Town of Ayer

Senior Center Site Selection and Building Committee

Summary of Committee Scoring of Architect Proposals February 26, 2024

Scores were received from seven of the nine committee members. Total scores were calculated twice. Once with all ratings, and once with Section 5: References omitted, as only half the committee entered data in these fields.

Total Scores - Sections 1-4 only (reference scores omitted):

Catlin:

261

bh+a:

249

Abacus:

219

Maguel:

211

Oudens Ello:

199

Gienapp:

193

Total Scores - All Sections

bh+a:

303

Catlin:

297

Abacus:

255

Maguel:

245

Oudens Ello: 235

Gienapp:

217

Town of Ayer

Name of Project: Sentor Center Site Select Committee - General Professional Architectural Services
Name of Evaluator. (1990)

	CHTIIH MHITEUY	APACUS	G-i GHAPP	BH+A	MAVGEL Desterna	Ello Ello		
CRITERIA			l		<u> </u>			
1. Project Approach								
Understands Town Goals	3	4	<u> </u>	l+		3		
Identifies innovative ideas and approach	3	4	Ц	И	3	2		
2. Scope of Services								
Understands services in RFQ	Ч	Ч	4	3	4	4		
3. Project Team	·	,						
Key staff has similar experince	2		3	Ц	4	4		
Team has worked together on similar projects	2		3	4	4	3		
Depth of expertise	Ч		3	4	Ч	5		1
\vailability to staff	-3		И	3	Ч	3	_	
4. Qualifications and Similar Projects								
Similar to project type (complexity, size, etc.)	4	4	3	4	4	4		
Project summaries	<u> </u>	3	2	3	И	4		
Projects in progress	2.	2		.2	·	•		
. References			•		,			
Quality of design	4	4		4	3	5-		
Ability to meet schedules/ deadlines			•		}			
Ab∓ty to control cost/meet oudgets								
Communication/cooperation	3	4		3	3	3		
Other / Comments		,						

Rating Key: 1 = Poor 2 = Fair

3 = Good

4 = Excellent 5 = Superior

Town of Ayer

Name of Project: Senior Center Site Select Committee - General Professional Architectural Services

Name of Evaluator Dennis (Vrran

	Bargman	0 111	Maryel	.01	0	n. la		
	1300 Janes	Catlin	L III	Abacus	(nienass	Ouders Ello		
	Hendry		Dr Halaro	, ,	J.C. App	8/10		1
CRITERIA			*	1	<u> </u>			
1. Project Approach		A			1		1	
Understands Town Goals	4	4	3	3	12	1 2	1	1
Identifies innovative ideas and	1.		T	-	~~~	1	<u> </u>	
approach		_ 3	1 2	2	1	2		İ
2. Scope of Services				,			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Understands services in RFQ	4	Ч	3	3	λ	2	T	T
3. Project Team					·	I	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	.k
Key staff has similar experince	5	5	3	3	21	1]
Team has worked together on			1					
similar projects	5	84	1 2	7 82] I	2		
Depth of expertise	-5"	4	2	Q 1	1	V		
Availability to staff						<u> </u>		
4. Qualifications and Similar Projects				<u> </u>	·			<u> </u>
Similar to project type		-			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Τ	
(complexity, size, etc.)	5	১	3	1	2	}		
Project summaries	5	4	3	7	7	3		l
Projects in progress								
5. References					I	1		
Quality of design	~							I
Ablity to meet schedules/ deadlines								
Ability to control cost/meet oudgets		***************************************						
Communication/cooperation								
Other / Comments								
Rating Key								

Rating Key:

General observations on the six responses reviewed:

Bargman, Hendrie; and Catlin are my clear first two choices. They both have substantial sr. center design experience, a substantial portfolio of completed work, sr. center specific references, and specific design ideas and approaches.

My third choice would be Maugel, Destefano. They are a local firm, which I think has value for this project. While they have limited sr. center specific experience, they do have substantial experience designing shared spaces for multiple uses. They also have good experience incorporating kitchens and dining areas, a critical piece of this project, into the overall design of comfortable spaces. I also think Ms. Cavanagh's detailed experience working on medical offices/facilities has value when looking at issues of accessibility, confidentiality, ADA compliance, etc. The overall scope and quality of some of their larger projects seems substantial.

^{1 =} Poor

^{2 ≍} Fair

^{3 =} Good 4 = Excellent

^{5 ≈} Superior

GENERAL COMMENTS: 1,) MOST COMPUETE PROPOSAL BY BARCMAN (BH +A) 1MO. 2,) 4 GOOD PROPOSALS IN GENERAL 3,) 4 ADDED A SCORE FOR FICE STRUCTURE, BH+A TREQUEST FOR UNITROPPES.

