



MEDWAY EPFRAC MEETING
Medway Senior Center
7:00 P.M.
Minutes
September 27, 2016

Committee Attendees: Dr. Richard D’Innocenzo, Ellen Hillery (FinCom Alternate), Mike Francis (Open Space), Paul Mahoney (CPC), Cathy Morgan (Friends of Choate Park), Mark Diebus, Rob Pearl, David Travalini (CONCOM), David Blackwell (CONCOM), Michael Schrader (FinCom).

Other Attendees: Allison Potter, Tom Holder.

Committee Chair called the meeting to order at 7:07 PM.

Approval of meeting minutes of 8-23-2016, 09-01-2016, 09-12-2016 –

A motion was made by Mr. Blackwell to approve 8-23-2016 as amended (David Blackwell should be added to Committee Attendees section), seconded by Dr. D’Innocenzo. All were in favor.

A motion was made by Mr. Diebus to approve 09-01-2016 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Schrader. Mr. Travalini abstained.

A motion was made by Mr. Mahoney to approve 09-12-2016 meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Francis. Mr. Diebus abstained.

Review- Draft RFP’s for Consultant Designers

- **Mr. Schrader** discussed the changes/ edits made to the draft RFQ from the last time the Committee met. All the edits in the document are available in track changes.
- *Draft RFP-Pg.2 (Min. Requirements #2):* Language has been changed to clearly state that the potential firm should have lead communities through an alternative evaluation process with input for various stakeholder groups as well as general public.
- *Draft RFP-Pg.3 (Scope & Services):* Task 1 header has been changed from “Background investigation” to “Alternative development and evaluation”.
- *Draft RFP-Pg.3 (Scope & Services):* Task 1- Suggested that the Consultant meeting with EPFRAC to discuss additional alternatives, opportunities to meet program goals and alternative evaluation process should be a joint meeting with CPC and the Board of Selectmen. Dr. D’Innocenzo concurred with the suggestion.
- In #1 under evaluation criteria, reference to firms will be changed to “ Multi-Disciplined”

- Mr. Schrader talked a little bit about the multi criteria evaluation process. He talked about the important to define the alternatives and the criteria for alternatives. Selected consultants will conduct the alternative evaluation and facilitate the process. He also stated that the current structure of the document is for RFQ and the preferred alternative evaluation and scoring matrix could be discussed during scope negotiation. There was discussion on whether to move forward with a RFQ or RFP. The current draft could be changed into a RFP with some minor changes (include proposal, scope, and price to the current language).
- CPC will have to approve the prelim plans before any further work is undertaken.

Mike Francis- He asked if the preferred alternative needs to be approved by BOS and CPC. EPFRAC Chair, Dr. D’Innocenzo stated that EPFRAC Committee is charged with providing recommendations to CPC and the Board of Selectman. It is their expectation that this Committee comes forward with a preferred design concept.

Mr. Holder- He asked if the alternative evaluation process involves a scoring matrix where different criteria are ranked/ scored. He stated that a scoring matrix should be provided to help in the decision process. He asked if it should be stated explicitly in the RFQ or if it’s already conveyed in the language. He stated the importance of including the language in the RFQ so that consultants will come to the meetings prepared to explain the evaluation criteria and scoring methodology when explaining the alternatives(s). He also suggested encouraging joint ventures among the consulting firms. Committee should craft the scope of services for the proposed work.

Pg. 9, #5:“Interview Presentation” bullet will be changed to address Mr. Holder’s point. It was noted that interview evaluation will be applied to the finalists.

Ms. Potter- She asked who will be negotiating the contract/ design services price once the consulting firm is chosen. She asked if a Sub-Committee of EPFRAC, or the Board of Selectman, or town hall staff is expected to conduct the negotiations. Timeline wise, she stated the cost of project should be finalized by the end of March/ April 2017 in order to secure state grants.

Mr. Travalini- Alerted the members on the restricted timeline Committee has to finalize the firm and negotiating the price. He suggested adopting an efficient way to conduct price negotiations. He recommended asking for cost (design and construction) information per site to make an informed decision.

Mr. Diebus- He asked how different the current draft RFQ is from the one that was sent to GALE Associates few years ago. Mr. Holder responded that both the documents are similar and that the current draft solicits newer ideas from the consultants in addition to the concepts in the Master Plan and Master Plan update.

Chair, Dr. D’Innocenzo- To the question on the entity conducting price negotiation(s), Dr. D’Innocenzo stated that an EPFRAC sub-committee (with town representation) will be entrusted the responsibility to conduct negotiations.

Cathy Morgan-Ms. Morgan raised the parking concern issue at Choate Park. She talked about increasing the number of parking spaces as part of this project. Ms. Potter stated that CPC considers there is enough parking. They don’t believe that it will not work aesthetically and is not their priority at this point. Ms. Morgan also suggested more green space at this location.

After considerable discussion, Committee decided to move forward with RFQ.

A motion was made by Mr. Paul Mahoney to move forward with the RFQ as amended with the points discussed at this meeting, seconded by Mr. Pearl. All were in favor.

The amended document will be distributed for members to review before submitting to the Town Counsel.

A motion was made by Dr. D’Innocenzo to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 PM, seconded by Mr. Diebus. All were in favor.

Next EPFRAC meeting is on October 25th, 2016.