

Building and Facilities Committee

Minutes of 11-21-19

Syd Crook Room, Academy Building; 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Bowers, Lewis, Bianchi, Cross, Cardillo, Beasley, Sherman (by teleconference), Cannon, Hoglund, Williams

Also present: Kim Hallquist, Administrator and Police Chief Ed Andersen, representing the Police Department

Members of the public: John Wilson

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

Mr. Sherman called in to the meeting at 6:29.

The Chair welcomed Ms. Hallquist and Chief Andersen to the meeting, and invited them to participate in the discussions that follow. Ms. Hallquist noted that under the Right to Know Law it was necessary to have a roll call vote to approve Mr. Sherman's participation by telephone. The Chair then called for a Vote to approve Mr. Sherman's participation in the meeting by telephone, and it was so MOVED by Mr. Cardillo and seconded by Mr. Bianchi. The Chair called the roll, and it was VOTED unanimously to allow Mr. Sherman to participate in the meeting by telephone.

*1. Approval of Minutes*

The minutes of the previous meeting of November 14, 2019 were reviewed by the Committee and were then approved unanimously.

*2. Discussion and approval of RFP*

The Chair introduced the topic of this meeting, the RFP, by first thanking Mr. Sherman, Mr. Cross, and Mr. Beasley for the work they have done preparing it. He then noted that the RFP was composed of, generally speaking, two parts. There are a set of general provisions related to most RFPs, modified to some degree for this specific RFP; and a substantive section related to the Scope of the Work. In addition, there is reference in the RFP to the subcommittee discussed at the previous meeting of the Committee. He noted that he would like to take these subjects up in an orderly manner, first discussing the general provisions,

with the advice and input of Ms. Hallquist; and then discussing the Scope of Work, led by Mr. Sherman.

The Chair noted that the subcommittee contemplated by the RFP is stated in general terms, and determination of the exact membership and function at this time is not necessary to the approval of the RFP. Because there are questions related to those issues, it is important that they be discussed fully, and the agreement of the full Committee be reached as to those issues. Moreover, Messrs. Beasley, Sherman and Cross are working on a description of the duties and responsibilities for that subcommittee, which will be available to the Committee at its next meeting. Therefore, the Chair will make it the main item of discussion, as a separate issue, at the next meeting of the Committee on December 5. In that way, the Committee as a whole can resolve any issues related to its formation and function. The Committee was in agreement with this process.

The Chair noted that proceeding with the preparation of the RFP and sending it to prospective firms has been approved by the Selectmen, but that Mr. Helm had raised a question of funding for the RFP at the November 4, Selectmen's meeting. The Selectmen stated at that meeting that the matter of funding would be looked into. The Chair stated that, at this point, the Committee should proceed based on the Vote of the Selectmen, and that there was no reason to believe that the RFP will not be funded. He then inquired of Ms. Hallquist whether that was an accurate conclusion. Ms. Hallquist stated that it was.

He then asked Ms. Hallquist to discuss with the Committee the general terms in the RFP. Ms. Hallquist explained the reasons and import of those terms, and answered questions from the Committee. There was discussion on the language set forth in the Background section of the RFP. Chief Andersen stated that he would like this section to reflect his desire to have a new police station at a separate site. The Chair addressed Chief Andersen on his concern, stating that the Committee had heard him clearly on this, and understood his position; but, that the Committee was seeking to determine what was possible within the existing building to meet the Department's needs and that his cooperation in that

effort was essential to the process. Ms. Hallquist also offered some suggestions on changes to the language. There followed discussion on these suggestions, and it was the conclusion of the Committee that those suggested changes would not be helpful to the architect review process, and that it was not consistent with the intention of the Committee in this RFP, but that a modification of the language would be helpful. It was then Moved by Mr. Cardillo and seconded by Mr. Cross, to delete the word “can” and replace it with the word “may.” The Chair called the roll, and the MOTION was unanimously approved.

