



TOWN OF BOXBOROUGH

BOARD/COMMITTEE: Boxborough Building Committee
MEETING DATE: February 9, 2022
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: Virtual Meeting - this meeting is being conducted via Remote Participation, pursuant to the Current Executive Order of March 12, 2020.

BBC members: Gary Kushner, Les Fox, Maria Neyland, Ralph Murphy, Diana Lipari, Owen Neville, Hugh Fortmiller, Larry Grossman, Bill Litant, Than Stuntz,

Missing: Becca Edson, Bryan Lynch

BBC Advisory: Paul Fillebrown; Jason Malinowski (7:56)

Non-members:

Meeting called to order at 7:05 by the chair, Les Fox

Roll call of attendees:

Diana-present, Gary-present, Maria-present, Bill-present, Larry-present, Al-present, Hugh-present, Owen-present, Than-present, Les-present

Minutes of January 19, 2022 were moved by Diana Lipari and seconded by Hugh Fortmiller. Roll call vote:

Diana-aye, Gary-aye, Maria-aye, Bill-aye, Larry-aye, Al-aye, Hugh-aye, Owen-aye, Than-aye, Les-aye

Approved 10-0

Outside correspondence - none

Les reported on the status of ARPA project proposals. On January 24 the Select Board approved a proposed spend plan and set of projects, following approved guidelines for recovery of “lost revenues” due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The BBC proposal to install a well on the Stow Road site was not included in the lost revenue spend plan.

The previous draft RFQ was reviewed by Captain Malinowski, Bill, Les, Hugh and Al prior to the meeting. A new draft was distributed and discussed by the committee. Discussion by Les regarding the process and MGL process. The person chosen by the RFQ does not need to be the final design team but could be. An Owner’s Project Manager (OPM) would be hired to then help choose the final designer and/or execute a design contract. HKT would most likely be precluded from doing the independent review but could certainly be the final designer. The expectation is that the respondent chosen for review would be an architectural firm. They will review the previous work and assumptions and provide a report to the Committee that would become the basis for the town to proceed to the ‘Big’ job of detailed design and construction specifications. Larry indicated that there are small firms that could do the work versus a full-service firm. The Town can open up the final design RFQ to all firms including HKT. The independent review will address whether the Stow Road site is adequate.

Discussion around reviewing other sites previously considered and rejected. Draft language was proposed in the draft RFQ under Site Selection. Two versions were presented, as indicated with red and black font text.

4. **SITE SELECTION: Considering review of space needs and the existing site constraints study, determine whether the Stow Road site is adequate to support the construction of new public safety facilities. Confirm that the Stow Road site is appropriate for the intended use. Review sites the Committee has rejected, consider other possible site options, and evaluate the Committee’s consideration of the Stow Road site as being most appropriate for new safety facilities.**

Diana Lipari moved to approve the red and not the black text in section 4. Seconded by Hugh Fortmiller.

Diana-aye, Gary-no, Maria-no, Bill -no, Larry-no, Al-no, Hugh-aye, Owen, no, Than-no, Les-no

Fails 2-8. Language approved as voted:

SITE SELECTION: Considering review of space needs and the existing site constraints study, determine whether the Stow Road site is adequate to support the construction of new public safety facilities.

Larry suggested that the RFQ state that the designer will review the site constraints study and “evaluate”, not “validate”. Hugh concurred. Consensus to adopt.

Is 60 calendar days sufficient? Jason put the 60-day time period into the RFQ but could be shortened or lengthened depending on feedback. Fixed fee.

Question on who should be designated as the primary contact. It could be a member of the BBC or Town officer. Consensus to strike “xx will be the primary contact”.

Sections on Town Background - discussion and whether to leave in or take out. Not absolutely needed but no harm in keeping. Decision was to leave it in.

Run statistics discussed and whether to append. The statistics are in the Town report. Designer should be able to determine the stats. Are aging stats important as the Town is currently aging, but cyclical? Could potentially allow the Town to keep the older ambulance as a backup.

