant raised the issue. Tracking insurance compliance became a project in itself, and some subcontractors simply had to walk away.

Issues Related to Labor

- A PLA can be helpful if properly written and negotiated; this one appeared to be swayed toward the unions. The no additional cost for second shift work was touted as a big plus for the owner, but in reality no one would work B-shift without additional pay.
- ROAR program lot of effort and activity, with small payoff. 1000 applicants, 400 accepted, 200 graduated but with skill sets not needed in the field at that time. Pike was going to have ROAR graduates build out their field office in the former Maynards warehouse space, but was ultimately told by Gilbane that they could not (insurance issue).

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\24a Rollins Summary 11 25 13.docx



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Steve Rollins

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Tom Castelein	Date:	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review		No knowledge of PM effort on this.
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions		Same as above.
Administration of the Bidding process	1	Very hands off. Left almost everything to CM.
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	2	Left virtually everything to CM.
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	1	No interactivity/support/direction at all.
Constructability Review		No knowledge of PM effort on this.
Meetings and Coordination with SED		No knowledge of PM effort on this.
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	?	Can't answer. Severe relationship issues exist between PM & Facilities. Coord'd with all other groups was primarily done by AE with PM as facilitator.
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website		Never was aware there was one.
Quality and timeliness of Direction	2.5	Average. Hit & miss.



Interview w/Steve Rollins

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	2.5	Can only speak to communications with team members. Don't know about public. Seems average with consultants. None to very little with contractors.
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	2	Never knew the real project budgets.
Internal PM coordination	N/A	
Meeting Documentation	3	Average.
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	2	RFP's for consultants (kitchen equip, Cx, Insurance consultant/ were published after project start. Very untimely. Created delays in response to contractors require for information. Insurance turned into nightmare.
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope		Can't rate. Never privy to original scope document.
Implementation of a project procedures manual	0	If one exists.... Never saw it. Biggest disappointment of all. Had expected PM with all their horsepower and similar project experience to have this canned. CM had to develop their own project procedures manual. This should have been the foundation for all CMs to manage the projects by. No standards to follow. All projects look different as each Cm was left to develop their own manuals.
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	2	Poor effort. No real QC performed. Plenty of holes and bad spec.
Managing and tracking expenditures		Can't rate. Not privy to PM activity in this effort.
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	2	Little participation. Mostly left up to CM.
Pursuit of alternate funding sources		CM not involved with this effort.
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share		CM not involved with this effort.
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	1	Little involvement. Left up to CM and Exec Dir.



Interview w/Steve Rollins

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	4	Rating provided tongue-in-cheek. Never anticipated amount of additional work to be pushed down to the CM. Certainly "exceeded expectations."
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)		Totally a function of the CM. No input from PM.
Coordination of Construction Managers	?	Not sure what this means.
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time		Effort managed by CM not PM.
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness		No knowledge of PM effort on this.
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	2	CM observations is this was primarily left up to the Architect.
Risk Management		Can't rate. Not aware of any dedicated program/policies or procedures. No RM program ever reviewed with CM.
Monitoring contract compliance	2	Left up to CM. PM got involved only when a problem arose.
M/WBE compliance	3	PM actively involved. Consultant very weak.
PLA administration	3	PM Actively involved.
Workforce Diversity Goals	?	As it relates to what?

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\24 Rollins_Score Sheet.docx



Interview w/Christine Vargas; Vargas Associates

December 20, 2013

Interviewer: Tom Castelein

Overall Comments / Observations

- Comments made from Vargas' program role as move coordinator for all Phase 1 projects, procurer of new FF&E, as well as current responsibilities as Interiors subconsultant on the School 12 project. These roles have given Ms. Vargas a unique perspective on how the program is working on a very detailed level.
- Appeared that Gilbane's experience was outside of the FF&E/move arena. Vargas operated with great independence to execute their role within the overall structure of the program.
- There is room for improvement in RCSD participation and contributions to the program.
 - Swing space was identified very late; physical improvements were needed with little time and no real mechanism in place to accomplish.
 - School Principals had a limited understanding of the process; had little support from District yet had key role. Issue might have been of District's creation, but Gilbane did not step in and push.
 - Observed District Facilities personnel give conflicting direction, at times at the same meeting.
- Programming/Interiors input may be underrepresented in the Program

Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.

- Vargas pushed District Technology group for required information and decisions; took this action themselves out of schedule necessity.
- Had some misses on furniture for the Food Service group due to miscommunication on contract scope
- Some critical information occasionally not getting through; for example, Vargas found out very late – and somewhat accidentally - in a procurement cycle that an Early Childhood program was funded by a separate grant and therefore needed its costs tracked separately.
- Vargas initiated a biweekly meeting for move coordination; Gilbane participated 75% of the time.

