GRS Cooperative School Board
Building Committee Report
December 2005

SUMMARY

The school facilities in the Gorham Randolph Shelburne Cooperative are the heart of the community. The options to meet the current and future facility needs, of the Gorham Middle High School, are extensive. The challenge is to find one that will improve educational opportunities, maintain the community's culture, while providing sensitivity to the Cooperative's fiscal stability. *This report pertains solely to the GMHS project and <u>does not</u> include study, comments, or recommendations regarding the Edward Fenn Elementary School.*

Numerous proposals from prior Building Committee consultants provided potential solutions to meet the educational needs. Due to technological advancements in building systems and ever changing educational standards, none of the plans are currently deemed adequate, to meet projected scholastic needs. In addition, no existing plan has enough detail for the Committee to give a definitive cost comparison for renovation, versus replacement of the current facilities.

Based on the existing plans, the Committee estimates $10,300,000 **(**+/-) 40% would be needed to provide the facilities required for the GMHS in 2006, using the inflation rate of 10% per annum, compounded on a base cost of ~$7,500,000 in 2003. The 40% deviation reflects potential changes due to scope and construction costs. Once the Cooperative commits in writing to a specific plan, architect, and general contractor costs would become far more rigid.

State Building Aid is reimbursed on the whole project regardless of how it is funded. Projects that do not require bonding are reimbursed over a 5-year period. Fully bonded projects are reimbursed on the length of the loan calculated on the yearly principal. The percentage figure is calculated by the Department of Education on a yearly basis. For the Cooperative District, Gorham, Randolph and Shelburne's tax bases are combined to arrive at the percentage. It has ranged from 30% to 60%. Next year it will be 54%.

All of the reviewed plans propose a net gain of building volume ranging from 35% to 47%. Maintenance costs will increase in the form of a greater amount of consumables for cleaning, light bulbs, etc. Labor costs will also increase as a greater building size will likely require at least one additional custodian, for general upkeep. This cost may be partially mitigated with the strategic placement of additional storage closets, decreasing transport time for equipment, allowing for ease of temporary displacement of classroom furniture, to ease and expedite work.

The Committee recommends that the GRS Cooperative Board consider proposing <u>both</u> budget requests (*below*) to the electorate, to win approval of either, and to allow the voters to directly indicate at what pace next year's work should progress. Proposing only one could potentially derail progress. If only <u>A</u> is proposed, we might miss the reality that <u>B</u> could win approval. Conversely, if only <u>B</u> is taken to the voters and is rejected, the Committee's work would be for all intents and purposes suspended for 2006, until a new funding proposal could be presented in 2007. *It is imperative to promote total inclusion of the three communities in order to nurture emotional and fiscal support, to this ambitious and extremely important project.* Its fruition is the foundation that will bind the Cooperative together.

We recommend:

A. An appropriation of $50,000 for committee general expenses and consultants to prepare a RFP and/or a RFQ from architects and/or engineers. *This option would essentially level fund The Committee for next year, which will slow progress towards our ultimate goal. It should also be noted that delaying this project will cost more taxpayer dollars as shown on Appendix A.*

B. An appropriation of $290,000 for committee general expenses, consultants, and partial architectural/engineering fees. This budget would be the sum of [A] ($50,000) plus $240,000 which represents a 30% payment of architectural fees, traditionally figured at a maximum of 8%. For the purposes of this project, we are using the capital cost of $10,000,000 as calculated and shown on ***Appendix A.*** (10,000,000 x .3 x .08) + 50,000 *This option would fund an expedited process enabling The Committee to present voters with materials, pertaining to a capital bond issue at the March 2007 school district meeting.*

See **Recommendations for 2006** for further elaboration of [A] and [B].

