

Sudbury Center Improvement Advisory Committee
Minutes
March 13, 2006

PRESENT: Deborah Kruskal, Eva MacNeill, Rich Davison, Scott Carpenter, Joe Sziabowski, Jim Hodder, Frank Riepe, June and Clay Allen, Larry O'Brien, Jody Kablack, Bill Place

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm.

The committee discussed the recent interviews that were conducted regarding the RFP.

3 firms were interviewed on March 6, 2006 – BSC Group, Denig Design and Carol Johnson & Associates. Committee members Frank Riepe, Deborah Kruskal, Rich Davison, Joe Sziabowski, Eva MacNeill and Bill Place and consultant Carolyn Britt were in attendance at the interviews. A consensus at the end of those interviews was that Carol Johnson & Associates should become a finalist. Denig Design had weakness in effectively communicating the broad issues of the scope of the RFP. BSC Group had a technically strong proposal, but the committee members were not confident in the design abilities of the team.

3 firms were interviewed on March 7, 2006 – The Cecil Group, Walter Cudnohufsky Associates and Moriece & Gary. Committee members Frank Riepe, Deborah Kruskal, Rich Davison, Joe Sziabowski, Jody Kablack and consultant Carolyn Britt were in attendance. A consensus at the end of those interviews was that The Cecil Group should become a finalist along with Carol Johnson. Moriece & Gary were very qualified and the team was strong, but the committee feared that preconceived notions of what should be done may have already been formed, based on a sketch that was presented at the interview. Walter Cudnohufsky Associates were extremely qualified, and possibly the most qualified of the entire group, but their price proposal was too high and they were not eager to scale it down at the request of the committee.

J. Kablack reported that the Sudbury Foundation had approved the grant request of the Town Manager for \$50,000, and the Community Preservation Committee had approved a \$15,000 request out of administrative funds.

Further discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of the Cecil Group and Carol Johnson continued. Cecil has more similar experience, particularly municipal experience. Their lead engineer, Marie Harris, was a weak link, however the engineering firm SEA was highly regarded in their field. References were checked by J. Kablack, and all those spoken to gave excellent references for all members of the team. Cecil is a medium sized firm and their hourly rates are lower than Carol Johnson. Given their price proposal, the committee would have flexibility to add items to the scope of services if needed.

Carol Johnson did not have any very similar projects, but was likely very capable of completing the work. They are a large firm with extensive public and private experience. Their reference checks were also all excellent. Joe Sziabowski opined that if they were asked to lower their price or reduce the scope of their proposal, it may be agreed to but the project might suffer as we get 75% of the way through.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously voted to recommend to the Selectmen to hire The Cecil Group for this project. Initial feedback to the consultant is that we expect creativity from their engineers and good presentations. If Marie Harris does not meet these expectations, we will ask that the Cecil Group be the lead presenters at public meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm. The next meeting will be scheduled once the consultant is ready to meet with the committee, which is anticipated sometime in April, 2006. It was also agreed that the visioning session will be moved in the timeline to after the initial assessments and inventories are completed by the Cecil Group, but no later than June 1, 2006.