

# Town of Colchester, Connecticut

127 Norwich Avenue, Colchester, Connecticut 06415

Gregg Schuster, First Selectman

**Board of Selectmen Regular Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, March 1 2012  
Colchester Town Hall**

**Meeting Room 1 – 7:00pm**

HANCY A. BRAY  
TOWN CLERK

*Hancy A. Bray*

2012 MAR -2 PM 2:29

RECEIVED  
COLCHESTER, CT

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** First Selectman Gregg Schuster, Selectman James Ford, Selectman Stan Soby, and Selectman Rosemary Coyle

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Selectman Greg Cordova

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Derrik Kennedy, Walter Cox, Patti White, Dot Mrowka, James Paggioli, Art Shilosky, Ron Tarlov, Town Attorney Pat McHale, Ryan Blessing, and other citizens.

**1. Call to Order**

First Selectman G. Schuster called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. Additions to the Agenda**

None.

**3. Approve Minutes of the February 18, 2012 Regular Board of Selectmen Meeting**

R. Coyle moved to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2012 Regular Board of Selectmen meeting with a correction under "Liaison Report, Planning & Zoning – 'subdivision' should read 're-subdivision'," seconded by S. Soby. Unanimously approved. MOTION CARRIED.

**4. Citizen's Comments**

D. Dander commented on the selection process for the architect for the WJJMS school and senior center project.

**5. Boards and Commissions – Interviews and/or Possible Appointments and Resignations**

**a. Planning & Zoning Commission. Member or Alternate Appointment. David Wasniewski to be interviewed.**

David Wasniewski was interviewed.

**6. Budget Transfers**

None.

**7. Tax Refunds & Rebates**

R. Coyle moved to approve tax refunds in the amount of \$36.71 to Tracey Bohuslaw, \$2,992.14 to Clayton & Laura Brown, \$21.31 to Alan Solek, \$6.47 to Tadeudz Drazewski, and \$106.87 to Tadeudz Drazewski; seconded by S. Soby. Unanimously approved. MOTION CARRIED.

**8. Discussion and Possible Action on FY 2012 Emergency Management Performance Grant Program**

S. Soby moved to approve the 2012 EMPG grant application and authorize the First Selectman to sign all necessary documents, seconded by R. Coyle. Unanimously approved. MOTION CARRIED.

**9. Discussion and Possible Action for State Matching Grant Program for Elderly and Disabled Demand Responsive Transportation**

R. Coyle moved the resolution that the Board of Selectmen for the Town of Colchester hereby authorize the First Selectman, Gregg Schuster, to negotiate and execute all necessary Agreement/Contract documents on behalf of the Town of Colchester with the Department of Transportation of the State of Connecticut and to affix the corporate seal, seconded by J. Ford. Unanimously approved. MOTION CARRIED.

**10. Discussion and Possible Action on Architect Selection for Schematic Design on WJJMS Project**

The Board discussed a change in the State Statute regarding purchasing to allow Towns to consider other factors when selecting architectural services and that the Town is adhering to State law, provisions of the Town referendum, the hard work of the Building Committee, and the selection process. Building Committee Chairman T. Tyler commented on the selection process and scoring matrices. The First Selectman will ask the Town Attorney to look at the selection process and relevant State Statutes. No action taken.

**11. Discussion and Possible Action on Personnel Policy**

Board discussed changes to Personnel Policy. No action taken.

**12. Discussion and Possible Action on FY 2012-2013 Budget**

G. Schuster thanked staff for their hard work throughout the budget process and its compilation then gave a brief overview of the proposed budget's revenues and expenditures. No action taken.

**13. Citizen's Comments**

D. Wykoff commented on information that was supposed to be provided by the police commission, but never was and questioned why the Town is funding another police officer when teachers are being laid off.

D. Dander commented on Building Committee short-list for architects and the selection process.

**14. First Selectman's Report**

First Selectman G. Schuster reported that last week's drug sweep at Bacon Academy by the Colchester Police and the State Police resulted in four arrests, the Town of Hebron is considering leaving KX Dispatch which could increase the budget on Colchester's end in the future, and pending legislation of Town concern.