The Committee then went through the RFP paragraph by paragraph, discussing the Scope of Work last. Mr. Sherman then reported on the proposed RFP in general terms, and discussed the Scope of Work provision in greater detail. He also noted that the names of three more firms had been added to the list of those firms to which the RFP would be sent (copy attached to and made a part of these minutes). Mr. Williams left the meeting at 7:45 p.m., prior to the completion of the discussion on the Scope of Work, but left with the Committee some of his thoughts on changes to that provision. The Committee reviewed and discussed at length the Scope of the Work provision, including Mr. Williams’ suggestions. The Committee concluded that the provision was acceptable as presented and no changes were made. There were minor changes suggested relating to other provisions, including establishing dates and times in certain provisions and the Title of the document. These changes were then consolidated into one MOTION made by Mr. Bianchi and seconded by Mr. Cross

TO APPROVE the Request for Proposals with the changes delineated; and for the Town Administrator to forward the RFP as approved to the list of firms developed by the Committee, and post the RFP as appropriate.

The Chair called the roll, and the MOTION was unanimously approved. Attached to these Minutes is the final RFP in its approved form. The Chair will send the final RFP to the Committee for its review to assure that it is correctly stated.

### *3. Reports*

The Chair reported that he attended the Selectmen's meeting of November 18, in his personal capacity, and not in his role as Chair of the Committee. He did so in order to respond to the CIP being presented at the meeting (copy supplied to the Committee, and attached and made a part of these Minutes). Paul Gorman, Chair of the Planning Board made his presentation, with questions asked. Mr. Bowers then presented to the Board the issues he found concerning, as separately set forth in a Memorandum he then delivered to the Board, the Chair of the Planning Board, and the Chair of the Budget Committee (copy supplied to the Committee, and attached to and made a part of these Minutes). Chair Rollins asked that Mr. Bowers and Mr. Gorman coordinate a meeting between the Building Committee and the Planning Board to attempt to prepare an agreed-to statement for the CIP as it relates to the Police Department.

The Chair then noted to the Committee that at the time he prepared his Memorandum the only posted minutes relating to the CIP were of the Planning Board meeting of October 22, at which time it was a draft proposal. His Memorandum referred to the CIP as a draft. He has now read the Minutes of the November 12, Planning Board meeting, which reflect that the CIP was formally adopted at that meeting. (Pertinent language from that meeting supplied to the Committee, and attached to and made a part of these Minutes.)

The Chair then invited discussion on the details of such a meeting between the Committee and the Board, or representatives of each. After discussion, it was agreed that the Chair should discuss the issue with Mr. Gorman and report back to the Committee.

#### *4. Other items to come before the Committee*

There were no other items discussed by the Committee.

#### *5. Action Items.*

- a. Ms. Hallquist to forward the approved RFP to the firms on the list agreed-to, and post the RFP at the appropriate websites.
- b. Messrs. Beasley, Sherman and Cross to prepare and forward to the Chair for distribution to the Committee a proposed description of the actions and duties of the subcommittee for consideration at the meeting on December 5.

The next meeting is scheduled to be held in the Syd Crook room on Thursday, December 5, at 6:30 p.m.

The meeting adjourned by unanimous consent at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Robert Bowers, Chair

### ATTACHMENTS

#### List of Firms to which RFP will be sent

Cowan Goodreau  
LaValle Brensinger  
HKT Architects  
Warrenstreet  
Banwell  
Port One  
Harriman  
HL Turner  
Mires  
Frank Azalone  
Tennat Goucher  
Wiemann Laphere  
SMP  
Udelsman Assoc  
CMK Architects  
Kaestle Boos  
Caolo and Bieniek  
Lieb Associates

New London Planning Board  
Capital Improvement Program (CIP)  
2020-2026

## INTRODUCTION

Annually the Planning Board reviews New London's capital needs and recommends a program of capital improvement projects for a period of at least six years. The CIP document approved by the Planning Board identifies key issues which need to be part of the discussion in the budget preparation process involving the Board of Selectmen and the Budget Review Committee. The recommended capital improvement projects and progress toward same will be considered as part of the annual CIP process in subsequent years.

