

900 Worcester FRP Planning Committee

January 31, 2013

7:45 AM at Warren

Attending:

Andy Wrobel, Miguel Lessing, Suzy Littlefield, Meghan Jop, Don McCauley, Jim Conlin, Barbara McMahon, David Perry, Heather Sawitsky, Dave Hickey, Mike Pakstis, Hans Larsen, Deborah Carpenter, Marjorie Freiman, and Jan Kasetta.

Public Speak:

None

Minutes:

Motion: To accept minutes of January 17, 2013, by Suzy Littlefield
Seconded: By David Perry
Vote: All in favor

Finalize Master Site Plan Cost Estimates:

Dave Hickey said he had a revised estimate of \$165k but it probably still lacked sufficient traffic review – only \$19k. He asked for a chance to review it more closely since it was only received late the previous night. Dave noted that \$55k of the cost was for preliminary building design. A contingency of 20% will also be included. Dave will send his revised update over the next few days. If these numbers hold, the total cost of the Master Site Plan would be in the \$225k ball park with CPC asked to fund 62.5% (\$140.6k) and Town general funds the balance (\$84.4k).

Discussed RFP writing support funding needs:

Tom Harrington walked the group through an excellent presentation (handout) explaining the difference between a 30b procurement and a “public construction” procurement. For various reasons he suggested, and the group agreed, that 900 Worcester will want to follow the 30b procurement process and allow “matrix scoring” instead of only “lowest bid”. This is very important since the “matrix scoring” will allow us to choose the vendor, building design, programming, pricing, etc. through a scoring matrix. To avoid ending up in the “public construction” procurement process, we need to avoid specific criteria (such as a specific design) and request objectives.

This decision in approach will impact how the RFPs are developed and reviewed. A question was raised as to whether PBC would be involved in the construction later. The answer seemed to be “no” since it will not be a Town funded construction project but Andy will discuss with the chair of PBC. A question came up about whether “prevailing wage” would be required and if so it would raise construction costs up to 20% (Braintree’s estimate)? More analysis is required for this question. If it is a “public construction” project the answer is certainly – yes. If a 30b procurement process is used, then the answer maybe No. Tom also suggested that the RFP require a performance bond to require builder / operator to do what they said they would.

David Perry speaking for the rink subcommittee identified a need not to develop the RFP but

rather to review the responses of \$10k-\$15k. The pool subcommittee will look at the programming study estimates and change their need to have the analysis feed more directly into the RFP. They expect to need \$50k but will need to put their programming study out for bid. Together these amount to and ask of \$65k from the Town general funds.

Other Annual Town Meeting Topics:

Many members discussed the upcoming ATM and whether to present motions given the unresolved appeal. No conclusion was reached but all agreed if we do go to ATM this spring the use of the funds would be contingent upon the successful resolution of the appeal and close on the sale with the Church. This topic will be reviewed at our next meeting either the 7th (if more information is known) or the 14th.

CPC meeting and upcoming Advisory meeting:

An update to the CPC is scheduled for Feb 13th. If funding will be requested at ATM, the CPC will be asked to fund the 62.5% of the Master Site Plan (only) as originally outlined in the pro forma shared at STM in June. The meeting with Advisory was also scheduled for the Feb. 13, but will be moved back.

Next Meeting:

The next meeting will tentatively be scheduled for Feb 7th with a fall-back date of the 14th should more time be needed to decide whether to ask ATM for funding this April. In addition, a review of the Aquatic Center survey will be conducted (it was not done in the last meeting due to inadequate time).

Motion: To adjourn by Tom Harrington
Seconded: By Heather Sawitsky
Vote: All in favor

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

Andrew Wrobel

AW/jk/kb