ORGANIZATION

Membership of the GRS Cooperative Building Committee includes Craig Burcalow, John Carpenter, Robert Demers, Conrad Deutsch, Kathleen Kelley, Reed Leberman, Ben Mayerson, Dennis Pedneault, Jean Tremblay, and Mike Waddell. These ten citizens from Gorham, Randolph, and Shelburne work closely with school administrative representatives, Dave Goyette, Patrick Low, Keith Parent, and Pauline Plourde. Faculty and staff input was integral in this process of evaluation.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing GMHS is a compilation of buildings ranging in age from 36 to 80 years. Among the deficiencies and concerns identified were:

1) Acute lack of fire sprinklers throughout the complex
2) Acute need to update the fire alarm systems
3) Structural defects/concerns with the south wall adjacent to the gymnasium
4) Rippling/buckling of the gymnasium floor, indicative of a greater problem below
5) Old drafty windows
6) Numerous weather related leaks from years of decay, in conjunction with numerous energy inefficiencies, which in some cases may be cost prohibitive to mitigate piecemeal
7) Status of roofs reaching end of useful life, and ability to keep areas water tight
8) Hazardous placement of heating radiators, in some cases, literally hang over the heads
9) Asbestos — ***Appendix B***, mostly non-friable: floor tiles in various rooms, chalkboards throughout, lab tops in science/gym area (20 Tables/counters), and window glaze
10) Access, foot traffic, and ADA compliance issues throughout the complex
11) Location, size, and accessibility of cafeteria/kitchen area – with an eye towards safety concerns during block changes and potential emergency evacuation
12) Acute lack of modern wiring for electrical, communication, and Internet

13) Acute lack of fire suppression in the computer server room, which if damaged or destroyed would affect the entire SAU, with potential loss of records, etc.
14) Acute lack of security systems, ability to monitor, and control egress to parts of the facility

Faculty and Administration input was solicited and received. Their documents are attached as ***Appendix C***. These will need to be expanded and refined with additional specificity, as the Committee moves through the next phase of the process.

DATA CONSIDERATIONS

The three options as defined in the charge were reviewed and observations are as follows:

1) The *Jordan/Barker renovation plan* at $7,788,995
2) The *Hebert plan* at $7,683,850
3) The *Couture plan* at $7,746,372 was found to be lacking in detail and scaled drawings, making a thorough assessment of its feasibility impossible.

Appendix A projects each option using inflation figures of 5%, 10%, and 20% (Note the breakdown of $/sq-ft, and its relation to each option's total building size). These numbers are relatively congruent in light of the scale of building size and calculated cost.

Construction pricing for the future is estimated, based on historical inflationary trends, to be approximately 10% in the last few years. It is nearly impossible to predict where materials, labor, and real estate prices will go four years from now, in light of national/global economies and energy costs which strongly influence and affect local economies and construction projects.

The cost per square foot for an onsite project in 2005 is currently estimated to be $120/sq-ft. (+/- 40%). If construction occurs on a newly acquired parcel the figure would be approximately $125/ft-sq (+/- 40%) in consideration of site preparation.

High-energy efficiency was not a major consideration, in any of the plans. Though some passive elements do exist, such as orientation of windows for natural lighting and heat gain, further thought should be given to additional passive and active technology. A balance must be stuck between initial cost and return on investment. Any renovation and especially new construction should bring some relative increase in energy efficiency. New technologies of lighting and HVAC have changed standards in recent years, but we do not know what innovations will be become the norm, possibly within the next 4 years. High efficiency lighting would cost more upfront, but would cost less than conventional to operate. Any savings however would be potentially more than offset (negatively) by an increase in building size, from the current ~ 63,000 sq-ft to a range of 85,000 to 90,000+ sq-ft. There would be the additional expense in the operation of HVAC, and other systems currently not in the existing GMHS. A "green building" would require a greater up front cost, but would yield some measure of savings during the life of the building.

