

Southampton Building Reuse Committee Meeting No. 16

Committee Members Present:

Libby Baldwin	Gary Swanson
Doug Blanchard	Angela Valinski
Bruce Coombs	Margaret Walden
Paula Maak	Tom Whiteley

Others Present: Dennis Sullivan, DA Sullivan

From: Libby Baldwin

Meeting Date: April 16, 2009

Date Minutes

Issued: April 27, 2009
Amended April 29, 2009

On April 16, 2009, Southampton's BRC Meeting No. 16 opened at 7:05 pm at the Town Library. The following are discussion items from the meeting.

1. General

- a. Minutes from Meeting No. 14 were accepted, with a correction to indicate that a reporter from the Springfield Republican was present at the meeting. Amended minutes were subsequently issued.

2. Proposals for Architectural Services

- a. Dennis Sullivan reported on additional due diligence that DAS performed regarding the architectural firms under consideration. The most significant discussion point was that Casella Design Associates does not currently have a registered architect on staff. On this basis, the BRC determined that Casella can no longer be considered as the architect for the Larrabee project.
- b. DAS also reported on the results of the reference checks that were performed for Design Partnership of Cambridge, Caolo & Bieniek Associates, and Reinhardt.
- c. Gary Swanson passed out a list of discussion points focusing on recurring themes that have been discussed during the architect selection process. The majority of the discussion points were determined to not be significant issues for consideration in the evaluation of the architectural firms. The BRC also discussed the \$150,000 fee for architectural services established in the RFP and whether or not it should be a point of consideration for the selection process. The BRC agreed that we need to make sure that the \$150,000 fee is adhered to when negotiating a contract with the architect. The BRC will select the "most advantageous" candidate for architectural services then will enter into fee negotiations with this firm.
- d. The BRC used 2 methods of ranking the remaining candidates as follows: First, BRC members individually ranked the 5 candidates that were interviewed using ranking criteria established in the RFP and subsequently clarified by the BRC. Each firm was ranked on each criteria using a ranking scale of 1 = unacceptable and 5 = highly advantageous. The total point values for each candidate were then tallied. The results of the first ranking are as follows:

<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Points</u>
Caolo & Bieniek Associates	249
Casella Design Associates	232
Reinhardt	246
Design Partnership of Cambridge	247
Clark & Green Architecture	192

The BRC agreed that the point totals were too close to use as a basis for selecting an architectural firm and that three of the firms were essentially tied. A roll call vote was then held to establish each member's preferred candidate based on the top three ranked candidates from the prior procedure (Caolo & Bieniek Associates, Reinhardt, and Design Partnership of Cambridge). The results are as follows:

Tom Whiteley - Design Partnership
Bruce Coombs - Caolo & Bieniek
Margaret Walden - Design Partnership
Libby Baldwin - Design Partnership
Gary Swanson - Design Partnership
Paula Maak - Caolo & Bieniek
Doug Blanchard - Caolo & Bieniek
Angela Valinski - Design Partnership

During the vote, Bruce Coombs and Doug Blanchard objected to the voting procedure, as it was not the original selection procedure established by the BRC. The BRC discussed this at length and decided that the first ranking procedure was "too close to call." In addition, some members did not feel comfortable without a clear consensus among all BRC members.

The 2nd ranking phase resulted in 2 remaining candidates for consideration: Design Partnership of Cambridge and Caolo & Bieniek Associates.

- e. The BRC agree to hold supplemental interviews between the remaining 2 candidates (Design Partnership of Cambridge and Caolo & Bieniek Associates). After the supplemental interviews, the BRC will discuss the candidates and will hold a roll call vote to determine the "most advantageous" candidate for architectural services. The candidate with the most votes will be selected to enter into fee negotiations with the BRC.
- f. DAS will summarize all procedures that the BRC has followed to date with respect to the selection of an architect.

3. Miscellaneous

- a. Paula Maak agreed to summarize the BRC's OPM selection procedures, as requested by Diana Schindler. Paula had some questions regarding some of the required information that were answered at the meeting.
- b. Margaret Walden spoke with the Chairperson of the Town's Energy and noted that she invited the Energy Committee to attend a BRC meeting to discuss their needs. The BRC will try to accommodate energy efficiency into the Larrabee renovation design.
- c. The next meeting will be on Thursday, 4/23/09 @ 7 pm at Town Hall. 2nd interviews will be held at this meeting. The meeting date was subsequently changed to 4/28/09.

- b. The BRC meeting dissolved at 9:35 pm.

4. Action Items

Item No.	Responsibility	Item
12-4	Margaret Walden	Work w/Energy Committee to review potential energy efficiency alternatives with respect to project design
12-5	Angela Valinski	Continue work w/PVPC to review possible funding sources for project
12-6	BRC members	Review "buy local" information
13-1	Doug Blanchard	Contact Northeast Utilities about grant or rebate programs
16-1	DAS	Summarize procedures for selection of the architect

M:\EGB\Building Reuse Committee #16 Summary 041609.doc