



Fire Station Building Review Committee

Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, August 3, 2016

APPROVED

Selectman Allan Brown opened the meeting at 6:07 pm.

In attendance: Selectman Allan Brown - Chair, Kimberley Edelmann - Budget Committee, David Hartman - Citizen, Howard Kirchner - Citizen at large, Janice Loz - Resident / Zoning Board of Adjustment Chair, Anthony Mento - Resident / Architectural Designer, Ed Raymond - Fire Chief, Peter Wyman - Fire Department

Absent: Peter Ladd - Energy Committee

Others present: Town Administrator Jim Bingham, Martha Mical, Ed Mical, Steve Hall

1. Previous Meeting Minutes

A motion to accept the minutes of the July 20, 2016 meeting failed after discussion. Anthony Mento noted that while the committee was discussing the methods of construction, he had mentioned some numbers, not as exact figures, but only to support the idea that additional funds would be needed at various stages. After discussion about the minutes, it was agreed they would be corrected in Section 3a and then reviewed and resubmitted for approval at the next meet.

2. Review of Draft Request For Qualifications & Proposal

Town Administrator Jim Bingham provided an updated version of a draft RFQ/P for the committee to review. The document was a variation of the Solar Array RFQ/P with ideas from other Towns' past RFQ/Ps. The committee took several minutes to review the updated version.

David Hartman suggested that the RFQ/P should clearly identify which phase of the overall project is being considered at this stage. Under "Purpose", he asked if the project was to design and construct or just to design? Allan said the project was to simply design. Jim noted that the phrasing was confusing and he would adjust it.

David asked where the design requirements (the building program) the committee had agreed upon should be located within the RFQ/P. It was agreed these could be added as an appendix, as was done in one of the example documents the committee viewed.

Martha Mical suggested that the RFQ/P should clearly note that a Construction Manager (CM) will also be engaged during the first phase. Allan noted the first step was to do the RFQ/P for an Architect. It was agreed that the RFQ/P should specify that the selected Architect will be working with a CM. To that point, Anthony suggested wording to include, "Detailed proposal for professional design services for a Phase 1 Conceptual Design. Intent is to hire a Construction Manager under a separate RFP. The Construction Management Model is the chosen delivery model for this project." Jim said he would work those ideas into the next revision.

Allan noted that he wanted to make sure that the dates in the "Background" section are correct. This includes history about the present fire station. The building cornerstone reads 1963. Allan believes the addition was built in 1985, but wasn't sure.

Discussion about whether the Architect would be the partner beyond the first phase. Anthony noted that a full design fee would not be possible until the building design is agreed. However, he offered that wording for RFQ/P could include, "It is the intent of the Board of Selectmen to complete a conceptual design for the facility with an

accompanying quote to follow for full design and engineering."

Peter Wyman asked if the intent was to go out to bid again for the next phase and how that can effect responses to the first RFQ/P. In discussion, Anthony noted that the respondents will likely outline a score of services and deliverables, outline a recommended process through to the end, and with it, their fees. He added that during interviews, the committee can ask questions about next services. He reiterated that without a design in hand, it is impossible to estimate construction costs.

Kimberley asked if it can be specified in the RFQ/P that references may be checked, including speaking with other towns and fire departments. Allan noted that that was in the document and the intent.

Jim noted that the "Purpose" section was still confusing in terms of what was required for the March 2017 Town Meeting. Kimberley suggested an "in score / out of scope" section within the document.

Anthony clarified that the Architect will provide a conceptual design. He is going to meet with the committee, facilitate public sessions, and provide plans and renderings. Then, he is going to give that to the Construction Manager (who will also sit in on some meetings). The CM is going to provide a conceptual estimate based on the renderings. So, before Town Meeting 2017 the committee will have an anticipated cost to build the building, within roughly 20%. At that point in time, the committee and selectmen will ask the Architect how much they would charge for their architectural services for engineering to do the documents. That would be another line item under construction costs. Within the "Total Project Budget" there would also be additional "soft" costs for insurances, legal fees, bond costs, and other miscellaneous costs. All of this will be provided in time to present at Town Meeting.

