

Mount Greylock Regional School District Building Committee
Minutes of Meeting of October 24, 2005

Members present: Irene Addison, Ann McCallum, Thomas Bartels, Jack Hickey, Nat Karns, Andy Hogeland, Bob Ericson, Elisabeth Goodman, Lyndon Moors

Others: Mark Amuso, Bill Travis, a member of the public

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

The minutes of October 3, 2005 were approved unanimously.

1. The meeting began with a preliminary discussion of the process to be used to evaluate the responses to the RFP. The Committee agreed that the evaluation must include verification that the response included all items deemed mandatory in the RFP and use of the evaluation matrix.

2. Bob Ericson made a motion that the responses be accepted for evaluation despite the fact that some responses did not address some requirements in the RFP. Nat Karns seconded the motion. Bob noted that some proposals did not include proof of liability insurance. The Committee voted unanimously to accept the proposals as submitted.

3. Reports on the in-depth review done by groups of 3 Committee members are as follows:

Group One: Irene Addison, Thomas Bartels and Elisabeth C. Goodman
Review of Tessier, DRA and Mount Vernon.

All three agreed that Tessier's proposal could be dropped from further consideration. Documentation of the proposal's completeness will be reported on Bob Ericson's chart by Irene Addison for the 3 proposals reviewed by Group One. DRA and Mount Vernon got high scores and should be considered further.

Group Two: Nat Karns, Lyndon Moors and Bob Ericson
Review of Barry, Burt Hill and ARCADD

All the proposals reviewed by Group Two were considered inadequate. Barry was the best of the three, but none merited further consideration. There was insufficient prior experience or failure to meet requirements of the RFP. Results from Group Two's evaluation also will be documented on Bob Ericson's chart.

Group Three: Andy Hogeland, Jack Hickey; Ann McCallum

Review of Margo Jones (with HMFH); Dore and Whitter, and Moser, Pilon, Nelson
Moser Pilon did not include a project timeline, documentation of creative solutions, or documentation of accuracy of cost estimates for feasibility studies. The Committee agreed that Moser, Pilon's proposal did not merit further review, but that Dore and Whitter and Margo Jones proposals did merit further review. Documentation of the

completeness of the proposals would be made on Bob Ericson's form for the three proposals reviewed by Group 3.

4. The Committee agreed that all committee members would complete the evaluation matrix for all four proposals determined to merit further review, which were:

Margo Jones

Dore & Whittier

DRA

Mount Vernon Group

Jack Hickey will distribute an Excel document to record the numeric scores for the evaluation matrix.

5. The Committee asked Mark Amuso, Business Manager, to set up interviews for the four proposers on Nov. 7 and Nov. 8 from 4PM on.

6. The meeting adjourned at 9:15pm.

Elisabeth C. Goodman