

Greenwich Board of Education
Minutes of the New Lebanon Building Committee Meeting

DATE: Wednesday, September 2, 2015
LOCATION: Havemeyer Board Room
TIME: 8:00-10:00 a.m.

Committee Members Present:

Stephen Walko - Chair
Peter Bernstein (BOE)
Dean Goss
Brian Harris
Patricia Baiardi Kantorski – Clerk
Clare Kilgallen

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Jake Allen (RTM)
Nick Macri (P&Z Commission)
Drew Marzullo (Selectman)
Barbara O’Neil- Chairman (BOE)
Will Schwartz (DPW)
Tony Turner (RTM)

Others Present:

Ronald Matten (BOE Director of Facilities)
John Franzione

Meeting called to order by Mr. Walko at 8:00am

1. Review Status/Results of the RFP
 - a. 22 architects came to the mandatory walk-thru
 - b. 15 architects submitted proposals
 - c. Good diversity of firms and wide breadth of experience & fees

2. Mr. Walko brought up administrative issues for the next step in the architect selection process:
 - a. Interviews scheduled for Tuesday, September 8 – plan on entire day
 - b. Meeting on September 9 will be to discuss firms & vote
 - c. If consensus is reached, the committee will make a recommendation on Sept. 10

3. Mr. Walko outlined the objectives for today’s meeting
 - a. Discussion of architect’s selection should not only be based on fee
 - b. Vote on best 5-7 architects to invite to interview
 - c. Non-voting members can contribute comments

4. Questions and issues raised prior to discussion:
 - a. How much and what kind of due diligence should we do?
 - b. Is there enough time between consensus and recommendation? We may want to give ourselves more time between consensus and recommendation.
 - c. Do we have a standard letter for invitation to interview and what should be in it? Mr. Matten said he will work on putting something together.
 - d. Mr. Goss raised potential conflict of interest due to his previous friendship/acquaintance with members of a couple of firms. When asked if his relationship with these firms would influence him, he answered “No.”
 - e. How consuming is this project for a firm?
 - i. Mr. Harris: This is a relatively small project, would require a team of 4-6 people.
 - f. Should we be concerned about the use of sub-consultants?
 - i. Ms. Kilgallen: It is not typical to have everyone on staff so it is typical for firms to use sub-consultants. Firms assume liability for any sub-consultants they bring in.
5. Discussion went around the table. Each person gave his/her criterion for selecting their top 3 – 6 firms to invite to the interview. Criterion included: scope of previous projects, location of previous projects, type/relevance of previous projects, reputation, prior experience working with the town, price.
6. Concerns was raised: Several firms seemed worried about time constraints. There was a discussion about the process and whether there were changes to the approval process that could speed things up. Mr. Matten clarified the approval process.
7. Mr. Eugene Watts informed the Committee that he is getting numerous calls from the firms wanting to know when they will receive a copy of contract to review.
8. There was discussion about the dismissal of KSQ from the MISA project due to errors and omissions and failure to deliver a promised principal. There was a discussion concerning firms who have worked for the town, and whether or not there was any advantage. Pros and cons were voiced and the need to consider previous work.
9. Discussion on plan for Tuesday interviews:
 - a. Questions to be similar for all. The follow up can be different based on their answers.
 - b. There were suggestions made for questions to be asked and when/if the firms would receive any of the questions in advance. The subcommittee will make and email a list of questions to the committee for review prior to Tuesday.
 - c. Letters will go out today to the invited firms.
 - d. At least one question should be given to each firms in advance. They will also be asked to further break out their fees and provide a copy of there presentation.

10. Mr. Harris gave the results of the top picks:
 - a. Top Six firms: Tai Soo Kim (10), Fletcher Thompson (9), Gisolfi/Newman (9), Geddis/SLAM (7), Perkins Eastman (7), Svigals & Partners (6)
 - b. Significant difference between top 6 firms and the others.
 - c. Top six firms were the same for the voting members vs all members.
 - d. Good range of firms and price levels among those selected.

11. A motion was made and seconded to notify the selected firms and inform them that they would be interviewed on September 8, 2015. The presentations would be 25 minutes with a 15 minutes Q & A. They should also be prepared to answer questions about their fees. The committee voted unanimously to approve the motion.

12. A motion was made and seconded to approve the list of six selected firms to be invited to interview. The committee voted unanimously to approve the motion.

13. A Motion was made and seconded to adjourn at 9:47am. The committee voted unanimously to approve.