

TOWN OF HARVARD

MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE



Meeting Minutes – Meeting # 10 – 2 August 2011, 7:30 – 9:00AM, Old Library

Attendees

Doug Coots, Mark Cooper, Chris Cutler, Lou Russo, Wade Holtzman, Marie Sobalvarro

1. Read and approved July 26 meeting notes as amended.
2. Site visit went well, we can expect reasonable response
 - a. Standard visit, as expected
 - b. 9 firms attended
 - c. Proposals will be ready to pick up Thursday afternoon
3. Questions and Evaluation criteria for OPM Proposal Review
 - a. Ranking system came from rankings used in previous proposals
 - b. Ranking method to be used to create “short list” of candidates. Doug suggests that we re-ask the same ten questions during the interview process to allow each candidate to elaborate. This will allow us to include in our final decision projects over 5 years old that would otherwise fit our criteria.
 - c. Questions by number
 - #1 – Wade asked if having one question for two different historic buildings is confusing. This led to Lou asking if we should we weight the questions. Wade suggested that we circle back after finalizing the list of questions; Doug suggested that we have a weighting scale ready and only use it if we feel we need to.
 - #2 – Mark suggests we change benchmark to 5 years (but not for #1 – projects don’t change.)
 - #3 – Wade asked how we would know they have current knowledge of pertinent construction laws. Doug thinks that this is more of an interview question, but that in terms of each proposal, we can look at comparable projects and assume knowledge of code. Chris asked what we should mark if we can’t find the answer in the proposal. Include a “couldn’t find answer” note. Doug commented that if there are lots of holes in the proposal – generally speaks to something larger.
 - #4 – How can we avoid redundancies? How would the candidate know the talents of the members of the MBC?
 - #5 – Relates to question #4.
 - #6 – OK
 - #7 – Somewhat dependent on size of firm (how much can be done “in house”), if dealing with a smaller firm can we use this rating metric? Should we assign a lesser value when weighting questions? (be careful with zero rating).
 - #8 – Doug – We don’t want to be “orphaned” because the firm we choose is too busy and over-scheduled. Lou – we should be able to make a judgment taking a look at current and past workload for a pattern. Doug – we need to try to judge how

we would factor into a firm's work when comparing a larger firm against a small (and assuming very hungry) firm looking for project. How can we be sure we would we get their "a-team"? Lou – at this point we are only offering schematic design... looking for a long-term view.

#9 – OK

#10 – OK

4. RFP for Architect – Inputs from section authors
 - a. Mark – will send out selection criteria section this morning
 - b. Chris – sent his section to Pete
 - c. Lou – Standard AIA contract – without pre-defined scope (allows for most flexibility). When appropriate, a construction attorney should be consulted.
5. Other Business
 - a. Thursday – pick up proposals at Town Hall between 2 and 4 PM
 - b. Doug suggests that everyone begin thinking about a list of questions for the interview; Mark - reading proposals will help clarify list of questions.
 - c. Pete will send out tally sheet for proposal review Thursday PM
6. Agenda for next meeting
 - a. Discussion of short list
 - b. Questions for interviews
7. Town Hall Restoration – update from Doug
 - a. Doug has heard that the majority of selectman do not want to wait to do restoration work
 - b. Tim Bragan met with architect last week. A plan of action has been declared.
 - c. Tomorrow night, 7:30, old library – public hearing with architect and historic commission
 - d. Concern over public perception – will the public see a need for a larger project if the outside of the Town Hall looks good?

Approved

Rachel Holcomb