

Ed Chart called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with Mike Weinkauf, Bob Lancour, Greg Beck, Russ Kumbier, Eric Johnson, Peggy Shumway and Paul Beere present.

Betty Novy, Clerk-Treasurer, was also present.

Weinkauf moved, 2nd by Kumbier to approve minutes of the March 28 and March 29, 2011 meetings as printed. Motion carried.

Review interview ratings, discuss candidates and service proposals, and possibly recommend award of contract: Construction Management/ Architectural Service Proposals

Interview scores were reviewed as follows:

Construction Management/ Architectural Service Team	Total Construction Services Fee as a Dollar Amount	% Fee Mark-up for Change Order Work	Architectural Services	Total CM & Architectural Services	Total Interview Score Submitted by Committee
Scherrer Construction Co. / Timothy J. Carson, Architect	\$70,000.00	0%	\$ 39,000.00	\$109,000.00	352.5
Anderson-Ashton, Inc. 2746 S. 166th St. New Berlin, WI 53151	\$122,350.00	4%	Not listed separately	\$122,350.00	399.0
The Peter Scherrer Group/ Abacus Architects LLC	\$80,000.00	5%	\$42,000.00	\$122,000.00	382.5
Selzer-Ornst Co. Construction Svcs/ TWP Architecture	\$91,800.00	6%	\$52,000.00	\$143,800.00	399.5

Each proposal was discussed as follows:

Scherrer Construction Co./ Timothy J. Carson, Architect. Scherrer Construction’s proposal did not conform to the request for proposals. Instead, they proposed to perform all pre-construction services, but then put the entire project out to bid to a general contractor who would be encouraged to utilize local contractors that may not be able to, or be willing to, secure bonding for the project (bonding fees are higher for smaller contractors). The general contractor would bond the entire project and offer a guaranteed price for construction. Scherrer would provide construction oversight and administrative services, including quality control and warranty supervision, throughout construction and close out of the project. Even though this proposal included an additional layer of cost for a general contractor, Scherrer felt it would give the most opportunity to local contractors to perform the work, be less expensive due to utilization of local contractors and a lower bond rate for the general contractor, and put the risk of construction on the contractor (versus the Village).

Committee members discussed pros and cons of the proposal. Some pros were noted as follows:

- It promised more opportunities for local contractors;
- Scherrer is known for excellent work;

- There are intangible benefits in that Scherrer is involved in the community and gives to local organizations;
- James Scherrer, Sr., is a resident of Rochester and would be driving by the building every day;
- The proposal was creative;
- James Scherrer, Sr., had educated the committee on the options available to purchase construction services and assisted to draft the request for proposals;
- James Scherrer, Sr., also believes this proposal would ultimately save money for the village.

Some cons were noted as follows:

- There is no guarantee a general contractor will utilize local contractors because public construction contracts must be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder;
- Scherrer estimated costs of \$25,000 - \$30,000 for a general contractor. It was noted this was profit only and did not include the cost of a full-time construction superintendent for six months, a safety director, or the bond. The general contractor would also likely charge more for taking on the risk of subcontractors in the area that are not bonded. The committee estimated the cost of a general contractor performing this work as closer to \$80,000 - \$100,000. In contrast, the other proposals included the cost of the full-time on-site construction superintendent and safety director (an estimated \$40,000 cost).
- Some committee members did not like that the request for proposals was not followed because it did not allow for “apples to apples” comparison.

Anderson-Ashton, Inc. Anderson-Ashton’s proposal followed the requested specifications. Committee members discussed pros and cons of the proposal. Some pros were noted as follows:

- Anderson-Ashton noted working with numerous church groups to show their experience building consensus with committees;
- The construction superintendent would be one of the owners of the company;
- They built the Rochester Fire House in the late 1970s;
- Some of their employees live in the local area;
- They presented a recent letter of recommendation from the Village of Mt. Pleasant. Committee members that were familiar with that building project were impressed that it came in under budget and before the deadline;
- All their services are under one roof- design through construction management- conceivably providing better, quicker collaboration among team members;
- They came across as just wanting to put up a good building;
- They have a good safety rating.

Some cons were noted:

- There appeared to be communication issues among team members in that the presentation seemed somewhat disjointed. They all seemed to answer questions independently, with some disagreement amongst themselves. Committee members didn’t really indicate whether that was good or bad- just an observation;
- They did not report the specific processes they used to build consensus among groups (some other teams were able to cite specific processes).

Peter Scherrer Group/ Abacus Architects LLC. Their proposal followed the requested specifications. Committee members discussed the pros and cons of the proposal. Some pros were noted as follows:

- Team members were very professional during the interview and had good communication skills;
- They are strictly construction managers and are not a general contractor. Construction management is their specialty;
- They are a new company, building a portfolio, so the importance of doing a good job is there;
- They provided good examples and strategies for building consensus with groups and showing the monetary impacts of design decisions;
- Peter had already done some comparative budget work so he knew the project was feasible;
- They had an aggressive design-build schedule (but it was noted that the other groups had expressed this as well);
- The three representatives from Abacus Architects seemed confident, thorough and very professional;
- The firm is located in Burlington, thereby strengthening the local economy;
- They had good strategies on how they would encourage the use of local contractors and assist them with their bids;
- The construction superintendent was a full-time person who had safety certifications. This would be supplemented by monthly safety audits.

Cons:

- They didn't really comment on change orders.

Selzer-Ornst Group/ TWP Architecture: Their proposal followed the requested specifications. Committee members discussed the pros and cons of the proposal. Some pros were noted as follows:

- Team members were very professional during the interviews;
- They were a very experienced team, especially the architect;
- They had the best answer on involving local contractors, stressing that they would call them individually if need be;
- Their last answer was that they may be the most expensive up front, but that they guarantee they would produce the lowest cost building- both in construction and operating costs. (It was noted there was no way to prove that unless you were building four buildings).

Cons:

- The cost. The architect was the primary reason why their cost was higher and there was question on whether the village needed to pay \$20,000 more to get a utilitarian building design.

The discussion moved to financial considerations. Costs were compared. Selzer-Ornst is \$20,000 higher than the next highest one. Scherrer Construction is considerably less but that doesn't take into account the general contractor. Anderson-Ashton and Peter Scherrer Group are within hundreds of each other.

It was noted that all the teams were very capable and no one on the committee felt any choice would be bad. The committee decided to narrow the choices by eliminating Scherrer Construction and Selzer-Ornst as they were felt to be the most expensive options. Committee members then each stated individually which firm they would choose and why. Six members chose the Peter Scherrer/ Abacus Architect group; two members chose Anderson-Ashton.

April 6, 2011

Village Hall Building Committee

Page | 4
7:00 p.m.

Kumbier moved, 2nd by Johnson to recommend awarding the contract to the Peter Scherrer/ Abacus Architect team. Votes were: Greg Beck: Aye; Paul Beere: Aye, Russ Kumbier: Aye; Eric Johnson: Aye; Bob Lancour: Aye; Peggy Shumway: Aye. Mike Weinkauf: Nay. Motion passed.

Schedule next regular meeting.

Novy reported the recommendation must go to the Village Board for approval. Once approved, Novy will make contact with the chosen team and ask them to forward the contracts for review and approval. Once that is in process, she will ask the architect for the best way to proceed and contact committee members to schedule the next meeting.

Chart thanked all committee members for the time and effort put into attending the interviews and rating candidate responses.

Kumbier moved, 2nd by Weinkauf to adjourn at 7:55 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted:

Betty J. Novy, CMC CMTW
Clerk-Treasurer