Allan noted that earth work needs to be considered, too. Anthony said that would be included in the construction costs. He added that at the end of this exercise, the committee will have the construction costs, the soft costs which include the architectural engineering proposal, to have a total to put into the bond. Jim noted that the bond would be put forward at Town Meeting 2018. Howard Kirchner added that for 2017, it was more like a pre-bond effort that was expected.

Janice Loz asked if the cover of the RFQ/P should specify "Phase I" for clarity. Jim answered that in part that was true, but that also they were looking for the respondents to have some buy-in for the next phase. Anthony felt the idea was pretty clear within the document.

Kimberley asked if it was safe to assume that the selected Architect firm would be staying engaged throughout the full project or if there might be a change of Architects for phase two. Peter commented that it could go either way. Allan said he felt he would prefer not to change horses mid-stream, but then noted that the roundabout project did have different phases.

Anthony reiterated that the Architect will not be providing construction prices. He will offer square footage costs. But the Construction Manager will provide information that leads to cost calculations.

Jim asked under what scenarios the Town may need or want to change Architects between conceptual and actual design. Anthony answered when communications were not going well, for example when the committee asks for one style of design and the Architect provides something completely different. Anthony added that he has seen language in RFQ/Ps which says the Town reserves the right to seek alternative options for the next phase. Discussion continued, with agreement that the RFQ/P will make this idea clear. Allan said he does not want the Town to pay twice for services.

Anthony noted that the Town of Newbury hired a phase one designer. The firm came up with some concepts. A year later, the Town went out for an Architect for the next phase. The second firm ignored all of the work done by the first firm, redesigning the building. In the end, the project did not pass at Town Meeting. Now, they may need to look for a third firm to begin again. Allan said he absolutely does not want to have that happen.

Steve Hall, in the audience, asked if the Town should be looking for the CM at the same time as the Architect firm. Allan said that was the idea, but first the committee needed to get the RFQ/P written.

Kimberley asked if the CM should be found first, so that he can help search for an Architect. Due in part to the tight time-line, the committee will continue with the search for the Architect first.

Chief Raymond asked Allan what process was used for design of the highway garage. Allan said it was just him, Ralph Kemper and Dick White. Allan noted that they only had \$300,000 to work with to build the highway garage. Two years later, they got money to build the salt shed.

Anthony noted that the Town of Warner will hold one contract with the Architect. And the Town will hold a second contract with the Construction Manager. He pointed out that another approach some Towns take is to hire an established Architect / Construction Manager team. They would still have two separate contracts, but they would come to the Town as a team. That would mean putting out one RFQ/P for the team instead of two for each role.

David Hartman said he liked that idea (one RFQ/P) and that it sounded less complicated. He believed it would result in less contention and better partnership between the Architect and CM since they would already have the established working relationship. Anthony noted that his points were good, but the dual RFQ/P approach gives the Town more control.

Peter Wyman asked if the check and balance goes away if the Town hires an established Architect / CM pair. Anthony said that that might be reduced. Kimberley reiterated that reference checks are critical, asking other Towns about their experience with the team.

Allan asked what would happen if the Town selected an Architect / CM team and decided that they only wanted to continue with one half of that team, for whatever reason. Jim said it sounds to him that when searching for an Architect for the conceptual, it should be clear that there would be a separate search for a CM. The Architect selected may be able to later help vet the CM.

Returning to the "Background" section, Janice noted that the paragraph was a bit negative sounding. The committee agreed that it could be touched up while still providing some history.

Chief Raymond said just read a history on the Warner website. It says the 1961 and 1962, dedicated on Memorial Sunday in 1962. Several attendees were certain the cornerblock on the building reads "1963". The addition was put on in 1992. He added that it must be true, as it was on the Internet.

Steve noted that communications to citizens are critical. Allan agreed and aims to keep the public informed of how things are progressing.

Allan asked Jim if he was comfortable with the "Expectations" section and ready to move on. Jim said he would like to word-smith it, with Anthony's help. Asked by Allan, Anthony said he was comfortable with the idea.

Anthony suggested that all of the deliverables, including meeting requirements, should be brought together for one section. Everyone agreed. Peter added that the example from Bow, which used a lot of bullets, was easy to read.