**15. Liaison Report**

G. Schuster read a statement for G. Cordova regarding the Board of Education, which is attached.

S. Soby reported that the Agriculture Commission had a presentation from the executive director of the Connecticut Farm Bureau regarding farmland preservation and the Town is in good position to take advantage of such recognition.

**16. Executive Session to Discuss Negotiations with Colchester Firefighters Union, UPPFA, IAFF, Local #3831**

S. Soby moved to enter into executive session to discuss negotiations with the Colchester Firefighters Union, UPPFA, IAFF, Local #3831, and invite Town Attorney Pat McHale and Fire Chief Walter Cox, seconded by R. Coyle. Unanimously approved. MOTION CARRIED.

**17. Executive Session to Discuss Municipal Employees Union, Local 506, SEIU, AFL-CIO, CLC (Town Administrators) Contract**

S. Soby moved to enter into executive session to discussion Municipal Employees Union, Local 506, SEIU, AFL-CIO, CLC contract, and invite Town Attorney Pat McHale and Fire Chief Walter Cox, seconded by R. Coyle. Unanimously approved. MOTION CARRIED.

Entered into executive session at 9:24 p.m.  
Exited from executive session at 9:41 p.m.

**18. Discussion and Possible Action on Municipal Employees Union, Local 506, SEIU, AFL-CIO, CLC (Town Administrators) Contract**

No action taken.

**19. Adjourn**

S. Soby moved to adjourn at 9:42 p.m., seconded by J. Ford. Unanimously approved. MOTION CARRIED.

Respectfully submitted,



Derrick M. Kennedy  
Executive Assistant to the First Selectman

Attachments:

- Information received by the Board from D. Dander
- Liaison report from G. Cordova

## Results by Ranking Categories Used in Selection Process

(For each of the four highest scoring Architectural Firms that were deemed to have met all the qualifications, earning them interviews.)

Highlighting Denotes Winner in Category	Objective Criteria				Subjective Criteria
		Bid Price	RFQ Evaluation From Matrix Total Points By Criteria		
1 <sup>st</sup> 2 <sup>nd</sup> 3 <sup>rd</sup> 4 <sup>th</sup>					
Jacunski-Humes Architects	4 <sup>th</sup>	\$ 57,100	4 <sup>th</sup>	40.80	Tied for 3 <sup>rd</sup>
Lawrence Associates	1 <sup>st</sup>	\$ 24,500	2 <sup>nd</sup>	41.80	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Silver-Petrucci + Associates	3 <sup>rd</sup>	\$ 51,000	1 <sup>st</sup>	43.20	Tied for 3 <sup>rd</sup>
Tecton Architects	2 <sup>nd</sup>	\$ 32,500	3 <sup>rd</sup>	41.00	1 <sup>st</sup>

### Comparison of Results by Categories for

The Recommended Firm, "Tecton" and "The Lawrence Associates"

Highlighting Denotes Winner in Category	Objective Criteria				Subjective Criteria
		Bid Price	RFQ Evaluation From Matrix Total Points By Criteria		
1 <sup>st</sup> 2 <sup>nd</sup>					
Lawrence Associates	1 <sup>st</sup>	\$ 24,500	1 <sup>st</sup>	41.80	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Tecton Architects	2 <sup>nd</sup>	\$ 32,500	2 <sup>nd</sup>	41.00	1 <sup>st</sup>

# TOWN OF COLCHESTER, COLCHESTER PURCHASING POLICY

## SECTION B PROCEDURES FOR REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL/COMPETITIVE BID

### 4. BID OPENING & AWARD

All bids, and bid security if applicable, must be submitted to the Purchasing Agent in sealed envelopes and show on the face of the envelope the bid number, the title of the bid, and the bidder's name. All envelopes will be date and time stamped as received.

At the date and time stated in the legal notice, all bids will be opened in public, read aloud (vendor name and bid amount only) and recorded. No bids shall be accepted or opened that were not submitted in compliance with the procedures set forth in the notice advertising the bid.

The award shall be made to the bidder whose bid meets the requirements, terms and conditions contained in the bid specifications, **and is the lowest** among those bidders possessing the skill, ability, and integrity necessary for faithful performance of the work based on objective criteria considering past performance and financial responsibility (the "Lowest Responsible Qualified Bidder"). Bid award is not based solely on the lowest fee proposal submitted, but includes all other considerations listed below in "Lowest Responsible Qualified Bidder."

