

Safety Services Committee
June 18, 2015
Draft

Members Present: Ken Tentarelli, Chair, Ed Thorson, Bob Messenger, Alex Azodi, Ron Williams, Patricia Sherman

Members Absent: Barbara Freeman

Chairman Tentarelli called the meeting to order at 5:22 p.m.

Introductions

The Board members briefly introduced themselves.

Committee operating rules

Chairman Tentarelli said that the Board can operate informally but they do need some rules.

Chairman Tentarelli said that the first rule that should be determined is how many members will make a quorum. Mr. Thorson said that he thinks it would be four. Ms. Sherman said five would be good because it is an uneven number. **Chairman Tentarelli moved for five members for a quorum. All in were in favor.**

Chairman Tentarelli said and the Board agreed that another rule should be that all important things should be decided in a vote and recorded in the minutes.

Decide on length of meeting

Chairman Tentarelli said that the meetings should not be a burden on members. Mr. Thorson said that he thinks that 60 minutes is good. Ms. Sherman said that she thinks that they should have ability to extend the meetings as 60 may be slim. Ms. Sherman suggested the meetings should be 90 minutes with the ability to extend. Chairman Tentarelli said that he thinks that the target should be 60 minutes and should not exceed 90 minutes. Mr. Thorson said that meetings should be kept it to the business and not go off target with time limit. The Board agreed that the interview process may be longer.

Review of the minutes of May 20, 2015: There were no changes made to the minutes. Chairman Tentarelli wanted to thank Patricia Sweet-MacDonald for doing the minutes for the last meeting. **Ms. Sherman made a motion to accept the minutes. Mr. Thorson seconded the motion. The vote passed with five in favor and one abstention.**

Action plan items

Chairman Tentarelli said that he would like to discuss the first item on the plan of action which is to discuss the RFQ submissions and select the top three candidates. The Board first needs to agree on selection criteria.

Chairman Tentarelli read to the Board Ms. Freeman's criteria of what is important to her. Her ranking is: the depth of experience the applicant has in this type of project; their understanding of Newbury's particular conditions; the consultants that they have chosen to be on their team; and the design talents of the architects, meaning their likely ability to design something that fits in with Newbury.

Ms. Sherman said that she had all of those items on her one more which was who is going to be the project manager.

Mr. Azodi asked and Chairman Tentarelli said that it is not clear in the RFQ the Town wanted to know the consultants. Ms. Sherman said that there was only one that did not submit the consultants.

Mr. Thorson said that he would also add to the criteria what designs the applicants have done, how the designs looked, did they fit area, and were they a nice design. He felt that some designs were poor. Chairman Tentarelli rephrased Mr. Thorson to say that the quality of the projects that they have done already is a criteria.

Mr. Messenger asked if there are any plans to pre-check references. Chairman Tentarelli said that should be on the list of action items. Ms. Sherman said that references should be checked after interviews so that they are done without prejudice. Mr. Messenger asked if three out of eight applicants is enough if they do decide they need to interview someone later based on references. There was further discussion regarding this matter and that after interviews the questions to the references can be more specific.

Mr. Messenger asked if someone will be assigned the task of calling references. Chairman Tentarelli said that this discussion should be deferred until another time.

Mr. Williams said that the Board needs to add doing a site visit to the things that they will need to do. Chairman Tentarelli agreed but said that it is not part of the selection criteria.

Chairman Tentarelli said that it seems as though the Board is in agreement on how they are ranking their selections. The Board can then go through their rankings individually or they can multi-vote and everyone can give their ranking through a secret ballot. Chairman Tentarelli said that this is the quickest and equitable. Mr. Azodi asked for clarification and Chairman Tentarelli said that the Board can multi-rank all eight of the RFQ submittals individually, one through eight with one being the best, and then they can take a tally. Chairman Tentarelli said that he would not vote as he will only vote in case of a tie.

Mr. Messenger asked how many of the applicants who submitted the RFQ's attended the pre-submittal meeting. Ms. Sherman answered that all of them attended the meeting.

Mr. Messenger asked about Wallace, who did the previous study, and how they were selected. Ms. Sherman said that the Board of Selectmen chose them because they had done the Town Office building and the work they did on the project previously was the Selectmen's choice.

Mr. Azodi asked and Chairman Tentarelli confirmed that he has Ms. Freeman's rankings.

Mr. Williams said that he did not have one of the RFQ's so he did not vote for one of them.

The scores were as follows:

Corzilius Matuszewski Krause Architects = 23
Tenant Wallace Architects = 29
Alba Architects = 37
SMP Architecture = 9 (Mr. Williams did not vote)
Frank Anzalone Associates = 31
Warrenstreet = 17
Bonin Architects = 45
Dennis Mires PA = 15

Chairman Tentarelli said that the top three choices are: SMP Architecture, Warrenstreet, and Dennis Mires.