## PROCESS

The CIP process for the years 2020-2026 began with an inquiry to Department Heads to review the existing 2019-2025 CIP for completed projects and to recommend new initiatives. A review of the status of the previous CIP recommendations indicates the following status:

- A. As supported by the 2019 Master Plan Survey, the first priority of the 2019-2025 CIP was to develop a plan with timelines to facilitate the development of a new facility to house the New London Police Department and New London Dispatch Department. This initiative is still considered a top priority.
- B. The Selectmen reviewed the Transfer Station study and determined that the Transfer Station is not a top priority at this time but should continue to be monitored. The Selectmen may work with the State to acquire more land if the opportunity arises.
- C. The Police Department needs to expand their radio communication coverage.
- D. The Town should continue efforts to fulfil the warrant passed at the 2018 Town Meeting to achieve 100% renewable sources for electricity by 2030 and 100% renewable fuel sources for heating and transportation by 2050. Additionally, the Town should support local institutions, businesses and residents to reach the same goals and considering cooperative efforts with Colby-Sawyer as they have set a similar goal of carbon neutrality by 2050. In addition, the Master Plan should incorporate energy and resiliency throughout the plan.

The CIP Subcommittee utilized the recommendations of the Fire Chief, Police Chief, Public Works Director, Recreation Director and Town Administrator.

As a result of these reviews and discussions: The New London Planning Board recommends the following Capital Improvement Projects be considered to add to the Capital Improvement program.

- The Police Department has expressed the need to expand its space and upgrade the Department's facilities. The Cricenti property on County Road has been identified as an ideal parcel that holds potential to house not only the Police Station but would provide the town with additional land for any future municipal facility needs.
- The Fire Department is planning the replacement of their Rescue Engine and are working to determine the estimated cost of replacement.
- As supported by the 2019 Master Plan Survey, the Planning Board supports the annual funding for the Conservation Land Acquisitions Fund.

The CIP is an advisory, guiding document, not a funding source. As the needs of the town evolve and projects historically noted in previous CIP documents are completed, this document looks to the future in an effort to identify and prioritize the evolving capital needs of the town. Capital investments shape and define the character, sense of place and economic vitality of this community.

## MEMORANDUM

To: New London Selectmen

From: Bob Bowers

(Note: Although the author of this Memorandum is the Chair of the Building Committee, and is familiar with their deliberations, this Memorandum is submitted in his capacity as a private citizen and resident of New London.)

Re: Planning Board CIP

Date: November 18, 2019

### *Issue*

The Planning Board (PB) has prepared and submitted to the Selectmen a draft of its Capital Improvement Program (2019 CIP) for 2020-2026 (references to the 2018 CIP will be "2018 CIP"). The 2019 CIP makes two statements regarding the Police Department (PD) which are inconsistent, and need resolution. This memo addresses that apparent inconsistency, but does so in the hope that general agreement can be reached on the intent of the CIP.

### *Concerns*

The first concern is the use of the phrase, "As supported by the 2019 Master Plan Survey [survey]," to modify the 2018 CIP subcommittee conclusion that a new police station is needed. This is not an accurate statement of the survey, when that survey is examined closely. (See discussion below.) And, although the 2019 CIP conclusion that a new station remains a top priority undoubtedly reflects the Police Chief's continuing position, it does not accurately reflect the conclusion of the Town itself, through its New London Building and Facilities Committee (BFC), which is specifically charged with addressing this issue.

The second concern is the apparent inconsistency which appears in the subsequent statement: "[t]he Police Department has expressed the need to expand its space and upgrade the Department's facilities." This is consistent with the BFC's recommendation (Second Report to Selectmen, dated October 17, 2019), and is an appropriate priority. (Note: This section of the 2019 CIP refers, almost as an aside, to "the Cricenti property" on County Road as an "ideal parcel." That property is currently listed for sale at a price of \$3,495,000. In comparison, the 2018 Town meeting voted down a request to authorize the Selectmen to spend up to \$500,000 to purchase property for new facilities. That vote required a 2/3 majority to pass; it failed by a 2/3 majority.)

### *The Survey Questions*

The rationale for the PB statement that the survey is supportive of a new police station is not stated in the 2019 CIP. However, that claim may be based on Questions 21 and 23 (Q21; Q23), posed on the survey. See Appendix.

Q21 uses the rhetorical device of providing the preferred answer to the question by choosing how it is phrased. This skews the results by failing to supply full information on the issue.

Similar questions could be posed in differing ways to elicit a completely different result. See example in Appendix. It was the task of the BFC to develop full information on this issue by reviewing the facts and data, rather than basing decisions on broad opinion.