Issues Related to Standards and the Consistent Definition of Project Work Scope.

- Gilbane had limited input on FF&E RFP's. Primarily limited to inquiries related to EEO M/WBE requirements as first RFP's were developed.
- Vargas started developing official classroom typical templates for FF&E; grew out of their observation of an overall need and their project work on School 12. Now being shared throughout the program.



- Ms. Vargas noted that if there is an official program procedures manual, it would be beneficial to have move-related input included.

Issues Related to the Administration of CM's and Architect Responsibilities

- Schedule pressure was strong throughout the program to date. Pressure on Vargas Associates was extreme at end of this summer as schools were to be turned over, but construction activities continued up to the opening date.

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\25a Vargas Summary 12 20 13.docx



Performance Rating Summary

Interview w/ Christine Vargas; Vargas Associates

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager’s performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Tom Castelein	Date: 12/20/13	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review		Didn't happen.
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions		
Administration of the Bidding process	3	Limited interaction
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	2	Late decisions
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	N/A	
Constructability Review	N/A	
Meetings and Coordination with SED	N/A	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	2	
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	2	Never seen
Quality and timeliness of Direction	3-4	Some people 4's



Interview w/Christine Vargas; Vargas Associates

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	3	Not a lot of quantity. Vargas does quite a lot.
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	3-4	
Internal PM coordination	4	Note: Vargas touches all projects.
Meeting Documentation	3	
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	3	
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	N/A	Vargas wrote scopes
Implementation of a project procedures manual	1	Unknown to Vargas – no more PF&E Input
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	N/A	
Managing and tracking expenditures	N/A	Did own tracking
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	2	Overall budget unknown. Schedule asked CM
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	N/A	
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	3	
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	N/A	Did own change order review
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	N/A	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	N/A	
Coordination of Construction Managers	N/A	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	1	
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	N/A	
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	3	District did nothing defined.
Risk Management	3	
Monitoring contract compliance	N/A	
M/WBE compliance	2	
PLA administration	N/A	
Workforce Diversity Goals	3	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\26 Vargas_Score Sheet_12-20-13.docx



Interview w/Peter Abdella

Interviewer: Jim Durfee

Overall Comments / Observations

- Schedule issues at School #17 (brought in).
- Overall Peter has a positive feeling about the PM's value and performance.
 - Very impress early on; Tom Roger was the right person at the right time.
 - Most of those on the RJSCB did not bring experience with large scale construction projects.
 - The previously established Master Plan was a good starting point.
 - The Building Advisory Committees (BACs) were a “good thing.” They dealt with practical project specific issues that affected the surrounding neighborhoods. Brought Marcia Barry/Brett Garwood's experience and expertise.
- During BAC meetings, Tom Keysa or Andy Wheatcraft would attend but would seldom comment.
- The design/construction schedule was very compressed. Tom Roger kept pressing that the longer the process took, the more expensive it will be. RJSCB took his work for this.
- Early in the project, Tom Renauto has not yet been hired. It would have been preferable to have someone of Tom's skill and experience much earlier.

RJSCB Priorities for PM

- SED approvals.
- Keep things on track.
 - RCSD has recently asked: “Why was not minimizing local share as priority?” Today: It is much more of a priority. The goal is to keep local share as low as practical and at a given level.
- The PM model utilized here in Rochester was a reaction to what was happening in Buffalo. There, the PM was seen as too powerful.
 - The PM said that four prime construction contracts was best way to go (not a single prime).
- Large values from insurance coverage & subcontractors: We may need to optimize the coverages in the next phases.



- The CM's have been taken advantage of in Phase 1, since so much scope has been delegated to them without additional compensation.
- CM fees will probably go up.
- During next phases the PM scope will be reduced; the master plan is complete.

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\20b Abedella_Summary.docx



Performance Rating Summary
Interview w/Peter Abdella

RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager's performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator: Jim Durfee	Date:	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review	3	
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions	3	Some projects better than others.
Administration of the Bidding process	2	Bidding timeframes short and rushed.
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics	3	
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning	3	
Constructability Review	3	
Meetings and Coordination with SED	3	
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)	3	
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website	3	
Quality and timeliness of Direction	3	
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)	3	This has been a continuing issue.