Within a reasonable time following the bid opening, the bids will be reviewed in detail by the department head/school administrators and Purchasing Agent to ensure the apparent low bidder meets all specifications of the "Lowest Responsible Qualified Bidder." If this bidder does not meet the specifications, or is not judged responsible, the next lowest bidder's bid will be reviewed for compliance with the specifications. The foregoing process will be followed until the Lowest Responsible Qualified Bidder is found.

In determining the Lowest Responsible Qualified Bidder, the following criteria will be considered, as applicable:

- The ability and capacity of the bidder to perform the work based on an evaluation of the character, integrity, reputation, and experience of the bidder. Consideration shall be given to previous work performed by the bidder for the Town or the Board of Education or for other agencies, including the quality and degree of satisfaction with the work performed.
- The financial resources of the bidder and the bidder's ability to secure any required bonds and/or insurance.
- Compliance by the bidder with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, including any licensing requirements.
- Delivery or completion time.
- **Cost.**
- Involvement in litigation.

## SECTION C PROCEDURES FOR OPTIONAL REQUESTS FOR QUALIFICATION

### 3. EVALUATION & AWARD WHEN REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION PROCESS IS UTILIZED

At the date and time stated in the notice advertising the bid, all proposals will be opened in public and recorded. No proposals shall be accepted or opened that were not submitted in compliance with the procedures set forth in the notice.


The Purchasing Agent will convene a review panel of not less than three individuals which will rank proposal submissions as follows: experience with similar projects; work approach; work schedule; staff qualifications; ability to meet requirements, terms, and conditions outlined in the RFQ; and firm's resources and stability.

A list of the most qualified firms will be developed. An interview will be conducted with a minimum of the top three qualified firms based on rankings. Fees are not to be taken into consideration as part of this determination.

After determination of the most qualified firms, the panel will open sealed envelopes containing fees. **The panel will recommend a firm based on the ranking combined with the fee** and will notify the Purchasing Agent by memo of its recommendation. The Purchasing Agent will bring the recommendation forward to the Board of Selectmen or Board of Education for approval as required by the Town Charter, State statutes, Board of Education policy, and this policy. A record of all proposals submitted, giving the names of the bidders, the amounts of the bids, and indicating the successful bidder shall be preserved by the Purchasing Agent in accordance with State law.

**Substitute Senate Bill No. 1406**

adopted by the State Board of Education concerning bidding and approval of plans and specifications by the Department of Education's school facilities unit, the town of Middletown may commence a project for fuel cell installation at Middletown High School and shall be eligible to subsequently be considered for a grant commitment from the state, provided plans and specifications have been approved by the Department of Education's school facilities unit. (1) The portion of the project funded from the Connecticut Clean Energy Fund as administered by Connecticut Innovations, Inc. shall not be considered a school building project expense, (2) the incremental costs of construction not funded from said fund that are attributable to the installation of a fuel cell and related equipment and facilities shall be fully eligible school building project costs for purposes of calculating the school building project grant, (3) the wall and resulting area enclosing the fuel cell, and any slab area for an emergency generator, shall be excluded from standard space calculations, and (4) the public request for proposals for alternative energy power sources and generator as conducted shall meet all public bidding requirements and preapproval of plans and specifications. The fuel cell and generator plans and specifications shall not be reviewed by the Department of Education. Connecticut Innovations, Inc. shall certify to the Department of Education that the fuel cell and generator were installed according to industry standards and applicable building and safety codes.

 : Sec. 25. Subsection (b) of section 10-287 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2007*):

(b) All orders and contracts for school building construction receiving state assistance under this chapter, including orders and contracts for architectural or construction management services, shall be awarded to the lowest responsible qualified bidder only after a

The current version of the Connecticut General Statutes Section 10-287:

(b) (1) All orders and contracts for school building construction receiving state assistance under this chapter, except as provided in subdivision (2) of this subsection, shall be awarded to the lowest responsible qualified bidder only after a public invitation to bid, which shall be advertised in a newspaper having circulation in the town in which construction is to take place, except for (A) school building projects for which the town or regional school district is using a state contract pursuant to subsection (d) of section 10-292, and (B) change orders, those contracts or orders costing less than ten thousand dollars and those of an emergency nature, as determined by the Commissioner of Education, in which cases the contractor or vendor may be selected by negotiation, provided no local fiscal regulations, ordinances or charter provisions conflict.