Q23 seeks to rank the order of priority the respondents felt applied to ten listed concerns covered by the survey. (The results are posted on the Town's website.) Only 9.16% of respondents rated "police station relocation" as its number one priority. Moreover, the survey results assign a "Score" to each of the ten listed concerns, based on the total stated priority of each of those concerns, and those are listed in order of their priority. The highest score, 6.53, and thus the highest priority of the respondents, was "Mobility enhancements (e.g., sidewalks, trails, bike lanes, etc.)." Not a new police station. "Police station relocation" was in eighth position out of ten with a score of 5.28.

Thus, the survey indicates that a new police station is very far down the list of perceived needs by residents of the Town, and further indicates that residents' true priority is "mobility enhancement."

#### *Changes since the 2018 CIP report*

The 2018 CIP subcommittee began its deliberations a full year prior to the formation of the BFC, which occurred on May 20, 2019. The 2018 CIP subcommittee's opinion was not informed by the work and analysis performed by the BFC. In contrast, the 2019 CIP subcommittee did have this information available to them, but did not communicate with, or seek any information from, the BFC. Moreover, a review of the posted Agendas and Minutes of the PB and CIP subcommittee, from and after the date of the 2018 CIP report to the present date, shows there was only one meeting to discuss the CIP, on October 22, 2019. The minutes of that meeting do not reflect an accurate and thorough analysis of the BFC's work. The PB has not devoted the time and effort, nor gathered the facts and data related to the PD and its needs, which the Building Committee has done. It is these efforts that are necessary to establish reliable conclusions as to the PD needs and the solutions to those needs.

#### *Conclusion*

Notwithstanding the concerns expressed in this Memorandum, it is undoubtedly a good idea for the Selectmen to begin to set aside funds in the capital budget "to expand [the PD's] space and upgrade the Department's facilities." Given that the 2019 CIP is draft document, it might be helpful, in order to move forward on Capital Improvement Program planning related to Police Department needs, for the Planning Board to meet in with the Building Committee to bring greater insight to the process. Communication and coordination between the various committees in the Town is crucial to proper capital improvement planning.

Cc: Paul Gorman, Chair, Planning Board

Rob Prohl, Chair, Budget Committee

## APPENDIX

### *Survey questions*

21. An engineering firm hired by the New London Select Board determined the town's police facilities are inadequate for meeting the department's needs and for maintaining public safety. The town has a plan to quickly address urgent needs — drainage, heating, ventilation, etc. — at the Buker Building, which was not designed to serve as a police station. Do you support the town's longer-term effort to

relocate the police department to a more suitable facility and repurpose the Buker Building to meet the space needs for other departments and town functions?

Alternative Q. 21. The Town has voted to spend up to \$600,000 to make mechanical and construction repairs to the Buker building, which repairs have been identified by an architect and an engineering firm. There are additional needs of efficiencies and safety concerns for the Police Dept. which should be addressed. Do you support the Town's effort to make the necessary alterations and renovations to make the current Police Department facility more suitable to its needs?

23. Now that you've answered questions about various aspects of planning, please choose your priorities for the town over the next decade. Please rank from 1 through 10, with 1 being most important and 10 being least.

- Agricultural and commercial development
- Mobility enhancements (e.g., sidewalks, trails, bike lanes, etc.)
- Community center development
- Parking enhancements
- Commuter amenities (e.g., park & ride, regional transit)
- Police station relocation
- Conservation land expansion
- Sustainability and resiliency efforts
- Housing opportunities
- Workforce housing (options for all income levels)

Excerpt from Minutes of Planning Board for 11-12-19

4. PUBLIC HEARING – Capital Improvement Program (CIP) – The Planning Board will review the CIP for 2020-2026.

The Planning Board members reviewed the draft document. The Capital Improvement plan is the responsibility of the Planning Board and is a formal document that summarizes proposals about capital improvements in the town. This document then goes to the Board of Selectmen as recommendations for development.

At the last meeting, Jeremy Bonin stated that they discussed omitting item C, which relates to the Recreation Center. Adam Ricker will remove item C on the final draft.

Jeremy Bonin also noted that they discussed including a portion of the survey results in support of item A. Mr. Ricker replied they could start the sentence by saying, "as supported by the 2019 Master Plan Survey".

A bullet will be added regarding the request by the Conservation Commission to appropriate funding for land acquisition. Adam Ricker will add the following item: As supported by the 2019 Master Plan survey the Planning Board supports annual funding for the conservation land acquisition fund.

IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (Tim Paradis) to accept the document as presented with the current changes. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mark Vernon asked if item A regarding the Police Department was consistent with or at odds with what the Building and Facilities committee has recommended. Selectman Kidder stated it is at odds. This item has been a part of the capital improvement plan for many years and it was their decision not to acknowledge it. The Building and Facilities committee want another study done and two out of three Selectman voted to have it done. There is now a question as to where the funding for the study will come from since voters have not appropriated money for this in the budget.

IT WAS MOVED (Jeremy Bonin) AND SECONDED (David Royle) to accept the document with the current changes that have already been voted in. THE MOTIONS WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Gorman will present the Capital Improvement Plan to the Board of Selectmen at their next meeting on November 18, 2019.

Town of New London, NH  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
POLICE DEPARTMENT ALTERATIONS

Due on or before Friday, December 19, 2019, at 2:00

I. INTRODUCTON  
PURPOSE

The Town of New London, New Hampshire (the “Town,” or “New London”) is soliciting proposals from qualified and experienced architectural teams to provide professional services to the Town for alterations to its existing police station. New London is a municipal corporation managed by a Board of Selectmen (also the “Board” or the “Selectmen”) serving a residential population of approximately 4500 (which includes students at the local Colby-Sawyer College) located in Merrimack County, New Hampshire, in the Lake Sunapee Region. It is also home to New London Hospital. The community has a total land area of 22.4 square miles and 3.1 square miles of inland water area making for a population density of approximately 200 persons per square mile. The Town provides a full range of municipal services to its residents, businesses and visitors, which include its Police Department as well as a communications services function, otherwise known as a Dispatch Center for multiple communities (collectively called the “Police Department” for this proposal).

BACKGROUND

The Harold W. Buker, Jr. Municipal Building(the “Buker Building”), and the basement of the connected Whipple Memorial Town Hall(“Whipple Hall”), located at 25 Seamans Road, currently house the existing Police Department , as well as the Recreation Department . It has been determined by the Town’s Buildings & Facilities Committee that the needs of the Police Department may be satisfied by alterations to the existing building; and the New London Selectmen have authorized this Request for Proposals (“RFP”) for that purpose. Current plans include the relocation of the Recreation Department out of the building. (The Recreation Department, and its relocation, is not part of this solicitation.)

The Town conducted a study of both Whipple Memorial Town Hall and the Buker Building in 2014. (“Whipple Memorial Town Hall Existing Conditions & Recommendation,” December, 2014, by Dennis

Mires, PA, which is available on the Town’s website: [www.nl-nh.com](http://www.nl-nh.com).) This study identified elements that required maintenance and upgrades, and much of that work has been completed. A study of Police Department options was also generated by Harriman in 2018 (“Buker Building Study,” which is also available on the Town’s website). This study identified options for the provision of upgraded and new facilities.

The Police Department is a full service, community-oriented agency that is charged with police protection of the Town. It provides 24/7 police coverage and provides dispatching services for New London as well as the towns of Sunapee, Newbury, Wilmot, Croydon, and Sutton. It is the Town’s only 24-hour, seven day a week department, and handles a multitude and variety of calls. The Town includes a large park-and-ride and two exits on/off Interstate 89. Presently, there are nine full-time officers (including Chief of Police), and one full-time and a part-time Administrative Assistant. There are six police vehicles: the Chief’s vehicle which is a pickup truck, 2 patrol cruisers, one K-9 vehicle, one cruiser for details and used if a front-line unit goes down, and one unmarked car (which is a non-patrol vehicle, and is used for the detectives).

The Police Department occupies most of the Buker Building which was built as an addition to Whipple Hall in 1985, with a second addition added in 2000. Whipple Hall was built in 1918 and is listed on the State Register of Historic Buildings; the basement of Whipple Hall is used by the Police Department. The 1985 portion was originally built for the administrative services for the town Selectmen, Town Clerk and Tax Collector functions. In 2000, the administration functions were moved, and an addition was added for the police, communications and New London District Court. This facility has provided a functional environment that includes a small lobby where the public is greeted by on-duty dispatchers, offices, evidence room, booking area, cells, training/meeting rooms, small exercise room, showers, a single-vehicle sallyport, and the communications center. There is on-site parking for employees and visitors. In 2000, when the town administration moved to its current location at the Academy Building and the police and communications departments took over occupancy of the Buker facility, the Police Department consisted of seven full-time officers; the communications department consisted of four full-time dispatchers. Both departments have part-time help as well.