Interview w/Peter Abdella

Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs	3	
Internal PM coordination	2	Didn't seem to be occurring consistently.
Meeting Documentation	3	
Quality and timeliness of RFPs	3	
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope	3	
Implementation of a project procedures manual	2	Not aware of one being developed.
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency	2	Forms were different for each project.
Managing and tracking expenditures	4	
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule	4	This was Gilbane's strongest attribute from my vantage point.
Pursuit of alternate funding sources	?	Not sure of Gilbane's actions on this.
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share	3	Mixed bad on this one.
Evaluation and authorization of change orders	4	
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs	2	
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)	3	
Coordination of Construction Managers	3	
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time	3	Okay under the circumstances.
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness	3	Some projects better than others.
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications	3	
Risk Management	3	
Monitoring contract compliance	4	
M/WBE compliance	3	It appeared that PM deferred to ICO and Exec Director on these issues, but they would get involved when requested.
PLA administration	3	
Workforce Diversity Goals	3	

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\19a Abdella__Score Sheet.docx



Interview w/ Mike Schmidt, RCSD Administration

October 10, 2013

Interviewer: Jim Durfee/Tom Castelein

Overall Comments / Observations

- Mike is deeply concerned about how far behind construction schedule the Phase 1a projects were and cannot understand how a competent program manager would allow that to happen. The projects not being completed on time – truly completed, not simply handed over with work still to be done - has a major negative impact throughout the RCSD; Administration, Facilities, support departments, Principals, Teachers, Students, Parents.
 - School 50 was OK
 - School 17 was 8 weeks behind schedule in June/July with no readily apparent plan to turn things around in time for a fall opening. Mike personally intervened and became the driver on that project, pushing it forward. Taking such action was a major investment of his time and should not be his job on a program like this.
 - Charlotte was/is a “disaster”; was apparently as far behind schedule 17 was, but in the absence of extraordinary actions similar to Mike’s push on 17, Charlotte opened with work unfinished. Mike stated any review of the program to date that does not consider what took place at Charlotte is not a full and valid examination.
- From Mike’s viewpoint, it appears that Gilbane is running on a very tight budget is not allocating adequate resources to the tasks they should be performing. He would feel more comfortable if he saw more, qualified, empowered personnel actively managing the projects. Currently there are 9 active projects and Tom Roger is a single person in charge of all them – not effective.
- Tom Roger appears to act as a facilitator, not a leader or director. Someone needs to speak up firmly to keep things on the right track or get it back if it strays off. On School 17 that became Mike, on other projects it did not happen.
- Gilbane and the Modernization Program has been able to benefit from the District’s excellent reputation and relationship with SED; at the Administration level (Anita Murphy) and the Facilities Dept. The creation of the Districtwide Technology project to address program funding problems was largely due to this reservoir of goodwill with SED, which was based on respect for RCSD.
- Mike sees the Facilities Department and its leadership as having been publically criticized and marginalized by the PM, ignoring their knowledge and experience.
- The consumption of project incidental costs by the Modernization Program ties the hands of the District for current and future projects



- Mike respects Tom Renauto as Executive Director of RJSCB but perceives a “closeness” between Tom and Gilbane that does not reflect the true relationship – Gilbane works for the Board. He also wonders if Tom Renauto’s office ought to be located with the District, perhaps with Facilities, rather than co-located with Gilbane.

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\20 Schmidt Summary 10 01 13.docx



Interview w/ Anita Murphy, RCSD Administration

November 4, 2013

Interviewer: Tom Castelein

Overall Comments / Observations

- Anita is concerned if the RCSD ultimately is being served well by the Modernization Program; don't rethink the whole thing, but there is plenty of opportunity to improve the process and the results.
 - Are the projects being selected in the best manner, in the best interests of the District?
 - Community wants are having a significant impact on project scopes, increasing local share costs which are very high in in this program.
 - PM was not familiar with the NYSED funding system. Made decisions like assuming the purchase of the former Maynards building was fundable, but it was not.
 - Some decisions seem politically oriented rather than a straightforward assessment of what is best for RCSD
- She acknowledges that the District created some of the most significant challenges for the program to date, with late decisions on the Master Plan, K-8 vs. K-6, and adding AC.
- There is a disconnect between the District Facilities and the Modernization Program and its Program Manager.
 - Facilities input on Modernization projects should occur – they are the District's buildings.
 - Facilities needs to know what work in being included in RSMP projects so that they can properly plan and budget for their CIP work.
 - Concerned that the RSMP projects are leaving work undone in schools, but their MCA is all used up.
- Anita witnessed Syracuse's program structured differently; the "Board" was the District staff, Superintendent, City Engineer – seemed more direct. She perceives the RJSCB as more willing to listen to the District now than it was previously, and thinks that Lois Geiss is a great help.
 - Gilbane was also the PM in Syracuse; performance seemed better.
 - Also observed a greater emphasis on sustainability in Syracuse; all projects aimed for a minimum of LEED Silver.
- The Building Advisory Committees are important to the success of projects. Proper representation is important especially given changeover that occurs at schools. Principals are important, but can't have them be primary decision makers as sometimes they are gone by the time the project is completed.
- The Architects and Engineers have performed well; although she noted that sometimes they were reluctant to raise issues directly in meetings, but did so through communication afterwards – trying to do what is right for the District, but aware that the District is not their client, they work for the Board/PM.



