

**Proposal Evaluation Subcommittee of the Harbor Committee  
November 9, 2009**

Members present: Alan Fischlowitz, Chair; Emmer Shields, Ashland County Highway Commissioner; Keith Sowl, Town Foreman; and Burke Henry

Members absent: Alternate Arnie Nelson

Also present:

**1. Call to order.**

Meeting of the Proposal Evaluation Subcommittee of the Harbor Committee called to order by Chair A. Fischlowitz at 1:05 pm Monday, November 9, 2009. A quorum of the committee is present as reflected in the members listed above.

**2. Review and approval of the following Proposal Evaluation Subcommittee minutes:**

**A. October 12, 2009**

For the record, B. Henry brings up a complaint about his appointment as secretary. Complaint so noted by the committee. Suggestion to say 'unanimous' rather than 3 ayes. Motion by Keith Sowl to accept the minutes as presented. Second, E. Shields. All in favor, 4 ayes, motion carried.

**3. Review proposals.**

Three proposals have been received: Ayres Associates, JJR, Inc., and AECOM. Proposals have been distributed to committee members as well as correspondence from GRAEF.

B. Henry would like to know how the programs will be paid for. The first phase of the proposal is to find money and to this end two grants have been applied for: WI Coastal Management (State funds) in the amount of \$130,000 60/40 split and Section 154 Corp of Engineers (Federal) in the amount of \$160,000-75/25 split. Question of how to pay for the match. A. Fischlowitz said some of the matching money is being generated by the volunteer time of professionals on the committee. There is also a line item in the 2010 ~~Kudrow for Harbor Phase I is \$30,000~~ unless the engineering firms know of other funds. If we were awarded Section 154 money, for an extra \$10,000 we would have a feasibility study and maybe an archeological survey.

There is nothing in the 2009 Town budget for Harbor, except that Harbor is \$4,000 over budget at this time.

Tentative dates of December 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> suggested as presentation dates, starting at 10:00am. Suggestion by E. Shields to set parameters - each presentation would be an hour – 40 minutes of presentation and 20 minutes of questions. Is there audio/visual available?

B. Henry suggested 30 minutes of presentation, 20 minutes for questions and a 10 minute break. In the 30 minutes we would like the engineering firms to present what their understanding is of what we are asking for and how they propose to accomplish that.

There is no need for the engineering firms to present the money part and we do not want them to spend a lot of time on projects they have accomplished in the past. E. Shields said the people who will give the presentation need to be the people we will be working with and we need to ask the same questions of each company unless there is something in an individual proposal that is bothersome. We need to have a set of scripted questions and then maybe 5 minutes of off-the-cuff questions to gauge their response.

K. Sowl said if we are to receive DOT funding we need to follow the Quality Based Selection (QBS) process. This process is a standardized method of looking at each

engineering firm without looking at costs at this time. Committee members have a copy of the QBS document.

A. Fischlowitz asked if the committee should get together after the presentations and do the scoring. E. Shields said yes. Committee members should be prepared to use the QBS score sheet during the presentations. Also helpful is to find out how engineering firms have been paired up with other engineering firms and what firm is doing what. In the case of Ayres/Baird – what part of the project will Ayres do? What part will Baird do? Which engineering firm will take the lead? We need to get the vision, the goals and the concepts. Some engineering firms might have a problem with streets but do just fine with harbors and that is the reason we do not want a marketer doing the presentation. We want to hear from the people that will do the actual work. We also need to call references before the presentations and be in agreement, in regards to the GRAEF correspondence, that if GRAEF could not put together a proposal we will not consider them as they did not follow the requirements for submission of a proposal.

Committee members will email their questions for the presentations to A. Fischlowitz.

Committee members should use the scoring sheet that is included in the QBS packet.

**4. Set next meeting date and agenda.**

A. Fischlowitz will contact the engineering firms to see if they would be available December 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**5. Adjourn.**

Motion by K. Sowl to adjourn, second, E. Shields. All in favor, four ayes. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 1:50 pm.

Minutes taken from recorder and respectfully submitted by Kathy Erickson, Clerical Assistant.

Minutes approved as submitted December 7, 2009