#### SCOPE OF WORK

The exact Scope of Services required by the Town shall be set forth in the contractual agreement between the Town and the firm which is awarded the contract pursuant to this RFP (the “Awardee”). Generally, the Scope of Services shall consist of providing the Town with a conceptual design for alterations to the existing building, consistent with the efficient and effective operation of the Police Department. It is expected that the Awardee will assist in creating, and then work within, a defined budget.

All such work shall be done under the direction of the Subcommittee with periodic review and approval by the Buildings & Facilities Committee and the Board of Selectmen.

The Scope of Work shall include, but is not limited to, the following work:

1. Conduct an organizational meeting with a subcommittee consisting of three members of the Buildings & Facilities Committee, and one representative each from the police department and town administrator.

2. Develop and implement data collection Plan.
3. Examine the existing building, previous reports and work completed to date.
4. Meet with the subcommittee and departmental representatives to determine and catalogue existing services, personnel, and equipment of the Police Department. Facilitate discussions leading to an understanding of programmatic space needs to provide the intended services, utilizing experienced police department planning as a part of the architectural team. Provide a detailed program and test fit.
5. Provide a conceptual design, suitable for preliminary pricing and presentation to the Board of Selectmen, and ultimately a Town meeting.
6. Attend no fewer than four meetings with the New London Building and Facilities Committee (the 'Committee'), and two meetings with the Board of Selectmen.
7. Consult and work in concert with the subcommittee on an as-needed basis.
6. Provide minutes of all meetings to the Subcommittee.

The intent at this time is to continue with the same design team if Town approval is received for the project to proceed into full design based on the work of the Awardee.

## II. PROCEDURES

### A. PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

There will be a mandatory pre-submission meeting, to which attendance is required of all potential respondents, that will start at Whipple Memorial Hall, 25 Seamans Road on Monday, December 9 at 10:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. Please respond prior to that date as to your preference as to those two times. This meeting will constitute a walk-through of the building.

### B. SUBMISSION PERIOD

Respondents must submit their Proposals on or before 2:00 p.m. on December 19, 2019. The Subcommittee expects to make a recommendation to the Selectmen within 14 days of the submission deadline. Any questions should be submitted in writing to the Authorized Contact Person by email no later than 2:00 p.m. on December 13, 2019.

### C. PREPARATION OF PROPOSAL

Each Proposal must be prepared concisely, avoiding the use of elaborate promotional materials. For ease of review, the Proposal must follow the outline in Section III of this RFP, entitled "Requirements." Each Proposal must fulfill the stipulations outlined in Section III, be clearly numbered, and completely answer all questions listed.

### D. NUMBER OF COPIES OF PROPOSAL

A minimum of five (5) copies of the Proposal, and one (1) electronic copy in PDF format, must be submitted to the Town through the Authorized Contact Person.

### E. INQUIRIES AND SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

Questions about the RFP and the submission of Proposals shall be directed to:

Authorized Contact Person

Kimberly Hallquist, Town Administrator 375 Main Street

New London, NH 03257

603-526-1240

All Proposals must be received at the above addresses before the end of the submission period, either by hand delivery, courier, or by certified mail in a sealed envelope clearly labeled: "Municipal Facility Needs RFP." The Town is under no obligation to return Proposals. It is requested that any and all contact be with the Authorized Contact Person and be made by e-mail. No contact with any other Town personnel other than the Authorized Contact Person is allowed until such time as an award has been made. Violation of this provision may be grounds for immediate disqualification. Questions about the RFP, and the submission and content of the Proposal must be directed to the Authorized Contact Person.

Selected Proposers may be contacted by the Town's Authorized Contact Person with questions aimed at clarifying their submission.

#### F. LONGEVITY OF PROPOSALS

A Proposal may be withdrawn at any time prior to the date specified as the closing date for acceptance. However, no Proposer may withdraw or cancel a Proposal for a period of sixty (60) days following the closing date for acceptance, nor shall the successful Proposer withdraw or cancel or modify the Proposal, after having been notified that the Proposal has been accepted by the Town, except at the request of the Town, or with the Town's written consent.

