

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

Betty Novy, Clerk-Treasurer, was also present.

Kumbier moved, 2nd by Lancour to approve minutes of the January 31, 2011 meeting as printed. Motion carried.

Review Revised Proposals for Construction Management Services that include Architectural Services

Proposals were reviewed as follows:

Firm Name	Total Construction Services Fee as a Dollar Amount	% Fee Mark-up for Change Order Work	Architectural Services	Total CM & Architectural Services
Scherrer Construction Co., Inc. (Construction Manager Fee Revised) P.O. Box 740 Burlington, WI 53105	\$70,000.00	2%	\$ 39,000.00 (Traditional Construction)	\$109,000.00 (Traditional Construction)
Anderson-Ashton, Inc.** 2746 S. 166th St. New Berlin, WI 53151 (includes architectural services)	\$121,000.00	5%	Not listed separately	\$121,000.00 (Traditional Construction)
The Peter Scherrer Group (CM Fee revised based on an accelerated construction schedule) 565 Milwaukee Avenue, Suite 3A Burlington, WI 53105	\$80,000.00	5%	\$ 39,000.00 (Pre-Engineered Metal Construction) \$42,000.00 (Traditional Construction)	\$119,000.00 (Pre-Engineered Metal Construction) \$122,000.00 (Traditional Construction)
Selzer-Ornst Co. Construction Svcs 6222 W. State Street P.O. Box 13097 Wauwatosa, WI 53213	\$91,800.00	6%	\$ 52,000.00 (Traditional Construction)	\$143,800.00 (Traditional Construction)

Novy reported on communication with Bill Matthews of Anderson-Ashton. Anderson-Ashton declined the invitation to submit a proposal for construction management services only. Matthews was upset that their fee proposal amount had been released to the competition. However, these numbers become a matter of public record once they are opened and read. Matthews indicated Anderson-Ashton is flexible on the fee and they hope to be given an opportunity to adjust the amount if it becomes the determining factor of whether they are awarded the work.

It was also noted that initial proposals submitted by Anderson-Ashton and Peter Scherrer offered less liability insurance coverage than the \$5,000,000 umbrella policy specified in the original request for proposals. Peter Scherrer Group's proposal indicated an upcharge of \$5,500 to implement that level of insurance coverage. Anderson-Ashton did not specify what the additional cost would be to provide coverage at that level.

There was discussion on how coverage specifications were determined. The template utilized for the original request for proposals specified \$10,000,000 coverage. However, this was amended when both the Village's insurance company and engineer determined \$5,000,000 as acceptable for a project this size. Consensus of the Committee was that the \$5,000,000 coverage level will be required of whomever is awarded the contract. Proposers should be made aware that this level of insurance will be mandatory.

The discussion moved on to safety requirements. It was noted that Selzer-Ornst's fee proposal allocates only a small amount of costs towards a safety director. There were questions about the responsibilities of a safety director, what is considered an adequate amount of time for that individual to perform his or her duties, and who bears the liability if safety regulations are not properly observed on the work site. Committee members agreed this should be clarified when interviewing candidates.

Select proposers to invite for interviews

Committee members found all four proposals well qualified. Consensus of the committee was to invite all four for interviews. The order of interviews was discussed. Slips were filled out displaying the names of each proposer. These slips were folded, shuffled, and then distributed to four members of the committee to determine order. The order was called out as follows:

1. The Peter Scherrer Group
2. Selzer-Ornst Co. Construction Services
3. Anderson-Ashton, Inc.
4. Scherrer Construction Co., Inc.

Finalize questions and rating system for interviews and select dates

Novy reported re-phrasing some of the questions that had been approved at the January meeting to address the fact that architects will now be part of the construction management interview process. Committee members reviewed the revised questions with the following results:

- A question was added regarding comparing the cost of implementing LEED principles (green building design) against long-term operational cost savings.
- A question referencing experience with other municipal projects is to be clarified to "municipal projects similar in size to this project"; and a personal reference is to be requested for those projects.
- A question regarding methodology to ensure compliance with public bidding and prevailing wage requirements was expanded to include reference to encouraging participation of local contractors in the bidding process and an inquiry of what advertising methods will be used to solicit bids.

- A new question is to be added regarding the processes the construction manager uses to qualify or disqualify bidders and what factors award recommendations are based on.
- A question addressing safety regulations is to be expanded to include a definition of what safety standards are mandated and who bears liability if safety violations occur.

Committee members were directed to submit any other questions they think of to Novy in advance of the interviews.

The interview rating system was then discussed. Each committee member will be provided with a question sheet for each proposer. A section will be provided adjacent to each question where committee members can take notes and score the answers from 1 (unacceptable) to 4 (extraordinary). Upon completion of interviews, Novy will tally the scores to determine which proposer scored highest overall; and for each question individually. This information can then be used as a tool to make a final selection.

Committee members were questioned on whether they wished to determine scores during the meeting; or have time to think them over. Consensus was they would like time to determine their scores before submitting them to Novy for the tally.

Future meeting dates and agenda items were determined as follows:

Monday, March 28, 2011: Meeting to begin at 6:15 p.m. with interviews to progress as follows:

6:30 p.m.: The Peter Scherrer Group
7:00 p.m.: Selzer-Ornst Co. Construction Services
7:30 p.m.: Anderson-Ashton, Inc.
8:00 p.m.: Scherrer Construction Co., Inc.

Proposers are to be instructed to provide a five minute introduction, followed by a question and answer period.

Wednesday, April 6, 2011: Meeting to begin at 7:00 p.m. with the meeting to progress as follows:

- Review of tallied scores; and
- Possible selection/ recommendation of construction management and architect award.

Kumbier moved, 2nd by Weinkauff to adjourn at 8:00 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty J. Novy, CMC CMTW
Clerk-Treasurer