Evaluation Form for Request for Qualificartions

Name of Project: Senior Center Site Select Committee - General Professional Architectural Services

Name of Evaluator._

Town of Ayer

		Ţ,				
	Breing House	FLO (OEA)	ABACUS	915VAPP	CATUN	CATUN MACKEL STEFANO
CRITERIA SE						
1. Project Approach	•					
Understands Town Goals	4	4	4	.3	7	4
Identifies innovative ideas and approach	4	K	4	7	V	4
2. Scope of Services					,	
Understands services in RFQ	8	4	4	λ.	4	V
3. Project Team						
Key staff has similar experince	5	4	20	8	p	4
Team has worked together on	V	7	7	2	1	N
Depth of expertise	7	- <		} 1	U _V	2 }
Availability to staff		17		7	0	0
A Ouslifications and Similar		ן ק	4	8	†	+
Projects	<u> </u>					
Similar to project type (complexity, size, etc.)	7.0.	4	70	8	5	4
Project summaries	7	4	4	7	77	4
Projects in progress	4	4	li,	14	<i>n</i>	7
5. References						À
Quality of design	4	4	4	رمن	4	4
Ability to meet schedules/ deadlines	¥	رس.	(v	(h-	<i>V</i> ·	(h.
Ability to control cost/meet budgets	4	C	C.	(~ ·	⟨ <i>C</i> ·	(h-
Communication/cooperation	4	۲- ۰	· ·	5.	4	V-
Other / Comments	SCENT OF THE SERVICE	LECKS FEFFE ON	SHOUD	6	QUANTICO S	10000
200	Sych Services	AC RECOIRC ACATS	Theod	5/	なら	iti da garanta da
"FEE STRUCTURE	5	2	4	CS	5	2
	-				-	

5= SUPERIOR Rating Key: 1 = Poor 2 = Fair

3 = Good 4 = Excellent

Town of Ayer

Name of Project: Senior Center Site Select Committee - General Professional Architectural Services
Name of Evaluator. Ellew F1+2 Party ick

Name of Evaluator. [1][[N]						Γ_{2}		
	Khoins	and the	CA HAR	BH+A	MAU GEL	Ello Gran		
CRITERIA		<u></u>						
1. Project Approach	L							
Understands Town Goals	5	5	1,	5	4	4-		
Identifies innovative ideas and approach	4	4	of:	.5	1 /2	2		
2. Scope of Services		I	L				1	l
Understands services in RFQ	3"	£	\$ 75	T 18	1 4-	-4	Ţ	1
3. Project Team	<u></u>		-),-	<u> </u>	1_1		.1	
Key staff has similar experience	<u></u>	,r	,,,,,			I A	1	1
	3	5	5	5	2	2	Ī	
Team has worked together on	#3	100	. 1	17	1	,		<u> </u>
simēar projects	3 3	مس ا	ij	5		l	<u> </u>	
Depth of expertise	3	√ 5.	<u> </u>	5	1 2	2		
Availability to staff	2	<i>i</i>	5	5	4	1 4		
4. Qualifications and Similar		• 7	•	_	,	-		
Projects								
Similar to project type	L.	[].	5	5	1	1		
(complexity, size, etc.)					, (
Project summaries	占	Cl-		3_	.3	.3		!
Projects in progress	73,	U]	<u> </u>	5.			<u> </u>	
5. References		'			· .			·
Quality of design	14	4	5	5	5	5		
Ablity to meet schedules/ deadlines								
Ability to control cost/meet budgets				5				
Communication/cooperation	4	4	4	6	3	3		
Other / Comments	360.	30%	10 pg	389. prop	315 pup	368.7		
			1	42119	3/1 pup + 38/18 No 5m center Exper	No su gote Expe		
Rating Key:					 ()		X	

Rating Key: 1 = Poor

2 = Fair

3 = Good

4 = Excellent 5 = Superior

164,000 164,000 Dreads All other to applicate verset probet

Town of Ayer

Name of Project. Senior Center Site Select Committee - General Professional Architectural Services
Name of Evaluator. Land M. L. Creary

	Mauge	(191+in		Photography	-	Det to
	Desteby		Granap		Diagens	
CRITERIA	•	1	1			
1. Project Approach	2 Commence of the land of the	4	Andrews memory of the same production of the same of t	annual for favorance and	Section Sectio	And the second s
Understands Town Goals		•		-	-	5
Identifies innovative ideas and		And the state of t				S
approach						J
2. Scope of Services	1	7	indicate the control of the control	artemeter artemeter and a second and a secon		C
Understands services in RFO	1		And the second s	7	0	P
3. Project Team	7	2	,	•	11	7/20
Key staff has similar experince	1		8		1	-
Team has worked together on						7
			- I più			Q
Depth of expertise		1		0	17	-
Availability to staff	7		The second section of the sec	2	and the second second second second second second	, The same of the
4. Qualifications and Similar		et unterfreunderließt, etnicht summähneit sein hebeite	and the second comments of the second comment	entire contraction of the section of	AND STREET STREET, AND STREET,	5
Projects						7
Similar to project type						1
(complexity, size, etc.)			- pudado			15
Project summaries				11	17	P
Projects in progress		77	The second second second second	7	The state of the s	
5. References	7	1	The state of the s	Transference in the format of the first of t	wertper transmission of the second and or the second	The state of the s
Quality of design		2				6
Ability to meet schedules/ deadlines		1500	~			24!
Ability to control castimeet budgets		J.	PIN		243	امرا
Communication/cooperation		a fu	a Di mpu al		t no	nd
Other / Comments	No serior	podro podroj podroj	1,0209019 24,2 64 1,0421820		11 DENOTES AND SOLUTION OF THE PORT OF THE	51 d