#### G. METHOD OF SELECTION OF AWARDEE

The Board of Selectmen with the advice and input of the Committee will evaluate each Proposal with emphasis on the following factors:

- Demonstrated relevant experience and past history in completing projects of comparable value and scope to the type contemplated by this RFP
- Reasonableness of fees and costs
- Expertise and technical approach of the Proposal, explaining the degree to which the Proposer's interpretation of the work meets the needs and goals of the Town
- Quality of project team's overall organizational strength
- References, reputation, and strength of the Proposer's financials
- Quality of the Proposal – adherence to Section III – Requirements (following), to include conciseness, clarity and readability

#### H. RIGHT OF REJECTION BY THE TOWN

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this RFP, the Town reserves the right to select the respondent that best meets the requirements of the RFP, and not necessarily the lowest Proposer. Further, the Town reserves the right, for any or no reason and in its sole and absolute discretion, to (1) amend, in whole or part this RFP, (2) withdraw or cancel this RFP, and (3) accept or reject any or all Proposals prior to execution of the contract for the Project for any or no reason and with no penalty to the Town.

#### I. NOTICE OF AWARD

The Town shall inform the Awardee that they have been selected by means of a Notice of Award issued by the Town. Neither the selection of a Proposer as the Awardee nor the issuance of a Notice of Award shall constitute a binding commitment on behalf of the Town to enter into any contract with the

Awardee, as any binding arrangement must be set forth in definitive documentation negotiated between and signed by the Awardee and the Town.

#### J. CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

The Town intends to enter into contract negotiations with the firm selected, which shall be required to enter into a contract (the "Contract") with the Town in a form satisfactory to the Town's Board of Selectmen.

The Town reserves the right to negotiate the terms and conditions of the Contract with the selected Proposer. These negotiations could include all aspects of Services and fees. Neither the selection of a Proposer nor the negotiation of the Contract with such Proposer shall constitute a binding commitment on behalf of the Town to enter into a Contract with such Proposer, as any binding arrangement must be set forth in the Contract signed by both parties and is subject to all requisite approvals.

The selected firm will be required to provide proof of liability, workers' compensation, and errors & omissions insurance to limits acceptable to the Town, with the Town listed as an Additional Insured on the liability coverage. Contracts will require that the firm indemnify and hold harmless the Town to the extent errors are caused by the awardee.

#### III. REQUIREMENTS

The awarding of the Contract shall go to the Proposer that best satisfies the requirements set forth in Section G, Method of Selection, above, and in Subsections A hereinbelow.

##### A. WRITTEN PROPOSAL SUBMISSION ELEMENTS

Satisfactory Proposals shall be comprised of the following:

1. Narrative Response (to be included in the Proposal document near the beginning) shall include:

a) Service Summary: This should provide a description of the key points of your Proposal, specifically addressing why your firm is qualified to provide the services in connection with the Scope of Services of the Project. The email address, telephone number, and facsimile number of your Proposal's contact person(s) must be included in your cover letter.

b) Qualifications: Provide background information on your firm, including but not limited to:

i) business overview

ii) the age of the business

iii) names, addresses and position of all persons having a financial interest in the company

iv) state of formation (as applicable)

v) the number of employees

vi) summary of relevant accomplishment, particularly those involving services similar to those required for the Project

- vii) any other information that will permit the Town to determine capability of respondent to meet all contractual requirements
- c) Fees/Costs: Provide information pertaining to fees or costs, including the fully burdened billable hourly rates charged for the services of employees of the firm. In addition to being organized pursuant to an employee roster, provide a schedule of reimbursable expenses. Provide a proposed total cost to deliver the Scope of Services required to complete the Work.
- d) Resumes: Please provide resumes of the individuals who would comprise your operational team, the principal-in-charge, and the project manager. Describe only the people who would actually work on the Town's account. Specify the role each would play, as well as what backup coverage would be available in time of conflicting engagements.
- e) A list of any sub-contractors who may be used to perform the Work. Resumes of, and references for, said contractors should be provided as well.
- f) Specific information on expertise in police department space planning, specifically referencing the personnel referenced in Sections d) and e) above. Additional information that you believe pertinent to the Town's requirements. (Please include your company/team internet links to websites.)

2. References: Names, titles, addresses, emails and phone numbers of key contacts for five (5) customers, particularly those for whom the respondent has undertaken projects similar to the Work identified herein, linking such references to those personnel identified in Section A. 1. d) above. If possible, please supply at least two (2) contacts for references within New Hampshire.

