

DRAFT

MINUTES – SPECIAL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING TOWN OF BARNET, VERMONT WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2017

Meeting convened at 6:30 p.m. in the conference room of the Town Clerk's Office.

Committee members present: Chair William Graves, Dylan Ford, Benjamin Heisholt, Dennis McLam, Stanley Robinson, Laurajean Stewart, David Warden, and Dana Young.

Others present: Kara Denio and Rebecca Reese (Lyndon State College News 7).

1. Consideration of minutes of special meeting held January 30, 2017

Mr. Robinson moved to approve as presented the minutes of the special meeting held January 30, 2017. Seconded by Mr. McLam and approved by voice vote.

2. Consideration of proposals from architects for feasibility study on McIndoe Falls Academy through Municipal Planning Grant

Mr. Graves indicated that the Committee had received proposals from four firms: Arnold & Scangas, Bast & Rood, EH Danson, and Studio Nexus. All members of the Committee present confirmed they had received emails containing the four proposals, and had reviewed them prior to this meeting. Mr. Graves suggested there would be no harm in discussing the proposals in a general manner in open session, but that he would prefer to enter executive session to perform detailed analysis and critique. General discussion ensued, as summarized below.

- Mr. Graves noted that all four proposals use third party estimators.
- Mr. Graves distributed copies of a series of questions he generated in the process of assembling an analysis rubric. These questions were as follows:
 - Is the proposal complete?
 - What subcontractors and services does the proposal provide?
 - What is the value assigned for the architects oversight and basic service?
 - What are the values for subcontracted services?
 - How does experience and references match this project?
 - Is a clear schedule shown?
 - What is the distance to the site for this firm?
 - How many meetings are scheduled with the public?
 - How many meetings are scheduled with the board/committee?
 - Is there room for negotiation?
 - What is the apparent outcome of the feasibility study?
 - Will this outcome be equal to another?
 - What are the differences which affect similarity and/or equivalence?
- Mr. Graves distributed copies of a comparative table prepared from his review of the proposals. These tables compile the various costs quoted by the firms and compare them side-by-side. In their proposals all the firms arranged costs differently, and some included in their grand total items that were listed as supplementary costs by others. Part of Mr. Graves' table is a recapitulation of eight individual service costs quoted in each proposal: in-house, civil engineering, structural engineering, mechanical engineering, historic, estimate, and reimbursable. Items generally identified as supplementary costs (e.g. survey, site plan, water and septic design, site assessment, historic report, etc.) are isolated and listed separately on the table. The total quote for each firm on the eight standard costs are as follows:
 - Arnold & Scangas: \$20,540
 - Bast & Rood: \$34,664

- EH Danson: \$28,420
- Studio Nexus: \$31,300
- Ms. Ford distributed copies of the Request for Proposals (RFP) to which these proposals responded, and reviewed the requirements presented therein. She then distributed copies of a scoring rubric produced by Alison Low of Northeastern Vermont Development Association, as based on the above questions developed by Mr. Graves and the requirements presented in the RFP. This rubric consists of ten sub-categories distributed across the three categories stipulated in the RFP. Each sub-category is assigned a value of ten percent. Each sub-category is scored on the scale of Low (2 points), Present (4 points), Good (6 points), Strong (8 points), and Exceptional (10 points). The categories and sub-categories are as presented below:
 - 1) Consultant Qualifications (40%)
 - a) The right people/skills for the job
 - b) Experience with similar projects
 - c) Ability to work with municipalities
 - d) Familiarity with potential funding sources
 - 2) Scope of Work, Fees, Methodology, and Schedule (40%)
 - a) Ability to reach a “shovel-ready” outcome
 - b) Feasibility of schedule
 - c) Public engagement strategies
 - d) Room for negotiation on cost
 - 3) Quality of Proposal (20%)
 - a) Clarity, professionalism
 - b) Completeness – addresses all the points on the RFP

Mr. Graves and Ms. Ford shared the results of their scoring of proposals, as prepared prior to the meeting. These were as follows:

	<u>Ms. Ford</u>	<u>Mr. Graves</u>
Arnold & Scangas:	92/100	80/100
Bast & Rood:	52/100	72/100
EH Danson:	70/100	74/100
Studio Nexus:	86/100	78/100

- Discussion was had regarding details of the various elements of the rubric. This included the relative importance of proximity to the project, municipal experience, etc. Ms. Ford reported that Alison Low suggested the Committee add approximately two to three months to each proposal’s timeline.

Mr. Graves indicated that he would entertain a motion to enter executive session to discuss the specific merits of each proposal.

- Mr. Warden moved that the Board make a specific finding, pursuant to 1 V.S.A. Section 313 (a)(1)(A), that the premature public knowledge of discussion concerning details and evaluations of proposed contracts for the McIndoe Falls Academy feasibility study, would clearly place the Town of Barnet at a substantial disadvantage. Seconded by Ms. Stewart and approved by voice vote.
- Mr. Warden moved that the Board enter executive session pursuant to 1 V.S.A. Section 313 (a)(1)(A) to discuss details and evaluations of proposed contracts for the McIndoe Falls Academy feasibility study, as the premature public disclosure of which would clearly place the Town of Barnet at a substantial disadvantage. Seconded by Ms. Stewart and approved by voice vote. Entered executive session at 7:25 p.m. Those present in executive session: Mr. Graves, Ms. Ford, Mr. Heisholt, Mr. McLam, Mr. Robinson, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Warden, and Mr. Young.
- Mr. Warden moved to exit executive session. Seconded by Mr. McLam and approved by voice vote. Exited executive session 8:10 p.m.

- Mr. McLam moved that Mr. Graves, on behalf of the Committee, communicate with Arnold & Scangas to confirm cost and schedule details contained in their proposal and, barring any alterations, recommend that the Selectboard accept the proposal of Arnold & Scangas. Seconded by Mr. Warden and approved by voice vote.

3. Other business

No other business was discussed.

4. Adjournment

Mr. Robinson moved to adjourn. Seconded by Ms. Stewart and approved by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

A true copy.

Attest: _____
Town Clerk