General maintenance according to David Goyette, Director of Building Maintenance, a larger building requires more man-hours just for general "housekeeping" chores. One person is currently needed for each ~20,000 sq.-ft of building space. Where multiple flooring materials are installed, higher labor costs can exist, due to the need for unique cleaning equipment to service each surface. Some costs could be mitigated, if the design of the building lends itself to the use of powered equipment for housekeeping such as a mechanical floor-cleaning machine to wash/wax floors. The tradeoff is that corridors must be of a minimum width to use such a machine. Obviously wider corridors cost more money. Maximum efficiency could be achieved through a well laid out system of storage closet, and space utilization. This would mitigate time spent in transporting cleaning equipment, and repositioning room furniture. Maintenance costs associated with an HVAC system would add to the current budget line item for environmental support, as no AC system currently exists. The Committee felt more specificity of building plans and professional input was required, to nail down these issues.

ON SITE VS. OFF SITE

The cost of acquiring real estate has not been addressed nor calculated in any of these options. A new school off site would require land purchase, site prep, and other related costs. *There would be potential cost recovery from the liquidation of the existing school building and the parcels of land it currently occupies, once GMHS is relocated.*

Building a new school off site would trigger the State mandated athletic facilities to be located within the school's parcel of land. A waiver of that requirement could be applied for. A letter from Ed Murdough, Administrator at the Office of School Building Aid, NH DOE is attached as **Appendix D.** It references circumstances relating to waivers. There would be other potential ramifications of relocating the school to a new location:

1) Costs related to bringing power, communication, water, and sewer in to a new site if existing town services are not nearby
2) Availability of high speed Internet access
3) If town water is not available, the cost of well drilling, septic (including maintenance), and water storage for fire suppression (pond, tanks)
4) Egress for buses, EMS, etc
5) Cost of equipment to maintain athletic facilities IE fields, support structures, etc.
6) Cost of additional acreage to accommodate the athletic fields
7) Maintenance of new grounds might necessitate additional personnel for upkeep
8) Public sentiment regarding the relocation of the school (The location of the present school and athletic facilities promotes community involvement. This is often lost when schools are situated in remote locations, resulting in only student and parental participation.)

Leaving the GMHS at its current location will create other logistical issues:

1) The potential disruption of ongoing classroom instruction and activities as renovation and/or new construction is underway
2) Working within a specific and defined footprint as the land and adjacent setting is fixed, in a mixed residential/commercial area

3) Demolition costs
4) The potential for "surprises" as renovation goes on, possibly effecting cost and schedule
5) The need to satisfy existing and future State mandates relating to athletic facilities, and cost ratio in order to recover as much money as possible through State matching, etc.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2006:

The Committee should continue its work, with the support and oversight of the School Board. The charge should be reviewed and refined to commit the Committee to furthering the process. The Committee recommends the hiring of a professional(s) to advise, consult, and assist the Committee in the following tasks:

1) Review and examine existing facilities to advise the Committee and School Board if these are sound and "worth" renovating, with regards to safety, structure, input from faculty/administration, economics

2) Seek input from local school professionals, community groups, concerned citizens, and others to solicit support and input for a GMHS renovation or new building project, and promote total transparency and inclusion to the project. This would lead to a unified base of support, as the Committee moves towards potential funding discussions and a vote by the electorate.

3) Review existing proposal/options with a professional eye toward updating them, taking into consideration all materials that has been discovered and presented

4) Assist the Committee in composing a detailed RFP for submission and approval to the School Board, and eventually to industry professionals. IE Architects/Engineers

The Committee recommends one of two possible scenarios:

A) An initial phase, as described in #s 1-4 above, which would include hiring a Planning Consultant, or an individual(s) with similar credentials. **This scenario would require funding in the amount of $ 50,000.**

B) A broader based process that would combine the activities of (A) with the hiring of an architect and/or engineer to either refine existing plans or execute new plans based on current information, lessons learned, and future needs/expectations. Based on a $10,000,000 project, and using an architect/engineer expense of 8%, a 30% payment toward services would be required. **This scenario would require funding in the amount of $ 290,000.**

The Committee believes that the existing facility is lacking in safety, infrastructure, and life span. Left unattended, the GMHS ability to meet the learning community needs will continue to decline, as the cost of repairs, renovation, or replacement substantially rise. Failure to act decisively will redirect limited financial resources, and compromise the ability of the faculty and staff to execute their charge of delivering the outstanding educational opportunity that we expect and currently

celebrate. *It is essential that the process of renovation or replacement of the GMHS be of the highest priority. After years of abortive attempts, this Committee must be logistically supported and financed to move forward in a productive, substantive, and constructive process.* The students and faculty of our Cooperative deserve a safe and updated learning environment; free from inefficiencies of space and energy, poor ventilation, antiquated plumbing and wiring, and personal safety concerns.