- Vargas Associates did a good job with move management, especially considering how their tasks were impacted by construction delays.
- The Bond Counsel for the program had a significant spreadsheet error in one of its documents, resulting in less project money being available. This had to be “saved” by contingency. Disappointing; should have been checked by PM.
- Results of ROAR Program uncertain; cannot get solid information on it. District itself hired 8 graduates, but they had to go through some effort to track them down. How many actually placed in union workforce? What is the data?
- Ultimately feels that the PM is performing in a perfunctory manner, not adding value though evaluation and advisement on issues and decisions. Yes they are performing the job, but are they fulfilling the larger mission of maximizing this opportunity for the District?

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\B Interviews\21 Murphy Summary 11 04 13.docx



RSMP

**Rochester Schools
Modernization Program**

Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board

Bob Brown, Vice Chair
Alex Castro
Lois Giess, Chair
Richard Pifer
Ann McCormick
Brian Roulin, Treasurer
Jerome Underwood
Windell Gray, ICO
Tom Renauto, Executive Director

To: RSMP Phase 1 Partners and Team Members

From: Tom Renauto

Date: May 1, 2013

Subject: Program Manager Evaluation

All,

The RJSCB recently retained the services of Bergmann Associates to perform a limited review of Phase 1 activities. The purpose of the review is to capture the ways in which the Project has gone well and to suggest ways that various aspects of the process could be improved. The focus will be on Program Management.

Bergmann Associates was selected for this work for several key reasons:

- They have no ties to the project and have expressed no desire to participate in future Phases of the project
- Their experience working with the District
- Their experience in the construction field
- They are a local Rochester firm

The Phase 1 review will include discussions about "program wide" topics as well as a detailed focus on two specific school projects, selected by the RJSCB, for their potential to be representative. As Phase 1 is well underway and Phase 2 is on the near horizon, it will be important to consider any changes that might be appropriate in work scope, program process, communication, responsibilities, and coordination among many other areas.

Mr. Jim Durfee will be leading the Bergmann Team with assistance from several key staff members. In consultation with Bergmann we have selected a broad array of issues for discussion with Program stakeholders. Jim and his team will be setting up separate meetings with each stakeholder group. These conversations will be designed to capture responses and identify program strengths and potential avenues to improvement. The responses and dialogue will be formatted in a way the RJSCB can use in future decision making.

The following are the specific stakeholder groups they will be meeting with:

- The RJSCB
- The Program Manager
- The RCSD
- Construction Managers (for select school projects)
- Architects (for select school projects)

Within the next week Bergmann will be contacting you to schedule a meeting to begin the process of information gathering.

Thank you, in advance, for your participation in this effort.

Respectfully,

Thomas M. Renauto
Executive Director
Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board

**RJSCB PHASE ONE PROJECTS
PROGRAM MANAGER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
INTERVIEW ROSTER**

RJSCB

Tom Renauto (Executive Director), Trenauto@aol.com, (585) 512-3806
Peter Abdella (Harter Secrest), pabdella@hselaw.com, (585) 231-1116
Windell Gray Independent Compliance Officer, wgray@landonrian.com, (585) 334-8240

PROGRAM MANAGER (GILBANE)

Tom Roger – Program Director (School 50), TRoger@gilbaneco.com, (585) 512-3813
Wayne Hermanson– PM (School 17 and School 12), WHermans@gilbaneco.com, (585) 512-3810
Bob DiPaola – PM (School 58 and East HS), RDipaola@gilbaneco.com, (585) 512-3808

RCSD

Anita Murphy – Deputy Superintendent (admin Sheila Wall), Anita.Murphy@rcsdk12.org, (585) 262-8517
Mike Schmidt – COO (admin Rhonda Kirkland), Michael.Schmidt@rcsdk12.org, (585) 262-8275
Tom Keysa – Facilities Director, thomas.keysa@rcsdk12.org, (585) 336-4098
Andy Wheatcraft – Facilities Planner, Andrew.Wheatcraft@rcsdk12.org, (585) 336-4002
Eric Hansen – Associate Architect, Eric.Hansen@rcsdk12.org, (585) 336-4016

CONSTRUCTION MANAGERS

The Pike Company (School 17 and 50)

