

BRS Town Building Committee Meeting

September 10, 2009

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Buda, Tim Cohen, Marc Estra, Jeff Kaufman, Sheila McCreven, and Sandy Stein.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Guy Stella, Superintendent; Marsha DeGennaro, Clerk.

As both the Chair, David King, and Vice Chair, David Barkin, were not in attendance due to scheduling conflicts, Tim Cohen was elected to serve as Chairman pro tem for the meeting.

MOTION #1 – APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN PRO TEM

Move that we appoint Tim Cohen as Chairman pro tem for the September 10, 2009 Meeting.

Ms. Stein

Second by Mr. Buda

UNANIMOUS

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Tim Cohen called the meeting to order (6:41 PM).

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

MOTION #2 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Move that we approve the minutes of August 20, 2009 Meeting as amended.

Mr. Estra

Second by Mr. Kaufman

Mr. Buda noted that he left the meeting at approximately 7:45 PM and Mr. Kaufman asked that his name be corrected with one “F”.

UNANIMOUS

Ms. Stein asked that the final RFQ be sent to all committee members.

RFQ for Alternative Financing

The Committee reviewed the RFP for alternative financing options for green energy efficiencies. It was noted that if more Town buildings were included, we would stand a greater chance of obtaining funding. Concern was expressed for jeopardizing the BRS project, should we pursue additional Town buildings. It was also noted that this funding option was outside the scope of the original charge to the committee and would require approval from the Board of Selectmen prior to pursuing. It is also possible, that this consultant could be secured as part of the design team, hired by the architect and/or engineering firm. However, that would mean the individual hired, would not be under the direction of the committee and would be guided by the architectural/engineering firm. Perhaps the best approach will be to separate the Beecher project but secure pricing in phases, based on requirements for other town buildings, i.e., the Center, Town Hall, the original Fire House and the Public Works complex. The Town would then be positioned to run parallel projects. The feasibility of conducting energy audits on multiple sites was also questioned.

There was a consensus that the BRS portion should remain separate and distinct. There was also a consensus that this will be a one-step process and developed as an RFP document. Changes and/or suggestions included:

- Important to separate the ESCO aspect from the consultant services to capitalize on funding opportunities, grants and energy initiatives. There is a myriad of services available specific to energy savings.
- 4th paragraph \$9.4m, assuming...change to “construction start date”

- The culture has changed and numerous firms are clamoring to get into this business. Generally, firms will submit “green” alternatives as part of the their proposal, and it is possible that we may not need to fund these aspects differently.
- Second to last line, strike “temperature” and change to “indoor environmental conditions”.
- Reference AZTech Study and SBS Report as well as the web site.
- Include BRS square footage building chart.
- “Conduct energy audit” should be its own bullet.
- Add Under Scope of Service – monthly meetings; attend design meeting; referendum meetings, community presentations and public forums. Several members believed that as part of the RFP firms will outline the number of meetings, presentations, etc. included in their overall pricing.
- Page 2 “they may provide” – expand/define the word “they”, add “will provide hands-on opportunities”.

It was questioned whether enough detail existed in the document to provide pricing. It is anticipated the RFP will be drafted next week. The outline of our expectations would then be incorporated into this document to eliminate any confusion.

Update on RFQ Process

Approximately 14 firms will submit an RFQ. It is anticipated that 4 or possibly 5 firms will be selected for interview. In order to develop a uniform rating scale in review of the RFQ’s, each member was asked to review the five questions developed by Mr. Zettergren and rank them from Most Important to Least Important.

Criteria:

1. *Firm's history and resource capability to perform required services.*
2. *Evaluation of assigned personnel*
3. *Related experience: school renovations, energy efficiency, HVAC, A/C, Windows, Lighting etc.*
4. *Qualifications of other members of the design team (sub-consultants)*
5. *Firms Perception of project requirements*

Discussion ensued over interpretation of assorted terms. Questions 2, 3, 4 and 5 are very clear while 1 can be read numerous ways. Language modification was suggested for Question 1 - remove “resource capability to perform required services” and change to “history and reputation”.

There was general consensus that Question 3 was the most important. By knowing who is on the team, you will be able to determine experience of individuals, project completions and the history of each firm. It is crucial that individuals who appear as part of the initial project remain consistent throughout the project. It was noted that the RFQ stipulated firms may not substitute subcontractors without our knowledge and consent.

The general ranking order of the questions attained was: 3, 2, 1, 4, 5 with questions #1 and #4 equal at 6 out of 10. The weighted number attached to each question was as follows:

- ◆ Question 1 – 6 out of a possible 10 points
- ◆ Question 2 – 8 out of a possible 10 points
- ◆ Question 3 – 10 out of a possible 10 points
- ◆ Question 4 – 6 out of a possible 10 points
- ◆ Question 5 – 2 out of a possible 10 points

A different scoring grid will be developed for the interview process. It was suggested that the Committee develop the interview questions. Committee members were asked to submit 2-3 questions to Mr. Zettergren for consideration. A complete list will be compiled and shared at the September 16 meeting.

ADJOURN: (8:15 PM)

Ms. McCreven
Second Ms. Stein
UNANIMOUS

Recorded by Marsha DeGennaro, Clerk