



Meeting Notes

Owner Representative RFP-Preproposal Information Meeting

December 15, 2023

In Attendance:

Dr. Gary Kinzer, Mason Public Schools Superintendent

Tracey Wooden, Mason Public Schools CFO

Randy Barton, Mason Public Schools Assistant Superintendent

Barry Roney, Consultant

Ron Drzewicki, Moore Trosper Construction Company

Heather Place, Moore Trosper Construction Company

Marc Alexa, Vice President, Plante Moran Realpoint

Allison Duncan, Project Executive, The Veridus Group

Information Presented:

- I. Dr. Kinzer facilitated introductions and welcomed those in attendance.
- II. Dr. Kinzer reviewed the timeline for the RFP issued to solicit Pre-Bond Services of an Owner Representative to assist in preparing for a 2025 Bond Issue to address facility needs in the District.
 - a. 12/4/2023 Release of RFP
 - b. 12/15/2023 Informational Meeting
 - c. 1/5/2023 Proposals Due by 3:00 p.m.
 - d. 1/17-19/2024 Optional Proposer Interviews
 - e. 2/8/2024 Contract Award
 - f. 2/9/2024 Commencement of Services
- III. Dr. Kinzer distributed page 8 of the District's 2023-2028 Strategic Plan, which addresses Facilities and Infrastructure.
 - a. Dr. Kinzer highlighted Objective 1, which states that the District will be prepared for a bond offering in 2025, and clarified that current thinking is for a May 2025 bond vote, but that is not a commitment at this time.
 - b. It was noted that the focus of the facility work resulting from a 2025 bond offering would be on Secondary facilities.

- c. Also identified as relevant in the planning was the Baker-Tilley Future Bond Analysis, which was issued as Exhibit A in the RFP and the Facility Assessment issued as Exhibit B. Dr. Kinzer stated that the RFP review committee would like respondents to the RFP to explain how they will use this information in providing their services when working with a Steering Committee that will provide guidance in planning the Bond Issue.
 - d. Dr. Kinzer stated that the Steering Committee would consist of District Employees and Community members.
- IV. Dr. Kinzer provided an outline of the timeline for Pre-Bond Owner Representative Services.
- a. February through August 2024 – Meetings with Steering Committee
 - b. September 2024 – Recommendations Presented to Mason Public Schools Board of Education
 - c. November 2024 – Board Approval of Recommendation
 - d. December 2024 – Submit Ballot Language to Michigan Treasury
 - e. January through May 2025 – Committee Work to Prepare for Bond Vote
 - f. May 2025 – Tentative date for Bond Election
- V. Barry Roney noted that the RFP respondents are asked to provide Part 4 – Proposal Form, which includes the fee submission, in a sealed envelope separate from the written proposal, Parts 1 through 3. The review committee will review and score the qualitative proposals before looking at the fee proposals.

Questions:

- 1) What is the role of the Owner Representative relative to the roles of the District’s Architect and Construction Manager?
 - A. GMB (the Architect) and Christman (the Construction Manager) both understand that the District is hiring the Owner Representative to lead the Pre-Bond Planning Process, and that these other consultants will provide their expertise in design, cost estimating, construction planning, etc. as needed for that process.
- 2) Who prepared the District’s Facility Assessment, and was there an I.T. consultant used?
 - A. GMB and Christman worked with Moore Trosper to prepare the Facility Assessment with input from the District’s Operations Director, Kevin Doty.
- 3) How are respondents to format the response to the RFP? There appears to be duplication of information requests in Parts 1 and 3.
 - A. Respondents are to follow the format and order of the RFP in their response. If the same information is requested in more than one part of the RFP, then one reply is sufficient when answering the request, however, respondents are asked to reference the location of their informational response in subsequent requests for the same information.
 - It is recommended that proposers use their response to Part 3 as the primary section in which to provide information. The instructions in Part 1 ask for specific items to be addressed, and it is recommended that those items be addressed in the appropriate area of Part 3. *For example; in Part 1, K.12, the RFP states that the District wants to know about the steps that will be taken in review of the comprehensive facility study of District facilities. The RFP response should use the instructions in Part 1 to ensure that Part 3, B. – Approach to Pre-Bond Services is complete in addressing all the information in*

the instructions. In Part 1, K.12, there should be a note from the respondent identifying where in Part 3 the requested information can be found.

- *For requests in Part 1 that do not have a correlating question in Part 3, then provide the response in Part 1 or refer to the location of the requested information. For example, Part 1, K.1 instructs the respondent to provide a cover letter containing specific information. In Part 1, refer to the cover letter, and ensure that all the information is contained in the cover letter. Part 1 also requests information that may be more completely presented in chart or graphic form. If this is the case, and the respondent wishes to include the information in that manner, please ensure that the information will fit on an 8-1/2" by 11" sheet of paper legibly. It would be acceptable to include this information as an attachment to the RFP response with a note in Part 1 and / or Part 3 that the information is included as an attachment.*

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Barry Roney". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Barry Roney, Consultant