## Approved November 5, 2013

Taft Library Building Committee Meeting Mendon Town Hall Mendon, MA 01756 Wednesday, October 30, 2013 7:00 p.m.

### **Committee Members Present:**

Joe Cronin, Susan Darnell, Amy Fahey, Paul Fitzgerald, Dan Labastie, Don Morin, Kevin Rudden, Moritz Schmid, Jay Washburn

#### Others Present:

Mary Bulso, OPM, Lamoureux-Pagano Associates

## I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Joe Cronin at 7:00 p.m.

## II. Approval of Agenda

MOTION: A motion was made by Kevin Rudden, seconded by Moritz Schmid, to approve the agenda.

**DISCUSSION:** None.

**VOTED:** Unanimous.

# III. Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 24, 2013

<u>MOTION:</u> A motion was made by Kevin Rudden, seconded by Dan Labastie, to approve the meeting minutes from October 24, 2013.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTED: Unanimous.

## IV. Review Summary of Designer Ratings from Committee Members

The Committee members all rated the three responses that were received in response to the RFQ for Designer Services. DRA scored the highest, with Abacus/Situ finishing second and Nelson third. Mary Bulso mentioned that Nelson's Principal in Charge, Michael Tague is not a registered architect in Massachusetts. She was able to confirm this with a Human Resources representative with Nelson's home office in Pennsylvania, as well as the Massachusetts Board of Registration of Architects database. As a result, she recommended that we consider Nelson's proposal to be "non-responsive".

<u>MOTION:</u> A motion was made by Kevin Rudden, seconded by Paul Fitzgerald, to disqualify Nelson because they are "non-responsive" because their principal in charge is not a registered architect in the state of Massachusetts.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTED: Unanimous.

The ratings provided by the Committee members were as follows:

	SCORING				RELATIVE RANK				
	Abacus	DRA	Nelson		Abacus	DRA	Nelson		
Amy	105	111	66		2	1	3		
Chuck	98	119	110		3	1	2		
Dan	114	115	98		2	1	3		
Don	108	115	100		2	1	3		
Jay	98	110	85		2	1	3		
Joe	109	123	89		2	1	3		
Kevin	89	98	91		3	1	2		
Mary	83	114	*		2	1			
Moritz	118	102	97		1	2	3		
Paul	77	93	63		2	1	3		
Susan	117	117	50		1	1	3		
	101.5	110.6	84.9		2.00	1.09	2.80		
I	lumber d	of first p	lace vot	es:	1.5	9.5	0		
1/2 first	./2 first place vote for Abacus and DRA from Susan due to t								

\* Mary didn't finish Nelson's scoring due to them being "non-responsive".

#### V. Discuss Plans for Reference Checks

The group discussed how to proceed with reference checks. Amy and Paul volunteered to follow up with this as they did with the OPM references. Amy will contact the Abacus/Situ references and Paul will contact those from DRA. After reviewing the available contacts in each of the proposals, the group agreed to use the following references for each responder:

Amy - Abacus/Situ: Peter Bulkeley Terrace Elderly Housing, Concord, MA and Harvard University Media Slide Library, Cambridge, MA.

Paul – DRA: Norfolk Public Library, Norfolk, MA and North Adams Public Library, North Adams, MA.

Amy and Paul will ask the references about the designer's ability to meet the project goals in the following areas:

- Ability to stay on budget; if over budget, were the change orders customer requested?
- Expertise of designer's team was the team knowledgeable?
- Communication between designer and project owner, OPM, GC, etc.
- Ability to stay on schedule
- Value engineering/cost control
- Quantity of change orders what drove them?
- If you had to do it over, what would you like to see be done differently?
- Would you hire the firm again if you had to do it over again?
- Any other lessons learned from the project that I didn't cover?

# VI. Discuss Schedule for Interviews of Responders

The Committee wants to interview the two qualified responders as soon as possible. Joe will contact Diane Willoughby on Thursday to try to arrange for interviews on Tuesday, November 5<sup>th</sup> (Abacus/Situ) and Thursday, November 7<sup>th</sup> (DRA) at 7:15pm each day, allowing for 30 minutes for a presentation and 30 minutes for questions from the Committee. The responders will have to bring their own projector to make their presentation.

Joe pulled together interview questions that the Committee used for the OPM and modified them for the Designer. His proposed list is as follows:

Questions for the Designer Services Interview

- a. Tell us about your work experience with libraries. You've seen the site and reviewed the documents we have made available. The project is unique in that we're renovating a church into a library. Do you have any creative ideas about this project? What excites you about it?
- b. What challenges do you anticipate with this renovation project?
- c. Tell us about your past library project experiences, specifically for your lead architect.
- d. How do you manage the general contractor to maintain the project schedule without sacrificing quality workmanship and avoiding change orders and cost over runs?
- e. Do you understand that we only have \$125.6K for the Designer Services work, which is all inclusive? What is your billing structure/payment frequency?
- f. Based on what you know today, what do you think the cost of the renovation project should be?
- g. What type of communication can we expect? What type of reports? Attendance at building committee meetings?
- h. Describe a time when you hit a major obstacle during a project and what you did to resolve the issue.
- i. Is there any work that was outlined in the RFQ that you take exception to?

The Committee reviewed the list and suggested adding two questions, one regarding the designer's thoughts about changing the look of the church to make it more inviting, and the second their ability to work within the \$1.7 million budget.

VII. Items not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to meeting

None.

#### VIII. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 5<sup>th</sup> to interview Abacus/Situ, followed by a meeting on Thursday, November 7<sup>th</sup> to interview DRA.

## IX. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: A motion was made by Kevin Rudden, seconded by Jay Washburn, to adjourn. No further discussion

 $\underline{\text{VOTED:}}\,$  Unanimous. The meeting adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

Minutes by Don Morin