

TOWN OF HARVARD

MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMITTEE



Meeting Minutes – Meeting # 11 – 9 August 2011, 7:30 – 9:00AM, Old Library

Attendees

Pete Jackson, Doug Coots, Lou Russo, Wade Holtzman, Ron Ricci

1. Read and approved August 2 meeting notes.
2. Review of Proposals
 - a. Pete has financial reports from the firms that wished to keep this information private.
 - b. A few of the proposals were missing many elements, indicating a canned response. Everyone agreed that the level of care taken in preparing the proposal is of concern, especially when this is such a detail oriented project.
 - c. Wade weighted heavily the firms that looked like they had handled similar projects and looked for transferable experience.
 - d. Doug looked to clarify OPM project experience with similar projects. Have they worked as an OPM on similar projects? Or in some other capacity? Often the exact role was unclear. What kind of experience is more important? Years of OPM experience or similar project experience in a dissimilar role.
 - e. Lou felt that the medium to small firms make a better fit and allow for more personalized attention. Lou also weighted the financial stability of each firm given the current economic climate. For example, Lou was concerned that Atlantic showed almost no assets.
 - f. Pete was concerned with how well would they work with our committee and the community. Looking for a facilitator rather than director.
 - g. Doug was more impressed with the proposals that engaged in a “conversation” with the RFS and answered with specifics - it shows an understanding of the project. Doug also agrees that we are looking for a partner, not a show-runner.
 - h. MBC Members each declare their “top 3” (in no particular order)
 - i. Pete
 1. Skanska
 2. Vertex
 3. NETCO (later replaced by DTI)
 - ii. Lou
 1. Diversified (later replaced by Skanska)
 2. NETCO
 3. DT
 - iii. Wade
 1. Vertex
 2. NETCO
 3. DTI
 - iv. Doug
 1. Diversified (later replaced with Vertex/Netco)
 2. Skanska
 3. DTI
 - i. When scoring question #1 Doug added the qualifier “As OPM.” Changed meaning/ranking especially for P3. It appeared as though P3 was lacking OPM work and it was unclear if they

had worked past feasibility on many of their listed projects. Do they have construction experience only? P3 also listed some out of date projects.

- j. The discussion then turned to DTI – Doug was concerned that they didn't show any wood frame experience. Pete's work experience with DTI was complimentary. Lou's concern is that the principal would not be directly involved and felt that we might be better served by someone who is not an architect. Lou feels it is important that the firms demonstrate that they are capable of detail oriented management, especially in detailed design process.
- k. Vertex was then discussed. Doug felt it was unclear that they had done OPM work but lots of school projects showed some important experience working with towns. Pete likes that they have both an engineer and architect on the team and stated that Vertex "won" in criteria #1 and #7 on his tally sheet. Lou felt it was a boilerplate proposal. Wade pointed out that OPM experience is stated but just in a different space in the proposal (under project experience and reference.)
- l. Pete is changing NETCO out – DTI is now on his "top 3" list
- m. The other members asked Pete about his prior experience working with DTI with special concern for questions #5 and #7 (while still recognizing the proposals as the primary source for creating a ranking.) Nothing in the report would have pushed Doug to give them to a number 2 on either of these questions. Pete had them as 2 (but maybe a soft 2.) Pete's experience with DTI was that they run a small staff and that meant low overhead and good clerical work. DTI brought in a Clerk of the Works early and that was of benefit to the project. Wade's concern was that there was nothing listed under education. It also seems like DTI is carrying a lot of projects – how can we be sure we won't be fighting for attention? Pete is confident that John will be our guy given his familiarity with the town.
- n. We revisited a question from the previous meeting -- What does it mean to be busy? How does a firm manage multiple projects simultaneously? Perhaps this is an issue better pursued in an interview.
- o. The conversation turned to a discussion of question #3. Doug's winning scores came from #10 and #3. He feels we need someone with a strong understanding of up to date code. Lou added that the OPM is not empowered to make a decision on what meets code but certainly they can flag certain issues. Doug favors OPM knowledge concerning question #3. Certain weaknesses in architecture and engineering are inherent. Skanska outlined their understanding well. For other firms, Doug had to make an assumption based on recent in state projects.
- p. Diversified received high scores from Lou and Doug. Wade was concerned that he found no reference to their cost approach. Pete liked that they had experience with senior centers, but was concerned that they only showed one historic building. Pete and Doug gave them a high score on #4 both felt the proposal revealed that they had read and understood our RFS. Pete was concerned that they have a limited number of architects and engineers on staff and only one Clerk of the Works on staff. Overall low scores for #6. Doug finds them comparable to Vertex and Netco and is willing to give up Diversified. Lou will also give up Diversified
- q. All members present agree to "cross off" Atlantic, Daedlus, Diversified and P3.

Next meeting will be at the Hildreth House at 7PM on 8/10.

Approved

Rachel Holcomb