3. Identify all adverse determinations against your firm, or its employees or persons acting on its behalf, with respect to actions, proceedings, claims or complaints concerning violations of federal, state or municipal equal opportunity laws or regulations, including licensing regulations

4. Has your firm, or any of its employees present or past, or anyone acting on its behalf, ever been convicted of any crime or offense which has not been annulled arising directly or indirectly from the conduct of your firm's business, or has any of your firm's officers, directors or persons exercising substantial policy discretion ever been convicted of any crime or offense which has not been annulled involving business or financial misconduct or fraud? If so, please describe any such convictions and surrounding circumstances in detail.

5. A description of any action, suit, proceeding or investigation pending or threatened against your firm including, without limitation, any proceeding known to be contemplated by government authorities or private parties.

6. Has your firm, or any of its employees, or anyone acting on its behalf, been indicted or otherwise charged in connection with any criminal matter arising directly or indirectly from the conduct of your firm's business which is still pending, or have any of your firm's officers, directors or persons exercising substantial policy discretion been indicted or otherwise charged in connection with any criminal matter involving business or financial misconduct or fraud which is still pending? If so,

please describe any such indictments or charges and surrounding circumstances in detail.

7. All persons working within the building will be fingerprinted and have a background check performed.

8. Organizational Chart: Please illustrate the relationship(s) of the individuals and firms to each other that would comprise your operational team, principal-in-charge, project manager, and sub-consultants on an organizational chart.

9. Conflicts of Interest:

a) Please disclose:

i) Any material financial relationships that your firm or any firm employee has that may create a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest in contracting with or representing the Town.

ii) Any family relationship that any employee of your firm has with a member, employee, or official of the Town that may create a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest in contracting with or representing the Town.

iii) Any other matter that your firm believes may create a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest in contracting with or representing the Town.

iv) Any contact, verbal or written or otherwise, with any individual involved in the selection process, or any employee of the Town of New London, other than the Authorized Contact Person identified above, related to this proposal.

b) Please describe any procedures your firm has, or would adopt, to assure the Town that a conflict of interest would not exist for your firm in the future.

#### IV. ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS AND INFORMATION

1. All materials submitted in response to this RFP will become the property of the Town.

2. The Town reserves the right to conduct discussions with, and to request additional information from, one or more respondents. No respondent shall have any rights against the Town as a result of such discussions.

3. The Town reserves the right to negotiate separately with any source whatsoever.

4. The Town reserves the right to waive any irregularity in any Proposal received or any other aspect of this solicitation.

5. Respondents are advised that with respect to this RFP, no contact with the Town personnel in any way related to this solicitation is permitted, except as shall be authorized by the employee designated herein as the Town's Authorized Contact Person as identified in Section II.E hereof.

6. Each Proposal prepared in response to this RFP will be prepared solely at the cost and expense of the respondent with the express understanding that there will be no claim whatsoever for reimbursement from the Town.

7. Submission of a Proposal in response to this RFP shall constitute an offer on the part of the successful respondent to become the Awardee, and to enter into a contract to undertake or complete the Project.

8. News releases or other public announcements relating to this RFP shall not be made by any party receiving this RFP without the prior written approval of the Town.
9. The Town and its respective officials and employees make no representation or warranty and assume no responsibility for the accuracy of the information set forth in this RFP provided by others. Further, the Town does not warrant nor make any representations as to the quality, content, accuracy or completeness of the information, text, graphics, links or other facets of this RFP once it has been downloaded or printed from this or any other server, and hereby disclaims any liability for technical errors or difficulties of any nature that may arise in connection with the Webpage on which this RFP is posted, or in connection with any other electronic medium utilized by respondents or potential respondents in connection with or otherwise related to the RFP.
10. Proposals submitted to the Town in response to this RFP may be disclosed in accordance with RSA 91-A. A respondent submitting a Proposal may provide in writing, at the time of its submission, a detailed description of the specific information contained in its submission which it has determined is a trade secret and which, if disclosed, would substantially harm such respondent's competitive position. This characterization shall not be determinative, but will be considered by the Town when evaluating the applicability of any exemptions in response to a request made per RSA 91-A.
- (END OF DOCUMENT)