The members of the GRS Building Committee pledge to continue our efforts on behalf of the teachers, staff, taxpayers, and our most important constituents, the students.

Acknowledgements:

The Committee wishes to express our gratitude for the ongoing support and input from Paul Bousquet, David Goyette, Patrick Low, Keith Parent, Pauline Plourde, and the staff of the SAU #20 office. *On a personal note I wish to also acknowledge the help and support from all of these individuals, without whom I would have an extremely difficult job. Add to that list Jo Carpenter for her advice and experience. I also wish to express my gratitude and respect for all the members of this Committee, whom I have the privilege of working with. Though some members share the title of Board members and/or past Committee members, all have stepped up to serve the taxpayers and students of the Cooperative. They are all highly dedicated, bringing personal and professional perspective to our proceedings, making the process interesting and progressive.*

Respectfully submitted on behalf of The Committee,

Benjamin W. Mayerson
Chairman/GRS School Building Committee

Attachments:
Appendix A – Spread sheet with inflation scenarios for options
Appendix B – Asbestos mitigation document
Appendix C – Faculty and Administration input documents
Appendix D – State Standards for School Site Size
Minutes of GRS Building Committee meetings September 13, 2005 – December 20, 2005
RFP Contract Program Consultant

GORHAM MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COST PROJECTIONS 2003 - 2010

Hebert - New onsite Design/Build

cost in year	*at 5% annual Inflation*	85,000 *Cost/sq ft*	*at 10% annual Inflation*	85,000 *Cost/sq ft*	*at 20% annual Inflation*	85,000 *Cost/sq ft*	*cost in year*
2003	**$7,683,850**	**$90**	**$7,683,850**	**$90**	**$7,683,850**	**$90**	**2003**
2004	$8,068,043	$95	$8,452,235	$99	$9,220,620	$108	2004
2005	$8,471,445	$100	$9,297,459	$109	$11,064,744	$130	2005
2006	**$8,895,017**	**$105**	**$10,227,204**	**$120**	**$13,277,693**	**$156**	**2006**
2007	$9,339,768	$110	$11,249,925	$132	$15,933,231	$187	2007
2008	$9,806,756	$115	$12,374,917	$146	$19,119,878	$225	2008
2009	**$10,297,094**	**$121**	**$13,612,409**	**$160**	**$22,943,853**	**$270**	**2009**
2010	$10,811,949	$127	$14,973,650	$176	$27,532,624	$324	2010

Hutter/Jordan & Barker - New onsite Design/Build

cost in year	*at 5% annual Inflation*	93,350 *Cost/sq ft*	*at 10% annual Inflation*	93,350 *Cost/sq ft*	*at 20% annual Inflation*	93,350 *Cost/sq ft*	*cost in year*
2003	**$7,788,995**	**$83**	**$7,788,995**	**$83**	**$7,788,995**	**$83**	**2003**
2004	$8,178,445	$88	$8,567,895	$92	$9,346,794	$100	2004
2005	$8,587,367	$92	$9,424,684	$101	$11,216,153	$120	2005
2006	**$9,016,735**	**$97**	**$10,367,152**	**$111**	**$13,459,383**	**$144**	**2006**
2007	$9,467,572	$101	$11,403,868	$122	$16,151,260	$173	2007
2008	$9,940,951	$106	$12,544,254	$134	$19,381,512	$208	2008
2009	**$10,437,998**	**$112**	**$13,798,680**	**$148**	**$23,257,814**	**$249**	**2009**
2010	$10,959,898	$117	$15,178,548	$163	$27,909,377	$299	2010