Howard noted that the date of the 2017 Town Meeting was shown in one section of the draft as being March 14 and in another section, March 15. Jim noted it may end up being Saturday March 18. The committee agreed the document should reference March 2017 and leave it as that.

Anthony suggested adding a timeline of key dates of the process into the RFQ/P. Allan noted that the dates also have to be considered against the Board of Selectmen's schedule with the Budget Committee, public hearings and all. Overall, everyone agreed that a timeline makes sense, clarifying expectations.

Kimberley asked Jim to try to make the "Background" paragraphs something we would want to read on the Internet for the rest of eternity, keeping it positive.

Janice suggested adding some information about the matrix the Fire Station Building Review Committee created.

Going back to the "Purpose", Allan wanted to be sure the money that will be requested in 2017 is for detailed engineering products and NOT construction. Jim said the next revision will be quite clear.

In the paragraph which talks about the fact that finalist(s) will be invited to review their proposals in a meeting with the Selectmen and committees, Anthony suggested the RFQ/P could note that the Town would have the right to maintain a relationship with the selected firm, or not. Kimberley suggested it should be part of the "Contract Award" section instead. She asked the committee if that should be for Jim and Anthony to finetune. No one spoke against

the idea. Jim agreed to address the comments in the document.

Peter referred to another example RFQ/P which listed the required insurances and asked if the Warner RFQ/P should do the same. Allan noted that one at point, they were listed. Jim said he left it out as it was not applicable at this phase. Anthony agreed that insurances will be required in the next phase.

Kimberley asked Jim about wording of a sentence in the "Certifications" section. Jim will finetune that section.

Allan asked if the reference to a "joint venture proposal" was still needed? It was agreed that was not what was being sought.

Returning to the "Certifications" section, it was agreed that the respondents show certify that they have no conflict of interest. Jim agreed.

3. Committee Membership

Anthony asked the committee if it would be acceptable for him to recuse himself from the committee at some point since he works for an architectural firm. If his firm was selected, he would stay engaged in the project as a member of his firm. If the firm was not selected, he would like to return in his role on the committee.

Kimberley replied that Anthony's contributions to the committee have been so appreciated, that he had provided guidance, insights and other contributions without trying to take over. He has been a valued active participant.

Allan said he felt that Anthony's contributions should not blackball his employer's firm.

Jim suggested that Anthony recuse himself now. Peter commented that the RFQ/P is not specific enough to aim the award to one firm and that at this point, Anthony should stay on a little longer. Janice suggested that the committee vote on this.

Voice Vote on the Motion: Should Anthony stay on the committee until editing of the RFQ/P is complete?

David Hartman - YES
Chief Raymond - YES
Peter Wyman - YES
Kimberley Edelmann - YES
Allan Brown - YES
Janice Loz - YES
Anthony - Not allowed to vote
Howard Kircher - YES

Allan noted that Anthony will remain on the committee for at least one more meeting.

Peter asked if the committee should vote on what to do if Anthony's employer is awarded the contract. He also asked if the committee should vote to allow the firm to respond? Discussion led to the agreement that neither action was required by the committee.

Anthony thanked the committee for their feedback.

Kimberley asked if she can be on the little sub-committee to finetune the RFQ/P with Jim and Anthony, in part to oversee and also to help in the effort. Everyone agreed that was a good idea.

Just prior to adjournment, Chief Raymond asked if the committee would be replacing Anthony if his firm is awarded the project. Allan responded and suggested that maybe Lois Lord would want to step back onto the committee. He also will speak with the other Selectmen. Peter suggested that someone with Anthony's skills would be great, because he had been so valuable to the committee.

4. Next Meeting

Since the Zoning Board of Adjustments (of which Janice and Howard are members) has a meeting at 7 pm on

Wednesday August 10. The committee agreed to meet a half hour earlier than usual.

Next meeting: ***Wednesday August 10 at 5:30 pm***

At that meeting, Jim hopes that the the final RFQ/P will be approved for release.

5. Public Mailing

Jim showed the committee a one page flyer updating citizens about construction of the roundabout. He noted that at 17 cents per flyer, the FSBRC could do the same, sending out updates in the mail.

6. Adjournment

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 7:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Kimberley Brown Edelman
Recording Secretary