(2) **All orders and contracts for architectural or construction management services shall be awarded from a pool of not more than the four most responsible qualified proposers after a public selection process. Such process shall, at a minimum, involve requests for qualifications, followed by requests for proposals, including fees,** from the proposers meeting the qualifications criteria of the request for qualifications process. Public advertisements shall be required in a newspaper having circulation in the town in which construction is to take place, except for school building projects for which the town or regional school district is using a state contract pursuant to subsection (d) of section 10-292. Following the qualification process, the awarding authority shall evaluate the proposals to determine the four most responsible qualified proposers using those criteria previously listed in the requests for qualifications and requests for proposals for selecting architectural or construction management services specific to the project or school district. **Such evaluation criteria shall include due consideration of the proposer's pricing for the project,** experience with work of similar size and scope as required for the order or contract, organizational and team structure for the order or contract, past performance data, including, but not limited to, adherence to project schedules and project budgets and the number of change orders for projects, the approach to the work required for the contract and documented contract oversight capabilities, and may include criteria specific to the project. **Final selection by the awarding authority** is limited to the pool of the four most responsible qualified proposers and **shall include consideration of all criteria included within the request for proposals.** As used in this subdivision, "most responsible qualified proposer" means the proposer who is qualified by the awarding authority when considering price and the factors necessary for faithful performance of the work based on the criteria and scope of work included in the request for proposals.

Scoring Matrix - Totals of Averages			R	Mosher-Pilon-Nelson Architects	JCJ Architecture	Quisenberry-Arcari Architects	Northeast Collaborative Architects	Jacunski-Humes Architects	Silver-Petrucci + Associates	Preiss/Breismeister	O'Riordan-Migani Architects	Robinson-Green-Beretta	Friar Associates	C.J. Lawler Associates	Drumme-Rosane-Anderson	Lawrence Associates	id3A	Joseph T. Sepot Architects	Tecton Architects
Criteria	Pts.	8		6	5	11.5	4	1	16	15	14	9	13	7	2	10	11.5	3	
A	Demonstrated success on past School Building projects	0 - 5	4.40	4.60	4.20	3.80	4.60	5.00	3.00	3.20	3.40	4.00	4.40	4.40	4.80	3.80	1.20	4.40	
B	Demonstrated success on past Community Center projects	0 - 5	1.20	3.40	4.00	3.20	4.00	2.80	1.60	3.40	2.80	1.80	0.00	2.20	4.00	0.80	1.60	3.80	
C	Demonstrated success on past Senior Center projects	0 - 5	1.80	1.20	4.20	1.00	4.00	4.00	2.20	3.20	2.00	1.00	0.00	3.20	4.00	0.40	3.60	3.60	
D	Ability to commit necessary resources and complete project on-time	0 - 5	3.40	3.80	3.20	2.60	3.40	3.40	3.00	1.60	2.00	2.80	3.20	2.80	3.20	2.80	2.80	3.20	
E	Qualifications / experience of individual personnel	0 - 5	3.60	3.60	3.40	2.80	3.40	3.80	2.60	2.60	3.00	3.60	3.20	3.20	3.80	3.20	3.00	3.40	
F	Qualifications of design team / consultants	0 - 5	3.20	3.40	3.20	2.80	3.60	3.40	2.00	2.40	2.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.40	3.00	2.80	3.40	
G	Firm's perception of project requirements	0 - 5	2.80	3.40	3.80	3.60	3.80	3.80	3.20	2.40	2.60	3.60	3.20	4.00	4.20	3.40	2.80	3.80	
H	Innovation/creativity/functional design	0 - 5	3.00	3.20	3.20	2.60	3.20	3.40	2.20	2.40	2.40	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.00	2.80	2.40	3.60	
I	Budget and cost control experience	0 - 5	4.00	4.00	3.60	2.40	4.00	4.80	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.40	3.00	3.80	4.00	4.00	3.80	4.00	
J	Quality assurance / control	0 - 5	4.00	4.00	3.40	2.60	3.80	4.20	2.40	2.40	3.00	3.40	3.40	4.20	4.40	3.80	3.60	4.00	
K	Firm's proposal quality and compliance with RFQ	0 - 5	4.60	4.20	3.80	3.40	3.00	4.60	2.60	2.80	2.60	3.20	3.40	4.00	3.00	3.60	3.20	3.80	
Total of Average Points by Criteria		0 - 55	36.00	38.80	40.00	30.80	40.80	43.20	26.80	29.40	30.00	33.20	30.20	38.20	41.80	31.60	30.80	41.00	