Couture - New onsite Design/Build

cost in year	*at 5% annual Inflation*	94,000 *Cost/sq ft*	*at 10% annual Inflation*	94,000 *Cost/sq ft*	*at 20% annual Inflation*	94,000 *Cost/sq ft*	*cost in year*
2003	**$7,746,372**	**$82**	**$7,746,372**	**$82**	**$7,746,372**	**$82**	**2003**
2004	$8,133,691	$87	$8,521,009	$91	$9,295,646	$99	2004
2005	$8,540,375	$91	$9,373,110	$100	$11,154,776	$119	2005
2006	**$8,967,394**	**$95**	**$10,310,421**	**$110**	**$13,385,731**	**$142**	**2006**
2007	$9,415,764	$100	$11,341,463	$121	$16,062,877	$171	2007
2008	$9,886,552	$105	$12,475,610	$133	$19,275,452	$205	2008
2009	**$10,380,879**	**$110**	**$13,723,171**	**$146**	**$23,130,543**	**$246**	**2009**
2010	$10,899,923	$116	$15,095,488	$161	$27,756,651	$295	2010

GRS Cooperative School Board
Building Committee Report
December 2005
APPENDIX B

GORHAM MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL
ASBESTOS REMOVAL
2003-2004

Ceiling tile removal and replacement:	22 Rooms – 24,324 sq. ft
Floor tile removal and replacement:	Room 210 – 792 sq. ft. 2nd Floor Hallway – 1,000 sq. ft. Janitorial Closet – 180 sq. ft. Center Core Hallway (1924) – 1,410 sq. ft. Ramps to Gym – 100 sq. ft. Stairwells and Landings – 240 sq. ft. (Gym)
Window Removal and replacement:	Room 212 Weight Room
Fitting Insulation:	10 linear ft. in Gym and 4 others

Remaining: Chalkboards throughout
Lab Tops in Science/Gym area – 20 Tables/counters
Window Glaze
Floor tiles in various rooms

STATE STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL SITE SIZE

Edward R. Murdough, PE
Administrator
Office of School Building Aid
December 14, 2005

This message is sent to clarify the issue of school site sizes and waivers.

We are frequently asked about the State standards for school site sizes and the possibility of waivers for those standards. The question has arisen three times in just this past week. The question often arises in reference to a decision to remain on an existing site or to build on a new site. In many cases I am called by proponents of both sides of the question, each hoping that my answer will support their position and refute the other side's position. That is not going to happen.

The minimum site sizes are specified in the NH Code of Administrative Rules, Ed 321.03. These minimums may be waived by the Commissioner of Education according to the procedures outlined in Ed 321.30. The minimum site sizes have been in place in New Hampshire for many years. Most states have similar requirements. Experience has shown that a certain amount of space is normally necessary to meet the program requirements at the various school levels. Insufficient space frequently leads to curtailment of programs or other problems.

School programs do vary and any two pieces of real estate in New Hampshire are seldom alike. Various building configurations may be possible on a particular site which may make it possible to accommodate a specific program on a site that is smaller than what the rules specify. Additionally, some program requirements, particularly athletics, may be met at locations away from the school site. For these reasons, we often do consider and approve waivers when it makes sense to do so. The rules are not intended to force a district to do something unreasonable.

Each waiver request is reviewed by the department and approved or disapproved based on its own merit. Without a request in hand, I cannot say that a specific waiver request would or would not be approved, but I will say that there needs to be a compelling reason for the department to grant a waiver. There are two primary reasons for which school districts request site waivers: no other suitable real estate is available within the district or development of another site is much more expensive than development of the smaller site.