- Pete Buckley (Executive), buckp@pikeco.com, (585) 241-0410
- Steve Rollins (Senior PM), rolls@pikeco.com, (585) 241-0431

ARCHITECTS

SWBR (School 17)

- Steve Rebholz (Senior), Srebholz@swbr.com, (585) 232-8300
- Michael Kuz (PM), MKuz@swbr.com, (585) 232-8300

Clark Patterson Lee (School 50)

- Brian Trott (Senior), Btrott@clarkpatterson.com, 800-274-9000 x 1057
- Ray Wenzel, rwenzel@ClarkPatterson.com. 800.274.9000 ext. 1095

NYSED

Debbie Johnson
Carl Thornau

CITY OF ROCHESTER

Bret Garwood
Nancy Johns-Price
Peter Sacks (*sp?*)

CONTRACTORS

Gary Squires – Manning Squires Henning
Christine Vargas – Vargas Associates
Jim McGuinness –
Larry Bell – Bell Mechanical



RJSCB - PHASE ONE PROJECTS
EXHIBIT A – ISSUES COMMENTARY

COMMENTARY

The focus for this review and evaluation is the agreement entered into between RJSCB and the Program Manager. This agreement requires the program manager to perform more than 150 separately identified scope items. The outline below groups a selected series of issues by general type for discussion and evaluation.

Please review these with the following questions in mind:

- What has been your observation regarding how this process has been executed?
- To what extent was this done and by who?
- What was your level of involvement and/or responsibility?
- Are there ways this could be improved?

Answers to these questions, along with the discussion they generate, will be gathered and used as a basis for summary observations and recommendations. In general, scope items are shown in quotes followed by additional descriptions and commentary for discussion.

- I. **Issues Related to Definition of Responsibility** - *The following scope items from the Program Management Contract appear either not to have proceeded as originally envisioned or are obvious candidates for clarification in Phase Two. In some cases a determination may have been made that the task was better accomplished in a different way.*
 - A. **“Independent Document Review”**: *The primary purpose of this activity is to apply a level of consistency in document content and quality. This requires a thorough understanding of each project scope. Reviewing this scope with key stakeholders like RCSD would be an important part of this.*
 - B. **“Review CD’s for E/O”**: *While no set of documents can be said to be perfect, a high degree of reliability can be achieved through quality assurance reviews specifically targeting potential errors or omissions. Consider extent to which this responsibility was delegated to another party?*



- C. “Administer the Bidding Process”: *The administration of the bid process involves close coordination with the CM and Architect. Consider extent to which this responsibility was delegated to another party?*
- D. “Plan and Coordinate Swing Space Logistics including Build Out, Moves and Occupancy”: *This is a scope of work that ended up being managed at a high level while specific “move management” services were provided by a consultant.*
- E. “Assist With and Coordinate Building Commissioning”: *This is a scope of work that had detailed requirements in the PM Agreement. Consider extent to which this responsibility was delegated to another party?*
- F. Constructability Review: *The PM has the responsibility to insure reviews are conducted at the appropriate times during the design process. The results should be disseminated to appropriate parties for action. Consider extent to which this responsibility was delegated to another party?*

II. Issues that Relate to Communications and Coordination between Stakeholders.

- A. Meetings and Coordination with SED: *These activities are particularly important to the Phase One Program in that they solidify the foundation of detailed planning work to follow.*
- B. Coordinate with District Internal Groups: *RCSD has a broad range of departments that have provided input to the planning process. These include: Facilities; Security; Food Service; Transportation; IMT; Teaching Learning.*
- C. Establishing Dedicated Project Website: *The project website was envisioned as a central communication point, both for the general public and project stakeholders.*
- D. Quality and Timeliness of Direction: *During the design and construction process the way in which communications move a project forward are key to overall success. Consider effectiveness of “sign off” process related to the following stakeholders – RCSD, PM, RJSCB.*
- E. General Communications: *Communications between program participants is very important to achieving overall success. For the following project stakeholders consider the consistency and quality of PM communications: RJSCB (Executive Director), PM internal staff, architects, CM’s, City, RCSD, public, SED.*
- F. Quantitative Evaluation of Project Issues and Costs: *The Evaluation of scope, cost and value is a complex and important activity. Issues of overall balance and how various program aspects compare with project goals must be quantified for decision.*



Consider the PM's command of the overall Program budget for this task. Consider the decision making process when a key choice or determination had to be made.

