

MINUTES
Randall Library Building Committee
March 23, 2012

Convened at 7:40 p.m. in the Warren Room. Members present: Steve Jelinek, Tom Lam, Peter McManus, Tim Reed, Jim Salvie, and Barbie Wolfenden. Steve Dungan was absent.

The Kang proposal, originally rejected for not meeting the submission requirement in Section C of the RFP, “a description of the firm’s approach” to the project, was discussed following a written request from the vendor for reconsideration. It was agreed that the work plan in the proposal could be considered a “simplified” approach. Therefore, Jim moved to accept the Kang proposal, Steve J seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

The other two vendors, LLB Architects and Dermady Associates, who were rejected because they did not specifically state that they would not remove key personnel without the town’s approval (Section C of the RFP), also requested reconsideration. Since they were not on the agenda, it was agreed to meet on Wednesday, March 28, to vote on whether to accept their proposals.

Regarding the interview process – The goal is to interview three vendors, If two are tied, they will interview four. Interviews will be 30 minutes each, which includes any Q&A.

Regarding the proposal rankings – To ensure objectivity, the tabulation of committee members’ scores will use only the numerical ratings. Comments on the forms can be used in discussions and interviews.

Following a discussion of the rating criteria, Steve J moved to modify the Minimum Selection Criteria A, B, and C to be “Meets” and “Does Not Meet,” Barbie seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

There are now three more proposals to review to prepare for the Wednesday meeting: Kang, who is now accepted, and the other two vendors, who are conditionally accepted, subject to a vote to accept on Wednesday.

Regarding the interview questions – Must the same questions be asked of everyone? There was general agreement that some vendor-specific questions will be necessary, especially to clarify items in the proposals. Jim will check with Bill on this.

It was agreed that the interview evaluations will use both numbers and narrative. How to blend the scoring of the first round with the interview results was raised. The interviews are to see if the Town can work with this team. Objective scores are needed for the Board of Selectmen. Some felt that the interviews should be rated independently of the earlier scores. Others felt that everyone will bring in their own preconceptions, which will affect the interview ratings.

There was general agreement to use the numerical scores from the proposal evaluations to propose to the Board, only to be changed by the interviews.

Barbie moved to decide the top three, based on the numerical scores, with the interview process providing a qualitative evaluation that could reorder the top three. Steve J seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

At 9:05 p.m., Steve moved to adjourn, Peter seconded, and the motion passed by unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan McLaughlin

Approved 4/5/12