Remove section 11 which asks for a timeline to complete the work. RFQ sets expectation for work to be completed in 60 days.

As part of the scoring process there was discussion on (desirability to...) approach to project and demonstrated understanding of public needs. Add back “desirability to approach”. Item 10, regarding sustainable design principles – should require that respondent be familiar with sustainability design.

Les is working with Rajon to determine if the checklist of criterion needs to be included in the RFQ body. Working to determine if there is a standard Town boilerplate or Town contract standards.

Discussion on striking “for the initial phase” after \$20,000 (placeholder),but will review with Rajon to determine if the responder can continue to pursue additional work on the next phase. Jason Malinowski believed the phrase is important.

Les showed a document found by Rajon.

July 2018 revision

M.G.L. c. 7C, §§ 44-58 – DESIGN SERVICES FOR PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS:
 Cities, Towns, Regional School Districts and Horace Mann Charter Schools

Estimated Design Fee (EDF)/Estimated Construction Cost (ECC)	EDF less than \$30,000 or ECC less than \$300,000	EDF \$30,000 or more and ECC \$300,000 or more
Procurement Procedure I	None. Recommend soliciting qualifications and prices from at least three designers.	Qualifications-based selection process. Jurisdiction must either (1) set the design fee; or (2) set a not-to-exceed fee limit and then negotiate the fee with the top-ranked designer within the fee limit.
Advertising Required	No.	Advertise in the <i>Central Register</i> and your local newspaper at least two weeks before the deadline for filing applications.
Designer Selection Board ¹	No.	No – adopt selection procedure in writing. ^{3,9}
Designer Application	No.	Yes. See Designer Selection Procedures for Municipalities . Use “Standard Designer Application Form for Municipalities and Public Agencies not within DSB Jurisdiction (Updated July 2016)”
Designer Evaluation (Submit to DCAMM and Designer Selection Board)	No.	Yes. See Designer Evaluation Forms & Information for Municipalities and Agencies
Registration	Yes.	Yes.
Insurance	No.	At a minimum, the lesser of \$1 million or 10% of the project’s estimated cost of construction. ⁴
Prevailing Wage	No.	No.

RFQ Evaluation scoring matrix

Respondent XYZ	Exceeds	Meets	Partially meets	Other/non-responsive
Scoring A simple check Y/N, numerical value, or relative score against the other submissions?	3	2	1	0 Or Disqualified?
1. Training, educational background of respondent				
2. Depth of experience with similar projects, and prior experience with other municipal construction projects.				
3. Identity and qualifications of all project personnel.				
4. Strength and credibility of client references.				
5. Demonstrated understanding of the tasks to be performed and products to be created.				
6. Completeness of submission.				
7. Current workload and ability to undertake the contract based upon the number and scope of projects for				

Discussion on weighting scale and are we locked into a specific scale in the RFQ. Equal weight to the interview, yes or no. All 10 items are equally weighted, but some are more important than others. Could indicate/group items into weight. E.g. items 2 and 3 if most important could be valued at 50% of total. Potentially lump into groupings. The interview is not part of the ranking but is then done on the top candidates from the criteria matrix. Set the floor not the maximum “at least 2”. The BBC will make the final recommendation on all candidates and then the final interview by the Select Board or a subset of the BBC. The majority of the BBC felt that the interviews should be a subset of the BBC which could include two members of the Select Board if they so desire.

Work to determine if the scoring matrix is required to be included. Les will work with Rajon and the Inspector General. Next meeting will focus on the matrix and vote to move forward

Next meeting March 2 at 7PM

Owen moved to adjourn and seconded by Maria

Diana-aye, Gary-aye, Maria-aye, Bill-aye, Larry-aye, Al-aye, Hugh-aye, Owen-aye,
Than-aye, Les-aye

Adjourned at 9:31PM

LIST OF EXHIBITS:

1. BBC minutes for January 19, 2022
2. RFQ
3. MGL c 7C ss44-58 Design Services for public building projects