- G. Internal PM Coordination. *The communication between program management representatives assists in improving project outcomes. Consider specific examples of how this happened.*
- H. Meeting Documentation: *Meeting documentation is necessary for effective project management. The formatting of this is key to the tracking of responsibilities. Consider how this was done including consistency of format.*

III. Issues related to Standards and the Consistent Definition of Project Work Scope.

- A. Quality and Timeliness of RFPs. *The formatting and scope requirements of RFP's, lays the foundation for a successful project. A variety of RFP's have been required for Phase One including: CM Services, A/E Services, Cx Services, Special Inspections, Environmental Monitoring, Move Services, Kitchen Equipment Procurement, Insurance Reviewer and FF&E Bid. Consider how effectively these have been undertaken.*
- B. Establishing and Holding Closely to Well-Defined Scope: *The definition of scope is important in minimizing uncertainty in terms of budget, schedule and professional relationships. When there is an actual or alleged scope change and there is a difference of opinion as to whether, or to what extent this has occurred, the clarity of an agreement/contract becomes critical.*
- C. Implementation of a Project Procedures Manual. *The consistency of how individual projects are executed assists the management process. Updating these procedures to capture 'best practices' helps to streamline activities and increase efficiency.*
- D. Front End Specifications – Standardization and Consistency: *Defining requirements for standards and procedures is important to maintaining consistency among various projects. Consider the extent to which protocols were established and updated and their effectiveness.*
- E. Managing and Tracking Expenditures: *This is one of the PM's most complex activity due to the number of constituents involved, the progressive shifting of project circumstances and the connection to "value" decisions. Consider how effective the following have been undertaken:*
- Evaluating expenditures as they specifically relate to the District comprehensive plan.



- Changes to the contract.
- Report formatting and consistency.
- Value engineering.
- Monthly progress reports.
- Managing and tracking Program budget estimates.
- Establishing a master schedule and tracking it.

IV. Issues that Relate to Budget and the Strategic Application of Funds:

- Managing and Tracking Overall Project Budget and Schedule: *Consider the effectiveness of the PM in making sure this was accomplished.*
- Pursuit of Alternate Funding Sources: *The intent behind this activity was to engage community/business support, allowing further leveraging of “local share” and building lasting connections to District schools.*
- Determining Aid/Eligibility – Minimizing Local Share: *The District-Wide Technology Incidentals Budget has been a key resource in maximizing value/benefit for the District, consider how effectively this has been undertaken.*
- Evaluation and Authorization of Change Orders: *Whether in the design or construction process, when significant changes to the scope of work occur, some type of formalized review is expected. A determination as to whether the change is reasonable/necessary, clearly unanticipated, a fair price, etc. should be made in accordance with an agreed upon protocol. Consider how this was undertaken and to what extent.*

V. Issues Related to the Administration of CM’s and Architect Responsibilities.

- Consistency of PM Coordination and Utilization of CM’s: *The definition and delegation of responsibilities between the Project Manager and Design/Construction Professionals is important in achieving an effective result.*
- Project Close-out/Turnover (O&Ms, As-Built Drawings): *Consider the effectiveness of the PM in making sure this was accomplished.*
- Coordination of Construction Managers: *Consider the effectiveness of the PM in making sure this was accomplished.*
- Management of Construction Schedule – Turning Over Schools On Time: *Consider the effectiveness of the PM in making sure this was accomplished.*



- E. Construction Document Review for Accuracy and Completeness: Consider the effectiveness of the PM in making sure this was accomplished.

VI. **Issues Related to Quality.**

- A. Incorporating of RCSD Standards Into Specifications: Consider the effectiveness of the PM in making sure this was accomplished.
- B. Risk Management: The PM is responsible for setting standards for risk management and monitoring how these are followed.
- C. Monitoring Contract Compliance: Consider the effectiveness of the PM in making sure this was accomplished.

VII. **Issues Related to Labor.**

- A. M/WBE Compliance: RJSCB is committed to fair labor practices in support of this program. Please comment on PM's effectiveness in meeting these goals.
- B. Project Labor Agreement Administration: Consider the effectiveness of the PM in making sure this was accomplished.
- C. Diversity Workforce Goals: Consider the effectiveness of the PM in making sure this was accomplished.



RJSCB Project Manager Evaluation Matrix

The following chart is intended to be completed by the listed evaluator utilizing the associated Program Manager Performance Evaluation – Commentary. Please refer to the commentary for further explanation of each scope item.

