

**CITY OF DELAFIELD ARCHITECT & CONSTRUCTION MANAGER COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

CALL MEETING TO ORDER.

M. Czubkowski called the meeting to order at 7:01 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Present

Absent

Marilyn Czubkowski (exited at 8:15 a.m.)  
Tom Hafner (entered 7:05 a.m.)  
Gerald Johnson  
Kean Kemnitz  
Jeff Krickhahn (exited at 8:50 a.m.)  
Gerry Maier  
Robert Mazurek  
Ron Miskelley

Also Present

Jim Romanowski  
Jenny Pope

1. APPROVE MINUTES OF APRIL 17, 2008

**J. KRICKHAHN MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APRIL 17, 2008, ARCHITECT AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGER COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES. J. JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED**

2. CITIZENS COMMENTS

There were no citizens who wished to comment.

3. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON RFP FOR PUBLIC SAFETY CAMPUS.
4. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON REQUEST FOR DOWNTOWN CAMPUS

*Discussion took place on Items 3 and 4 together.*

J. Romanowski reviewed the RFP on a page by page basis. He clarified that at the top there would be a different header. At the bottom of the front page he outlined important information. It was pointed out that they have tentatively set up a site tour and pre-proposal conference for Monday, May 5, 2008 at 9:00 a.m. at the DPW Building.

K. Kemnitz stated that the wording should reflect an Architect and/or Construction Manager. J. Romanowski stated that the two AIA documents (B141) Standard Form of Agreement between the Owner and the Architect, and the Standard Form of Agreement between the Owner and the Construction Manager were written to dovetail together, but the duties are separated. The wording will be changed to reflect "Seeking proposals for qualified firms to provide either or both..." The date will be moved up to Tuesday, May 20, 2008.

**CITY OF DELAFIELD ARCHITECT & CONSTRUCTION MANAGER COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

Page 3 – The last sentence will be changed to “The City will design a design and construction management team from one or separate firms.”

Section C - This is the desired project outcome.

Page 4 – The more recent version (2007) will be adopted versus the 1992 version. The final project scope will be subject to negotiation and determination by this Committee and by the Common Council.

Item 2 – It needs to be decided how the drawings will be reviewed. T. Hafner recommended that before an architect starts to work on the conceptual design, that they go to the Plan Commission to see what they would like to see in architectural styles, etc.

Item 1 – The following will be added: “... an initial meeting with the Plan Commission to identify general building styles.”

Phase 2

Item 1 – Sub-Consultants – It should read “alarm and security systems”. The last two sentences regarding fire protection for these buildings reflect the Plan B Committee’s recommendations.

Item 2 – K. Kemnitz stated that Plan B was calling for a Project Manager to be non-constructor, but that the individual bids would be managed by them. Extensive discussion took place. It was stated that this Committee is trying to accomplish a couple of projects that were put together by the Plan B Committee. With this in mind, not only the bricks and mortar should be similar to what Plan B came up with, but the method of doing it should also be in line with what the Plan B Committee did. G. Maier thought that the architect and construction manager system would work. Discussion took place on bid forms. T. Hafner stated that with multiple contracts any contract over \$25,000 is subject to the public bidding process; this would incur a lot of administrative effort. Additionally, he stated that this would not only open it up to local firms being able to bid, but the obligation would fall on this Committee to prove that someone is unqualified (very difficult to do). If this was broken into a lot of small contracts it could be opened up to some contractors that were not up to the standards; the quality of contractors would be very mixed. However, if a General were hired, they would be responsible for the quality of their subcontractors and would take this into consideration. R. Miskelley expressed his concern if this Committee were to review many contracts from many firms. Discussion ensued as to the proper way to manage the project and the responsibilities/roles of the general contractor compared to those of the construction manager.

M. Czubkowski informed the committee members that the 2007 version would need to be paid for; as it was not downloadable. Yaggy Colby had advised the City that they would be able to acquire this. M. Czubkowski requested that if the Committee had any questions or comments for J. Romanowski (Yaggy Colby) that they be directed to T. Hafner or herself in an effort to assist in cost control.

**CITY OF DELAFIELD ARCHITECT & CONSTRUCTION MANAGER COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

For the remainder of the meeting, T. Hafner assumed the responsibility of Vice-Chair of this meeting. The final RFP's (after T. Hafner has signed off on them) could be posted on the City's website; it was clarified that no mailings of the RFP's will take place. The final Plan B Committee's report will be re-posted on the website.