GRS Cooperative School Board
Building Committee Report
December 2005

APPENDIX D

Each school district needs to evaluate its options to determine how best to provide the desired educational program. Rather than be concerned about the number of acres in a parcel of real estate, the district should look at how the program will work on the various available sites and what it will cost to make the program work at each site. If a site is tight, some thought should be given to future growth expectations. Based on this analysis, including program issues as well as cost, the district should decide which alternative is the best. If the best alternative does not meet some of our rules then a waiver request will be necessary. If the analysis has been done to demonstrate that it is the best alternative, the waiver will most likely be approved.

When we receive an application for School Building Aid we evaluate the proposal to determine if the school program can work on the proposed site and in the proposed facility. That is our primary concern, not the number of acres on the site. In considering a waiver we want to be sure that the proposal addresses the building itself, parking for staff and students, safe access for buses and parents, and playing fields or playgrounds as appropriate for the program. The last item can vary greatly and is somewhat self-inflicted. We will look at the educational specifications for the project to see if all of the proposed activities have a suitable place to operate. For example, if the school says that it will offer a football program, we will expect to see a football field on the site plan, or an explanation of where the football team will practice and compete. If we are satisfied that the proposal can work, the waiver will be approved. Actually, the same process takes place for a site which does meet the acreage requirement in the rules. If we do not see the football field on the site plan, we will not approve the project until we have an answer about how the proposed football program is going to operate.

If a waiver is not granted on a site that does not meet the minimum requirements, School Building Aid will not be paid for the construction project. Furthermore, the school's approval status under the Minimum Standards for School Approval, Ed 306, could be in jeopardy if the State Board of Education was to determine that the program requirements are not being met due to site restrictions.

Edward R. Murdough, PE
Administrator
Office of School Building Aid
NH Dept. of Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 271-2037

Gorham Randolph Shelburne Cooperative School District
School Administrative Unit # 20
123 Main Street
Gorham, NH 03581

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Construction Program Consultant

Contacts: **Patrick C Low, Superintendent**

Pauline Plourde, Business Administrator

Address: **123 Main Street**

Gorham, NH 03581

Phone: **603 466-3632**

Fax: **603 466-3870**

Proposal Due Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2006

PURPOSE:

SAU #20 is requesting proposals from qualified companies and/or individuals, here and after referred to as the **consultant**, for assistance in working with the Gorham Randolph Shelburne Cooperative School Board, herein referred to as owner, in analyzing, and developing its goals and objectives for its middle/high school facilities. This Request for Proposal (RFP) is issued to solicit competitive bids in order to bring forward a proposal to address the building issues at its annual School District Meeting in March 2007.

PROJECT BACKGROUND:

For the past five years there have been a number of building committees set up to address the challenges faced by the district's schools; a K-5 elementary school and a 6-12 middle high school. In March of 2005 the towns of Gorham, Randolph, and Shelburne formed a cooperative school district.

The Edward Fenn School is a single story brick and block structure consisting of the original building built in 1956 and a classroom wing constructed in 1969 for approximately 35,500 square feel in overall area. The roof made of very hard cementitious wood fiber deck, a gravel surfaced built-up roof, ¾" fiberglass roof insulation and a gravel surfaced modified bitumen roof membrane and was treated with a re-saturant in 1983. The heating system is hot water, using #2 fuel oil. The water and sewer system is provided locally through the municipality. Function spaces within the school include a Kitchen, Cafeteria/Gymnasium, Locker Rooms, Library, 26 Classrooms, Administration and Support spaces, i.e., rest rooms, storage and circulation. The current school population includes approximately 220 students serving grades K-5 and 46 full and part-time staff. Further, the school must ensure that ADA code compliance is met.