Mr. Messenger said that one of the chosen, Warrenstreet, had seven out of ten projects go over budget. Mr. Thorson said that this was due to design changes.

Ms. Sherman said that the top three choices work for her and asked if anyone else had noticed that Corzilius Matuszewski Krause Architects had an excellent bonding history.

Mr. Azodi said that the Board can choose to interview more applicants if they want. Mr. Thorson said that he thought they were going to interview five applicants.

Ms. Sherman said that they have not done a RFP and suggested doing this and then asking them for the information before doing interviews. Chairman Tentarelli said that there are a lot of steps that need to be done before they do the interviews. The Board can work towards doing interviews while they work on what the interviews will involve. Ms. Sherman said that if they write a RFP they may know how to respond to the cost side. They know that they have \$60,000, but they may not need to spend it all. Chairman Tentarelli asked and Ms. Sherman said that she would like to do a RFP and proposal response before interviewing the top three. Mr. Williams agreed as then the Board can develop their questions before doing the interviews. Mr. Azodi asked if they would put a disclaimer that they may not only select from the top three. Chairman Tentarelli asked and Ms. Sherman said that she would tell the three applicants that the Board has chosen three firms and that they are one of them. Ms. Sherman said that Ms. Freeman agreed to the process of doing an RFP. Chairman Tentarelli asked if this is done before scheduling interviews. Ms. Sherman said that doing a RFP may take time and it would be nice to do the criteria in one meeting. Chairman Tentarelli asked if this can be done outside of a meeting. Ms. Sherman said that the Board needs to prioritize their tasks and they need to know what they need. Chairman Tentarelli asked and Ms. Sherman agreed to come up with an outline / bullet list of items and she will email them to the Board before the next meeting. Chairman Tentarelli said that he went online and found sample RFPs. Ms. Sherman said that the Town has samples as the Town Administrator, Dennis Pavlicek, has written them before. There was further discussion regarding the RFP.

Chairman Tentarelli asked what will be done at the next meeting. Ms. Sherman said that the Board will need to agree on what the RFP should include such as the work they will expect to be done. They will then need to task someone with writing the RFP before running it by Mr. Pavlicek.

Mr. Thorson said that he believes that the old firehouse site should not be considered and also said that there is a question as to if the building should be a combined firehouse / police station. Ms. Sherman said that a site analysis will need to be done for the old firehouse site as well as for the other site. They also need a structural condition report on the old firehouse. Chairman Tentarelli asked and Ms. Sherman agreed that this will go on her list.

Mr. Thorson said that he does not think that there is any intent of the Town on using the old firehouse. Ms. Sherman said that part of the analysis will be an indication if there is any use for the building.

Chairman Tentarelli asked and Mr. Thorson said that he agrees with Ms. Sherman's goals.

Mr. Azodi asked Mr. Thorson if he would be opposed to the site of the old firehouse if the expert they hire with an expertise in fire and police stations come back to the Board that it is the best site. Mr. Thorson said that he would not be totally opposed but that the site was the least desirable site indicated at the Town Meeting. Ms. Sherman said that the expert would be wrong because the sight lines are so bad that the State would not like it.

Mr. Williams asked why there are no safety or warning lights for the building. Mr. Thorson explained that the State will not allow any lights.

Ms. Sherman said that if they hire the right architects that the job includes doing the work to come up with the best possible site. Mr. Azodi said that he does not want the Board to have a preconceived notion regarding what is best. Ms. Sherman said that she thinks that the Board will be able to look at both sides. Chairman Tentarelli said that the Board can choose to make it a preconceived notion that the old fire station site is not the best one.

Mr. Messenger asked when the Board should start talking about a specific location. Ms. Sherman said that she thinks it is reasonable to go to Town Meeting with a site recommendation and cost estimate. Mr. Thorson said that the project will require a bond and they should be able to go to the Town Meeting with that information.

Ms. Sherman said that a big thing will be a written program for the fire department, police department and library. While the engineers are doing their geo-tech stuff, other things will be happening simultaneously. Mr. Williams asked if the fire and police departments have come up with their lists of essentials. Ms.

Sherman said all of that will be taken care of in the programming phase that will happen between the architects and the departments.

Determine date/ arrangement of next meeting

The Board agreed after general discussion that the next meeting will be on July 2nd at 5:30 pm.

Ms. Sherman asked that the Board set the meeting calendar at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Melissa Pollari
Recording Secretary

Action Items for the July 2nd meeting:

Ms. Sherman – write an outline / bullet list of items for a RFP and email them to the Board before the meeting

Board - set the meeting calendar