5



**Regular Meeting, January 26, 2011 - 7:00 PM**

Members Present: Thomas Tyler, Anthony Tarnowski, Joseph DeLucia, Joseph Ruiz

Members Absent: Paul Picard, Pam Scheibelein

Others Present: Director of Facilities Greg Plunkett, Board of Selectman Jim Ford, Senior Center Director Patti White, Senior Center Liaison Goldie Liverant, John Malsbenden, Irene Malsbenden, Tracy Butterick

Item 5

- Discussion and possible action on determining architects to be interviewed: After reviewing the 16 submitted RFQs, the average of individual members scoring using the matrix approved at the last meeting, were totaled. (see attached) The following four architects scored the highest: Silver- Petrucelli and Associates, Lawrence Associates, Tecton Architects, Jacunski – Humes Architects. Members discussed the results and were in agreement that the four architects that scored the highest meet all qualifications.

Item 6

- Establish questioned to be used during architect interviews: Questions to be used during the interview process were discussed and categorized.

Item 7

- Finalize interview process. Architects will be asked to bring the RFP in a sealed envelope which will not be opened until after interviews have been completed. A matrix, similar to that used to select the architects to be interviewed, will be developed to use during the interviews.

**Special Meeting, February 1, 2012 - 7:00 PM**

Members Present: Thomas Tyler, Anthony Tarnowski, Joseph DeLucia, Joseph Ruiz, Paul Picard

Members Absent: Pam Scheibelein

Item 3

- Finalize questions for Architect interview process: Questions to be asked to interviewing architects were finalized.

**Special Meeting, February 6, 2012 – 6:30 PM**

Members Present: Thomas Tyler, Anthony Tarnowski, Joseph DeLucia, Joseph Ruiz, Paul Picard,

Members Absent: Pam Scheibelein

- Tecton Architects was interviewed.
- The Lawrence Associates was interviewed

**Regular Meeting, February 9, 2012 - 7:00 PM**

Members Present: Thomas Tyler, Anthony Tarnowski, Joseph DeLucia, Joseph Ruiz, Paul Picard, Pam Scheibelein

Item 5

- Committee members evaluated architects based on interviews and qualifications.
- After a lengthy discussion and the opening of sealed bids A. Tarnowski motioned to request the Board of Selectman to authorize the signing of any and all contracts with Tecton Architects, Inc for the sum of \$32,500 for the purpose of developing schematic drawings and cost estimates for the Colchester Senior Center Community Center, Middle School building project, seconded by J. Ruiz. Vote was unanimous. MOTION CARRIED.

**Senior Center, Community Center, Middle School  
Building Committee  
Architect Interview Questions  
February 6 and 7, 2012**

1. There are several different, yet equally important components of this project (school, senior center, community center,). How does your firm propose integrating these elements into one cohesive project?
  
2. Due to the complexity of the project, what approach will you utilize to identify the unique challenges including phasing and minimizing impact on the school and how will you propose to meet and resolve those challenges in a timely manner?
  
3. Discuss your experience and success with funding mechanisms and requirements for maximum reimbursement for schools, senior centers and community centers.
  
4. Discuss your ideas to support the Town in implementing a multi-faceted communication program to help ensure referendum success.
  
5. Describe something that went "wrong" with a recent project and how your firm worked to find a solution.
  
6. Do you utilize a web site based management program for design and construction? If so, what is the program and explain how it works and what access the building committee will have to the site.