On a scale of 5 (highest performance) to 1 (lowest performance), please rate the Program Manager’s performance for each scope/task item indicating that the program manager has:

- 5 – achieved excellence
- 4 – exceeded expectations
- 3 – met expectations
- 2 – not fully met expectations
- 1 – been deficient

Please include any notes that may apply (in the associated column) and attach additional sheets if necessary:

Evaluator:	Date:	
Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Independent Document Review		
Review of Construction Documents for Errors/Omissions		
Administration of the Bidding process		
Planning and Coordination of Swing Space Logistics		
Assistance and Coordination of Building Commissioning		
Constructability Review		
Meetings and Coordination with SED		
Coordination with District Internal Groups (Facilities, Security, Food Service, IM&T, Transportation, Teaching and Learning)		
Establishment and Maintaining Dedicated Project Website		
Quality and timeliness of Direction		
General Communications (with project stakeholders, internally among team members, with the public, with consultants and contractors)		
Quantitative Evaluations of project issues and costs		
Internal PM coordination		
Meeting Documentation		



Scope/Task Description	Rating Number	Notes
Quality and timeliness of RFPs		
Establishing and holding a well-defined scope		
Implementation of a project procedures manual		
Front End Specifications – standardization and consistency		
Managing and tracking expenditures		
Managing and tracking the overall project budget and schedule		
Pursuit of alternate funding sources		
Determining aid / eligibility – minimizing local share		
Evaluation and authorization of change orders		
PMs coordination and utilization of the CMs		
Project Close-out / Turnover (O&M Manuals, As-Built Drawings)		
Coordination of Construction Managers		
Management of construction schedule – turning over schools on time		
Construction document review for accuracy and completeness		
Incorporation of RCSD standards into the specifications		
Risk Management		
Monitoring contract compliance		
M/WBE compliance		
PLA administration		
Workforce Diversity Goals		

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.1 Design Criteria\PM Evaluation Matrix.docx



RJSCB PHASE ONE – SELECTED SCHOOLS

ENRICO FERMI SCHOOL 17

Located in the northwest area of Rochester, Enrico Fermi School No. 17 is a Pre K–6 school with a current enrollment of 561 students. Constructed in 1967, the building is a three-story construction and contains approximately 77,111 square feet of building space. Additionally, the school utilizes four transportable classroom units that total approximately 4,584 square feet. The building sits on a 5.40 acre site, has 32 parking spaces, playground space, an athletic field and basketball court. The buses load/unload on the service drive located on site to the North of the school building. A 3.76 acre city park sits adjacent to the school to the east.

The school presently contains 37 general classrooms, most of which meet today's standard. Common spaces include a cafeteria, gymnasium and library. The stage located in the cafeteria allows the lunchroom to double as an auditorium/performing arts venue. School No. 17 presently houses a universal Pre K program, a Montessori Pre K/Kindergarten, the Unity Health Orchard Street Community Health & Family Center and a dental clinic run by the Eastman Dental Center's Department of Community Dentistry. It offers a bilingual program for native Spanish speakers in Kindergarten through grade 6; has the District's only elementary school string orchestra, taught by personnel from the Eastman School of Music; and has a primary and intermediate vocal chorus.

The proposed scope of work for this facility is driven by its conversion to a 3-strand (3 classrooms per grade level) K–8 building. Approximately \$2.3 million in infrastructure work has been identified to repair and replace deficient and outdated systems in the school's physical plant. Exterior rehabilitation work includes some window replacement, replacing the doors, and rehabilitation and repairs to the existing precast concrete wall system.

The final design incorporates some new classrooms and a large building addition for a new cafeteria and gymnasium on the east side of the facility bounded by Saxton Street. A new vestibule has been added between the existing main facility and a cluster of kindergarten rooms to create a new main entrance. Due the limited amount of land available, the design includes land-use modifications to adjust for the impact of the building addition to recreational areas, play fields, green space, pedestrian circulation and parking. A landscaped buffer is maintained between the new addition and Saxton Street. Adjacent parkland access from the school site has been improved. A dedicated service and loading area has been added on the Saxton Street side. The existing bus loop extending from Orchard Street to Saxton Street (north of school) is to be upgraded with new fencing, curb cuts, roadway and improved drainage. All fencing, curb cuts and landscaping are being designed to complement adjacent properties and provide adequate buffers.

Project Data - School 17

Original K-6, converting to K-8

Construction Budget \$21.2M

Started construction 7/1/12, completion scheduled for 8/2/13

Architect - SWBR, Primary contact Steve Rebholz

CM - The Pike Company, Primary contacts Pete Buckley and Steve Rollins

Primes: Manning Squires (GC), Eastcoast (EC), MA Ferraulo (Mech and Plumbing)

Gilbane PM - Wayne Hermanson



HELEN BARRETT MONTGOMERY SCHOOL 50

Located in the northeast area of Rochester, Helen Barrett Montgomery School No. 50 is a K–6 school with a current enrollment of 530 students. A single-story building, School No. 50 contains approximately 55,832 square feet of building area. Constructed in 1956, the building sits on a 6.54 acre site. It has 55 parking spaces, playground space, an athletic field and a baseball diamond. The buses currently unload in a loop off the north face of the school along Rau Street.