The Gorham Middle/High School is a multistory brick and block structure approximately 60,000 square feet in overall area. The facility consists of the original three-story school built in 1924, plus additions constructed in 1958 and 1969. The roof is made of very hard cementitious wood fiber deck, a gravel surfaced built-up roof, ¾" fiberglass roof insulation and a gravel surfaced modified bitumen roof membrane which was done roughly in 1985. The building has a hot water heating system using #2 fuel oil. The water supply is provided by the municipality, as is the sewer system. Function spaces within the school include Kitchen, Cafeteria, Gymnasium, Locker Rooms, Library, Industrial Arts, Home economics, Science Labs, Classrooms, Administration and Support spaces, i.e., rest rooms, storage and circulation. The current school population includes approximately 350 students serving grades 6-12 and 45 full and part-time staff. Further, the school has other shortcomings: the Middle School section is poorly located and undersized; the "added on" nature of the facility has resulted in undesirable class location and student flow; ADA code compliance is not adequately met; and, finally, the bus routing at the building exterior needs to be improved.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

The program consultant will help prepare a list of criteria for the construction of high performance buildings or the total renovation of the existing facilities; assist the GRS Cooperative Building Committee in choosing the appropriate project delivery system; help prepare a Request for Qualifications /Proposal based on the selected project delivery system with specific criteria to help choose the appropriate team; and assist in facilitating meetings in preparation for a positive Bond vote.

PROJECT GOALS & OBJECTIVES:

The GRS Cooperative Building Committee has worked on addressing the needs of the current buildings based in part on the work completed by the prior building committees, an analysis performed by Jordan Barker Architects, LLC dated April 15, 2002 and studying various proposals received from requests for proposals. The following list includes, but is not limited to, some areas of concern that have been identified:

ADA requirements, Sprinkler and Fire Code issues
Asbestos
Auditorium
Common Areas, i.e. storage, rest rooms, etc.
Electrical and Lighting
Energy and Efficiency
Gymnasium/Seating
Kitchen/Cafeteria
Physical Education Facilities
Plumbing, Heating and Ventilation
Roofs
Security Issues/ Grounds/ Parking
Underground Storage Tanks

WRITTEN PROPOSAL:

The written proposal is to be submitted by **February 15, 2006**. This proposal should include a description of the company, statement of qualifications and experience, and references. Additionally, we request:

1. A list of current school related projects completed within the past five years
2. A listing and resume of individuals, engineers, architects, etc. expected to work directly on this project
3. A description of the level of support the consultant will provide to the District in detailed planning, development, and design of the project to present to the District voters

4. Other information, qualifications and/or exceptions as each consultant may consider appropriate to the selection process
5. A cost of services, specified as an hourly rate, along with a projected estimated maximum price for services rendered as defined.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

The consultant shall be expected to perform professional services consistent with the industry-accepted roles and standards. In general they shall include, but shall not necessarily be limited to:

1. Attend meetings with the Owner or their designees, as necessary

2. Provide assistance and make appropriate recommendations regarding design improvements, materials, equipment selections, and cost

3. Assist in developing a request for proposal based on recommendations.

QUALIFICATIONS:

1. The Owner retains the right to waive any informality, to reject any or all proposals, or to accept any proposal determined to be in the Owner's best interest.

2. All designs, concepts, information, and cost analysis presented by the consultant during the selection process shall become the property of the Owner and shall thereafter be used at the Owner's sole discretion.

3. The Owner may at any time terminate the services and/or contract with the consultant for the Owner's convenience and without cause. In case of such termination for the Owner's convenience, the consultant shall be entitled to receive payment from the Owner limited to actual documented expenses of the construction project as of such date.

4. Questions related to this process shall be directed to the Owner's Representative listed below. All proposals shall be delivered to:

Patrick C Low, Superintendent
Pauline Plourde, Business Administrator
Gorham Randolph Shelburne Cooperative School District
123 Main Street
Gorham, NH 03581

SELECTION PROCESS:

Written proposals are due **February 15, 2006 at 2:00 p.m. at the SAU #20 office.**

After review of written proposals and checking references, the District School Board will select one consultant with which to enter into a formal contract for planning and developing goals and objectives of the district.

MISCELLANEOUS:

SAU #20 accepts no financial responsibility for costs incurred by any consultant responding to this request for proposal.

The selected firm will serve as a program consultant which by the nature of the service may preclude the firm from being selected as an architect, engineer, and/or construction firm in the event a project is put out to bid.