**From:** David Dander [mailto:ddander@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 01, 2012 9:12 AM  
**To:** Greg Plunkett; Thomas Tyler; gplunkett@colchesterct.gov  
**Cc:** Derrick Kennedy  
**Subject:** Repeated request for information

Mr. Plunkett,

Thank you for providing the questions the building committee used to evaluate the architects during the interviews. I have also asked (*repeatedly*) for the method that each building committee member used to translate the architect's performance during each 45 minute interview into the rankings of 1- 4. **See highlighting below.**

On the surface, it looks like it was a very subjective process when you consider the variation in scoring by individual building committee members. The most glaring example of this is with the rankings given to Silver-Petrucelli and Associates. They were the highest ranking of "1" from one building committee member while receiving the lowest ranking of "4" from three other building committee members. It's almost like they were at different interviews.

Almost as glaring is the disparity of rankings given to the Lawrence Associates. They received "2's" from two building committee members while receiving the lowest score of a "4" from another building committee member.

"Could you please provide me with the criteria used to evaluate the four shortlisted architectural firms (*based on their interviews*) together with **how each building committee member scored using that criteria.**"

I'm simply trying understand the process used.

Thanks again for you attention to my request for information.

Sincerely,

Dave Dander

Thu, March 1, 2012 2:23:27 PM

RE: Repeated request for information

From: Greg Plunkett <gplunkett@colchesterct.org>

[View Contact](#)

To: David Dander <ddander@sbcglobal.net>; Thomas Tyler <jtyler2@sbcglobal.net>; gplunkett@colchesterct.gov

Cc: Derrick Kennedy <dkennedy@colchesterct.gov>

Dave, I'm not sure I can provide you with any additional information. Each committee member ranked the four finalists based in their interview. There are no other documents that were used. Please feel free to call.

Gregory J. Plunkett  
Director of Facilities, Operations and Grounds  
Town of Colchester  
Colchester Public Schools

8

## Building Committee's Matrix

Scoring Matrix		J a c u n s k i - H u m e s A r c h i t e c t s	S i l v e r - P e t r u c c h i + A s s o c i a t e s	L a w r e n c e A s s o c i a t e s	T e c t o n A r c h i t e c t s
Colchester Community Center William J. Johnston Middle School Architect Selection RFQ # 2011-21					
J. DELUCIA		2	4	3	1
P. PICARD		3	4	2	1
J. RUIZ		3	2	4	1
T. TARNOWSKI		3	4	2	1
T. TYLER		4	1	3	2
Total Points		15	15	14	6

## Building Committee's Matrix With Scoring Key Using 1 = Highest Score 4 = Lowest Score

Scoring Matrix		J a c u n s k i - H u m e s A r c h i t e c t s	S i l v e r - P e t r u c c h i + A s s o c i a t e s	L a w r e n c e A s s o c i a t e s	T e c t o n A r c h i t e c t s
Colchester Community Center William J. Johnston Middle School Architect Selection RFQ # 2011-21					
Key: 1 Point = Highest Score 2 Points = Medium High 3 Points = Medium Low 4 Points = Lowest score  Best possible Score = 5 Worst Possible Score = 20					
J. Delucia		2	4	3	1
P. Picard		3	4	2	1
J. Ruiz		3	2	4	1
T. Tarnowski		3	4	2	1
T. Tyler		4	1	3	2
Total Points		15	15	14	6

## Matrix Using 4 = Highest Score 1 = Lowest Score

Scoring Matrix		J a c u n s k i - H u m e s A r c h i t e c t s	S i l v e r - P e t r u c c h i + A s s o c i a t e s	L a w r e n c e A s s o c i a t e s	T e c t o n A r c h i t e c t s
Colchester Community Center William J. Johnston Middle School Architect Selection RFQ # 2011-21					
Key: 4 Point = Highest Score 3 Points = Medium High 2 Points = Medium Low 1 Points = Lowest score  Best possible Score = 20 Worst Possible Score = 5					
J. Delucia		3	1	2	4
P. Picard		2	1	3	4
J. Ruiz		2	3	1	4
T. Tarnowski		2	1	3	4
T. Tyler		1	4	2	3
Total Points		10	10	11	19

