

Phase II Committee Meeting
September 23, 2019

1. Meeting called to order at 6:15pm

2. **Attendance**
Members present: John Skavlem, Lindsey von Holtz, Dan Caplinger, Al Terranova, Bill Auger, Talia Cappadona, Julius Munemo. Through Phone Call: Steve Miller

3. **Minutes** of last meeting: **Approved** 8-0 (Motion: Al, Second: Bill)

4. **Notes on Bids** by John Skavlem based on phone call with Art Eddy.
 - a. There are three bids, all are high. Bids are 19-22% higher than committee estimate (larger percentage from SC approved amount).
 - b. All three companies (Mountain View, Clark Companies, RAD Sports) have good reputations and submitted all requirements.
 - c. There is a large difference/variety in the three bids. This is leading the committee to believe there is a misunderstanding in the bid specifications. Some categories are similar to each other and similar to estimate. Others (such as Synthetic Turf, Softball Field and Amenities) show large differences.

5. **Options** for committee from this point were presented via a document from Traverse/Art. This document is available, though summary below.
 - a. Option #1: Accept a bid (best qualified low bid). If School Committee approves of this option, MG is then legally obligated to the bid price, though could possibly negotiate 20% decrease in cost through.
 - i. Question was raised about looking at track record of company to determine how often bid was adjusted.
 - ii. Concern raised about the likely challenge for the SC to approve a high bid.
 - b. Option #2: Reject all bids, re-bid the project at a later time.
 - c. Option #3: Extend the bid period to all three companies. This would require a proposal of value engineering deducts to provide pricing for.

- i. Concern about postponed time line. Normally around one week, but expect additional delays.
 - ii. Concern was raised about the lack of specific costs (itemization) of various items before creating a proposal for value engineering.
 - iii. Concern was raised about how this option would affect the scope of the project and whether comparisons were still possible.
 - iv. Concern was raised regarding an adjustment in lowest bidder after completion of an extension.
 - v. Art (through phone call with John) believes all three companies will likely continue to work with the school.
 - vi. It is still possible to go back to original bid if this option is chosen.
6. **Motion** was made (Motion by Al, Second by Julius) to extend the bid process to allow vendors to resubmit new specifications based on proposed parameters. **Approved** 8-0.
7. **Next Steps:**
 - a. Might be beneficial to know the amount in the Williams Grant for the three projects (maintenance/endowment, Phase I, Phase II)
 - b. Art Eddy (with help of committee) can create a proposal to send to bidders. It will need to be approved by Phase II Committee.
 - c. It is likely a good option to bid the track separately at a later time.
 - d. Does this committee create a Plan B or is that the task of the School Committee.
8. Meeting **Adjourned** (Motion by Al, Second by Julius)