Rating Key:
1 = Poor
2 = Fair
3 = Good
4 = Excellent

Town of Ayer

Name of Project: Senior Center Site Select Committee - General Professional Architectural Services

Name of Evaluator: Katie Petrossi

	T	T	7		7			T
	Maugel	Catlin	Gienapp	Abacus	Oudens Ello	bh+a		
CRITERIA								
1. Project Approach			J	<u> </u>	1	ı	1	
Understands Town Goals	4	4	1 3	1 4	4	5		1
Identifies innovative ideas and	3	1		i -	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4		
approach	3	5	3	3	4	4		
2. Scope of Services								
Underslands services in RFQ	4	4	4	4	4	3		
3. Project Team					•		•	
Key staff has similar experince	3	5	3	5	3	5		
Team has worked together on similar projects	4	5	3	4	3	4		
Depth of expertise	4	5	3	4	3	4		
Availability to staff	4	4	3	5	3	4		
4. Qualifications and Similar Projects					······································			÷
Similar to project type (complexity, size, etc.)	3	5	3	5	3	4		
Project summaries	4	4	3	4	3	4		
Projects in progress	3	4	3	4	3	4		
5. References	_	•		•	<u> </u>			
Quality of design				E.				
Ability to meet schedules/ deadlines								
Ability to control cost/meet budgets								
Communication/cooperation								
Other / Comments	Lacks Sr Ctr experience but their relevant wellness experience could be valuable for future	Extensive Sr Ctr experience; understands senior- friendly design and function	Little Sr Ctr experience; proposal does not include program analysis	Established relationship means no need to start over, though the program may need to flex with updated input	Libraries have parallels but more rigid	Large firm, extensive experience		

Rating Key:
1 = Poor
2 = Fair
3 = Good
4 = Excellent
5 = Superior

expansion planning

Town of Ayer

Name of Project: Senior Center Site Select Committee - General Professional Architectural Services

Name of Evaluator: Dan Van Schalkwyk

Name of Evaluator:	Dan Van Schalk	wyk						
	Maugel	Catlin	Gienapp	Oudens Eilo	bh+a	Abacus	C	
						1		
						ŀ		
CRITERIA		<u> </u>					ļ	
1. Project Approach		1	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u></u>
Understands Town Goals	1	14	4	Ta		1.		т
Identifies innovative ideas and	3	3	4	3	3	5		
approach	3	3	4]3	3	4		
2. Scope of Services	 	<u> </u>	 		-			<u> </u>
Understands services in RFQ	4	3	4	4		4		1
3. Project Team	- '	3	 	-		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	<u></u>
Key staff has similar experince	4	5	5	1	5	5		Γ
Team has worked together on	4	5	5	14	12	4	 	-
similar projects	ľ	ľ				ľ	-]
Depth of expertise	4	4	4	4	4	4		
Availability to staff	4	3	4	4	4	4	<u> </u>	
4. Qualifications and Similar								I
Projects	1							
Similar to project type	3	5	5	3	5	5		
(complexity, size, etc.)						İ		
Project summaries	3	4	4	3	3	4		
Projects in progress	3	4	4	3	4	4	1	
5. References								
Quality of design	4	4	4	4	4	4		
Ability to meet schedules/	4	4	4	4	4	4		
deadiines				· ·				
Ability to control cost/meet	4	4	4	4	4	4		
budgets								
Communication/cooperation	4	4	4	4	4	4		
TOTAL	51	56	59	51	56	59		
04	T. d' C. C.	Staff of 6	D.1	Lacking Sr Ctr	D.1			
Other / Comments	Lacking Sr Ctr experience, no	Proposal was	Relevant experience, good staff	experience, seem like	Relevant experience, reprogram good idea,	Relevant experience, history with Ayer and		
	significant additions	"vanilia", not very	backgrounds, nicely	an exceptional firm	"vanilla" proposal -	knowledge of Town		
	to Ayer specific	on base with Ayer's	layout approach and	with libraries. Some	not much specific for	and existing work.		
	work	specific situation	understanding	suggested work scope	Ayer's situation	Spelling errors. Liked		
		Schematic design		is above what may be required		approach the best - one item is to not fully		
		not required				reprogram but review		
						the program and		

- Rating Key:
 1 = Poor
 2 = Fair
 3 = Good
 4 = Excellent
 5 = Superior