## Matrix Using A or 95% = Highest Score D or 65% = Lowest Score

Scoring Matrix		J a c u n s k i - H u m e s A r c h i t e c t s	S i l v e r - P e t r u c c h i + A s s o c i a t e s	L a w r e n c e A s s o c i a t e s	T e c t o n A r c h i t e c t s
Colchester Community Center William J. Johnston Middle School Architect Selection RFQ # 2011-21					
Key: A 95% = Highest Score B 85% = Medium High C 75% = Medium Low D 65% = Lowest score  Best Possible Average Score = A 95% Worst Possible Average Score = D 65%					
J. Delucia		B 85%	D 65%	C 75%	A 95%
P. Picard		C 75%	D 65%	B 85%	A 95%
J. Ruiz		C 75%	B 85%	D 65%	A 95%
T. Tarnowski		C 75%	D 65%	B 85%	A 95%
T. Tyler		D 65%	A 95%	C 75%	B 85%
Total Points		C 75%	C 75%	C- 77%	A- 93%

On 2/18/2012 12:41 PM, David Dander wrote:

Hi Jim,

I hope things are well with you. I'm contacting you with a concern and I've also contacted Rosemary. As you know, the building committee for WJJMS opted not to choose the Lawrence Associates, but instead chose Tecton Architects. The Lawrence Associates were \$8,000 less than Tecton Architects. I find this troubling and curious on a couple of fronts.

First, the Lawrence Associates has a long and positive relationship with Colchester. Having served on two building committees, the one for Jack Jackter and also for CES, I've had 10+ years time to work with and know Anwar Hossain from the Lawrence Associates. I believe that his firm is definitely qualified.

Secondly, it would appear that the building committee may not be following the law. Specifically, Public Act 07-249, Substitute Senate Bill No. 1406 states the following: "All orders and contracts for school building construction, including architectural services, must be awarded to the lowest responsible qualified bidder." I've attached an excerpt from this Bill for your convenience.

By virtue of being included on the building committee's short list of architectural firms, the building committee deemed the Lawrence Associates qualified. In fact, you were at the meeting of the building committee on January 26 when, according to the minutes of that meeting, they determined exactly that. So why didn't they get recommended as the firm of choice?

Thanks,  
Dave Dander

**Re: A Hello and a concern**

Mon, February 20, 2012 8:02:32 PM

From: James Ford <ford\_james\_w@sbcglobal.net>

To: David Dander <ddander@sbcglobal.net>

Cc: Gregg Schuster <gschuster@colchesterct.gov>; Stan Soby <soby@sbcglobal.net>;

Rosemary Coyle <rosemarycoyle@sbcglobal.net>; Greg Cordova <gecordova@comcast.net>

Hello Dave;

I understand the Building Committee used a Quality Based Selection system (QBS) which is approved by the State and recognized in the section of the statute you attached to your email. I was only at one meeting of the Committee and was very impressed with their diligence and process which they undertook to examine the 16 submissions that they received. At that meeting I did comment to the Committee how important it was that they feel comfortable with the firm they chose and how important the interviews were for that purpose.

The committee to my knowledge interviewed four firms and Lawrence Associates was one of those firms. I believe the Building Committee has conducted an exhaustive effort and considered all firms on an equal basis.

The selection of professional services in the state statute and our purchasing regulations make price only one consideration. QBS is a system designed to obtain the best result for the project not necessarily the least costly. I have confidence in the Committee decision.

Sincerely,

Jim Ford  
Colchester, CT

10

## LIAISON REPORT

### BOARD OF EDUCATION

First, they reported on the success of the drug search and seizure that occurred last week. Karen said due to the extensive notifications there were no negative responses from the parents or public at large. Jeff stated that even the students that were found in possession were very courteous with the authorities.

The other major discussion took place over the budget that they are presenting to the BOF next week. There were two major concerns discussed at length. The BA math teacher and Project Oceanography. The board and administrators agreed that the priority would be for teachers if given the opportunity to add something back. There were discussions that portions of the Project O could be factored into the regular curriculum and they would investigate other options including a pay to play field trip.

Thank you,

Greg Cordova