The school presently contains 25 general classrooms, most of which meet today's standard. Special programs offered include the Major Achievement Program (MAP) for grades 4-6, Learning English through Academic Program (LEAP) for grades K-3, and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) for all grades. Common spaces include a cafeteria, gymnasium, library, and a computer lab as well as mobile computer laptop stations. The existing school building does not have a stage or defined auditorium.

The proposed scope of work for this facility is driven by its conversion to a 3-strand (3 classrooms per grade level) K–8 building. Proposed building rehabilitation work includes alterations to reconfigure approximately 15,000 square feet of existing building area and renovation of approximately 31,000 square feet of existing building area. Approximately \$2.4 million in infrastructure work has been identified to repair and replace deficient and outdated systems in the school's physical plant. Interior rehabilitation work includes removal and replacement of interior finishes, doors, HVAC, plumbing and electrical systems and asbestos abatement.

A total of 53,331 square feet of additions to add needed classroom spaces, a large gymnasium addition, and a new kitchen are required to meet the model program needs of a K–8 school. Following construction, the closing of Lehaco St. is being requested to provide for additional field area to make up for some of the field space being taken by the building additions. Additional parking along Reliance St. is proposed to address the parking deficiency as the projected parking demand exceeds the currently available on-site parking. The exterior of the existing school facing Seneca Avenue and Rau Street will remain largely unchanged. The exterior façade of the existing school building along Reliance Street will be slightly changed by the classroom addition.

Project Data - School 50

Original K-6, converting to K-8

Construction Budget \$17.7M

Started construction 7/1/12, completion scheduled for 8/2/13

Architect – Clark Patterson Lee, Primary contact Brian Trott

CM – The Pike Company, Primary contacts Pete Buckley and Steve Rollins

Primes: Manning Squires (GC), Eastcoast (EC), Thurston Dudek (PC), B&B Mechanical (Mech)

Gilbane PM – Tom Roger

I:\Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board\009621.00 ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS - MODERIZATION\3.0 Design\3.8 Reports\Roch School Modernization Report12-16-13\Report Compilation\Appendix5. Selected Shools.docx



Durfee, Jim

From: Tom Renauto [trenauto@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2013 12:48 PM
To: Durfee, Jim
Subject: RSMP - Phase 1 background info
Attachments: 17 and 50 Executive Summary.docx

Jim,

Below is some information on the two projects that we have been discussing for the evaluation (School 17 and School 50). Also attached are project summaries for both schools.

School 17

Original k-6, converting to k-8
Construction Budget \$21.2M
Started construction 7/1/12, completion scheduled for 8/2/13
Architect - SWBR, Primary contact Steve Rebholz
CM - The Pike Company, Primary contacts Pete Buckley and Steve Rollins
Primes: Manning Squires (GC), Eastcoast (EC), MA Ferrauilo (Mech and Plumbing)
Gilbane PM - Wayne Hermanson

School 50

Original k-6, converting to k-8
Construction Budget \$17.7M
Started construction 7/1/12, completion scheduled for 8/2/13
Architect - Clark Patterson Lee, Primary contact Brian Trott
CM - The Pike Company, Primary contacts Pete Buckley and Steve Rollins
Primes: Manning Squires (GC), Eastcoast (EC), Thurston Dudek (PC), B&B Mechanical (Mech)
Gilbane PM - Tom Roger

Thomas Renauto

Executive Director
Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board
1776 North Clinton Avenue
Rochester, NY 14621
585-512-3806
585-730-9619 (cell)

SELECTED PHASE ONE HIGHLIGHTS

MILESTONE DATES

2008	RJSCB Formed
2010	Gilbane hired
Spring 2012	Bids taken on construction of Phase One Schools
2012-2013	5 schools under construction
2013	3 additional schools to be constructed
2014	2 additional schools to be construction

Gilbane Management

- Tom Roger has been overall PM for the last 4-5 years.
- Gilbane has a dedicated staff of ____.
- Gilbane hired Saving Engineers as subconsultant to supplement their staff.

Selecting The Schools for Phase One: The process for selecting the schools was based on early strategic planning and discussions with SED.

Building Advisory Committees: The scope of construction work at each of the selected schools was established through a dialogue between multiple stakeholders *(numbering from 10-25) including:

- School principal
- Designated school staff
- City of Rochester Community Development staff
- Neighborhood representative
- RCSD Director of Facilities
- Gilbane PM
- Architect

The Architect acted as Chair of the Committee, guiding the process. Basic data was assembled including AHERA Reports, building survey, infrastructure status.