J. Romanowski stated that there are still a lot of duties that the construction manager is responsible for in the AIA standard form of agreement between the owner and the construction manager. He suggested that members read through this document. K. Kemnitz suggested inserting a statement stating that the project will be general contracted so that the construction manager clearly understands this. J. Romanowski stated that the City needed to be aware of the pros and cons of each system. The City would either pay the general contractor to do all of the coordination work or they would pay the construction manager. It was stated that the amount of work was going to be the same, but it was a matter of who was going to do it. Concern was expressed as to whom would look at the feasibility of what the architect came up with.

**K. KEMNITZ MOTIONED TO PROCEED ONLY WITH THE RFP FOR THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER AT THIS TIME. DISCUSSION TOOK PLACE REGARDING THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR VS. CONSTRUCTION MANAGER. J. JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

Discussion continued on the RFP's as follows:

Page 6 - Construction Services Provided by the Architect – the words “will assist the Construction Manager” will be eliminated and changed to “the owner or the owner's agent”.

Page 7 – Services to be provided by the Construction Manager – This section will be taken out for now.

Page 9 – If the above section is put back in, the first paragraph starting with “the services shall... services as included” should be changed to “services shall include...”

Page 10 – Project Budget – Within this paragraph “E” there is a key question starting on line three beginning “with completion of construction in 2009”. This date was discussed. It was the consensus of the Committee to replace this statement with “with completion of construction in 2010”.

Page 11 – Project Schedule – The RFP will be released today for the architects. On May 5 a pre-proposal meeting will be held – a notation will be made that this will be “architects only”. After the May 16 date, a statement will be inserted to reflect that the scheduled will be determined.

Page 12 – Item #7 – Proposal Cost – Language will be added to state that the design will not be final until the cost estimates for the projects come in under budget. It will also be made clear that if the project comes in over budget, the architect is

**CITY OF DELAFIELD ARCHITECT & CONSTRUCTION MANAGER COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

responsible for working with the City to modify the drawing specifications at no additional cost.

J. Krickhahn addressed 13c – “All site survey testing ... by the City.” It should be made clear that these costs are part of the budget. J. Romanowski stated that this would be discussed at the pre-proposal meeting, that this budget covers everything and everybody.

Page 13 – Item F – Discussion took place on what percentage to hold and the length of time to hold it. The following sentence will be added: “The architect’s fees will not be paid in full until each phase of the work is complete and accepted by the owner.”

Page 14 (How to Submit Proposals) – J. Romanowski stated that all of the technical proposals will be submitted to the Committee for evaluation. Initially, the fee proposals will not be provided to the group. T. Hafner suggested that before any proposals are received, this Committee should develop a scoring system and debate what percentage the price is worth. M. Czubkowski has provided J. Romanowski with a draft scoring system that has not yet been weighted– this will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Page 15 – Conditions – Will reflect the 2007 AIA documents.

Page 16 – Item 2 will be taken out of this section for now. Any reference to the AIA document throughout this document will need to be updated.

Applicable Law – The City Attorney should review these conditions and give his opinion.

Page 18 – Selection Process – It will state: “The City intends to use a modified QBS process...”

Item H – The sentence: “The selection process will consist of a review of proposals by City Staff and this Committee” will be changed to “The selection process will consist of a review of proposals by this Committee.”

Item N – This will also reflect that the City has a right to modify.

The above modifications will be made to both RFP’s, however on the City Hall’s proposal “1985” will be corrected to read “1986”. The RFP’s will be posted on the City’s website. T. Hafner recommended that these documents be blended into one document in order to eliminate repetition. Discussion took place on the “addition” to the library and whether it would be feasible for the architect to design this “addition” into their plans. T. Hafner expressed that if the Council wanted the “addition” to be done the Council would have to approve a certain amount of money to design the additional 7,000 sf which is not in the original budget. It was the consensus of the Committee not to have the architect design the “addition” to the library.

**CITY OF DELAFIELD ARCHITECT & CONSTRUCTION MANAGER COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

J. Romanowski stated that the document would reflect that the architect could provide services for both buildings or one or the other building, and the documents would be combined so there is one RFP.

5. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON TIMELINE FOR REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

**J. JOHNSON MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE RFP's AS AMENDED ABOVE. K. KEMNITZ SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.**

6. SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will take place on Friday, May 9, 2008 at 7:00 a.m. The role of construction manager or owner's representative will be discussed at this meeting.

7. ADJOURN

**G. MAIER MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. K. KEMNITZ SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:10 A.M.**

Minutes prepared by:

Accurate Business Communications, Inc.