

West Bath School Administrative Unit

Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

October 21, 2015 at 7:00 PM at the West Bath School

Members Present: Dennis Crews, Meagan Hennessey, Keith Hinds, Robert McDaniel, and Jordi St. John

Members Absent: none

Others Present: Aggie Demers, David Strelneck, Emily Thompson

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Dennis Crews. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Mr. Crews thanked the board for coming to a special meeting.

Adjustments to the Agenda:

none

Public Comment:

Mr. Strelneck commented, as a parent of West Bath student but as a Bath resident, he wants to participate in school board meetings, but it is not sure when it is appropriate to do so.

Mr. Crews responded that he understood, as the same rules apply for his older children who attend RSU1 school, but that he should not hesitate to contact any of the board members at any time.

Mrs. Thompson asked that he please speak, participate, and be part of the process. Town meetings may be different because he's not a resident, but it's unlikely that he'd be denied the opportunity to speak if he wishes to. In terms of school board meetings, he may be involved as much as he would like to be.

Facilities Committee Recommendation for Heating Systems Upgrade

Mr. Crews explained that the purpose of the special meeting is to review the Facilities Committee recommendation for the heating controls upgrade.

He reviewed the minutes from the most recent facilities meeting with the board and summarized that the committee received a short notice proposal from Mechanical Services that they needed to look at and consider as well. Originally the committee had decided to work with Siemens, but felt that they needed to go through the process with Mechanical Services appropriately.

Mr. Crews explained that after reviewing the bid policy, the goals of the project, and the work that had already happened during the transition process, the committee grew concerned about having a situation where we have a maintenance contract with one vendor, yet having an alternative vendor providing the upgrades.

Mr. St. John asked, how Mechanical Services become involved, when the board had already determined that WBSAU would be moving forward with Siemens? Mr. Crews explained that it came about as a formation of the facilities committee. One of the members wanted to see what Mechanical Services could bring to the table. There was also concern about not installing a system that gave a vendor proprietary rights. The proposal from Mechanical Services ended up also being proprietary, albeit with a different brand.

Mr. Crews explained that the committee looked at the scope of both projects and noted that Siemens has been working on this over several years. They've been maintaining the school's system, and had been in the building several times to put together their proposal. Mechanical Services had not been in the building for a couple of years. They sent two employees to review the boiler room and a few classrooms prior to sending the proposal.

The Mechanical Services proposal came in two parts with an email explaining what the two parts were. The main part of the proposal fairly mirrors Siemens in areas. Additionally, they sent a separate proposal to come into the building to do a complete analysis of the system to present a different scope of the building. What they sent was something they felt would match what Siemens was proposing, but also sent a separate proposal that we contract them for an in depth analysis of the heating system.

Mr. Crews stated that most of the committee's discussion revolved around the qualitative information from the proposals. The committee also talked about the completeness of the two proposals. The general feeling was the Siemens was more complete and more polished and therefore reading the proposal had a clear understanding of what they were going to do, as compared to the proposal from Mechanical Services. Siemens provided line items for each of the pieces of equipment, where Mechanical Services quoted only generally. It was not clear what WBSAU would be purchasing in that respect.

Mr. McDaniel asked for clarification regarding the mechanical services cost, asking if it was truly 60% of the cost of the Siemens contract? Mr. Crews responded that the committee had also talked about the 60% difference in price and there were two concerns that stem from that question. The first is that the prices are so different, it made the group wonder whether Mechanical Services missed something in their bidding? Looking at the proposal, it is impossible to know what they included in that cost. There is a higher risk of unforeseen factors causing an additional expense. The second concern is that by sending the second proposal asking for a contract to review the system, it shows the initial bid is not all encompassing.

Mr. Crews said that the consensus of the committee was that we should move forward with the Siemens proposal.

Mr. Hinds asked if we are intending to propose the full project? Mr. Crews responded affirmatively. Mr. McDaniel asked for the time frame of the warranty, to which Mr. Crews responded it would be for 1 year. Mr. St. John asked if it is a fixed contract, or if it could end up being higher? Mr. Crews clarified that there are some items, such as asbestos abatement that will need to be taken care of, as well as the cost of painting, and Ethernet drops in the boiler room and cafeteria.

Mr. Hinds asked if other vendors saw the bid. It was clarified that the scope of work was seen, but not the price. He asked whether Siemens had had the chance to see if they could provide a better price.

Ms. Demers responded from the audience that the committee had none gone further because of the Mechanical Service proposal asking for a contract to determine scope. Mr. Hinds commented that he's had prior experience with this vendor and if the committee felt that something was missing, his sense would be that it is the case, and that there would be a changed work order part way through that would balance the scale.

Mr. McDaniel asked what the options were before the board. Mr. Crews said that the board needed to make a recommendation to the Board of Selectmen and that all of options were on the table. He restated that the Facilities Committee proposes that the board move forward with the initial plan and accept the Siemens proposal.

Mr. Hinds suggested that the board create a motion with language that included an amount not to exceed. Mr. McDaniel reiterated that this would give approval for the project without locking us into the full price. Mr. St. John agreed.

Public Comment:

Mr. Crews opened the floor to allow for public comment prior to a vote.

Ms. Demers asked, how much the town put aside for resources. Mr. Hinds responded that the amount set aside in a capital account was \$147,000.

Motion:

Mr. McDaniel made a motion to recommend the Siemens proposal to the city counsel in an amount not to exceed \$95,178. Mr. Hinds seconded the motion, "for the sake of discussion." He asked, if they should be recommending a project, or are we approving a proposal and asking for funding?

Mrs. Thompson clarified that the board should be making a motion to approve a project, and then to request funding from the Board of Selectmen.

Mr. McDaniel amended his motion, to approve the Siemens project proposal and to request funding from the Board of Selectmen not to exceed \$95,178. Mr. Hinds seconded the motion. Vote (5-0).

Adjourn:

Mr. Crews made a motion to adjourn at 7:56 PM. Mr. St. John seconded that motion. Vote (5-0).

Submitted by,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Emily Thompson", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Emily Thompson