



AGENDA
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
January 10, 2017 @ 10:00 AM
Public Hearing and Business Meeting

Anyone who requires an auxiliary aid or service for effective communication, or a modification of policies or procedures to participate in a program, service or activity of the City of Greer Planning Division, should contact Ruthie Helms, ADA Coordinator at (864) 848-5397 or City Administrator (864) 848-5387 as soon as possible, but no later than 48 hours before the scheduled event.

I. PUBLIC HEARING

- A. Call to Order

II. ELECTION OF OFFICER

- A. Chairperson (ACTION REQUIRED)
- B. Vice Chairperson (ACTION REQUIRED)

III. BUSINESS MEETING

- A. Minutes 10/28/16

IV. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Historic Preservation Grant

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. New Business

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. Other Business

VII. EXECUTIVE SESSION

- A. Executive Session

The Board of Architectural Review may take action on matters discussed in Executive Session.

VIII. ADJOURN

Category Number: III.
Item Number: A.



AGENDA
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
1/10/2017

Minutes 10/28/16

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Upload Date	Type
▣ BAR MINUTES 10-28-16 DRAFT	1/10/2017	Cover Memo



MINUTES
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
October 28, 2016

Members Present: Mr. Hannon, Mr. Price, Ms. Hiatt, Mr. Langley and Ms. Wood

Member(s) Absent:

Staff Present: Glenn Pace, Planning and Zoning Coordinator
Suzanne Lynn, Administrative Assistant-Building Development and Standards

I. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Call to Order and Opening Remarks: Chairperson, Ms. Wood, called the meeting to order at 11:42 a.m.

II. BUSINESS MEETING

A. Minutes of the Board of Architectural Review Meeting August 9, 2016.

ACTION- Mr. Price made a motion to accept the minutes as read. Ms. Hiatt seconded the motion.
Motion carried 5-0.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. No Old Business

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Discussion on Training and Attendance
- B. Go over Historic Grant Proposal
 - a. Bids Due November 4, 2016
 - b. Committee of 5 (2 from Board Members, Kyle Mensing, Glenn Pace and Mike Sell)
 - c. Grading Schedule
 - d. BAR will keep up to date at regular meetings
- C. Vote on RFP Review Committee

ACTION- Mr. Hannon made a motion to nominate Joada Hiatt and David Langley as committee members and Linda Wood as Alternate. Mr. Price seconded the motion.
Motion carried 5-0.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. Zoning Coordinators Report – Mr. Pace presented the following:
The next scheduled meeting will be January 9, 2017.

VI. EXECUTIVE SESSION

VII. ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 1:00 pm

Category Number: IV.
Item Number: A.



AGENDA
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
1/10/2017

Historic Preservation Grant

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Upload Date	Type
□ RFP Evaluation Forms	1/5/2017	Cover Memo

Evaluator Scoring Guide

Percent Score	Quality of Response	Description	Strengths Relative to Requirements	Weaknesses	Confidence in Proposed Approach
90-100	Excellent	The proposal addresses the requirements completely, exhibits outstanding knowledge, creativity, innovation or other factors to justify this rating.	Meets requirements - numerous strengths in key areas.	None	Very High
80-89	Good	The proposal addresses the requirements completely and addresses some elements of the requirements in an outstanding manner.	Meets requirements - some strengths in key areas.	Minor - not in key areas	High
70-79	Moderate	The proposal addresses most elements of the requirements.	Meets most requirements - minimal strengths provided in their response.	Moderate - does not outweigh strengths	Moderate
60-69	Marginal	The proposal meets some of the RFP requirements.	Meets some of the requirements with some clear strengths.	Exist in key areas - outweighs strengths	Low
0-59	Unacceptable	The proposal meets a few to none of the RFP requirements.	Meets a few to none of the requirements with few or no clear strengths.	Significant and numerous	No Confidence

Historic Resources Survey for the City of Greer

QUALITATIVE EVALUATION FORM

Proposer: Brockington & Associates Inc.

Evaluation Category	Maximum Potential Points	Excellent (90-100%)	Good (80-89%)	Moderate (70-79%)	Marginal (60-59%)	Unacceptable (0-59%)	Evaluator's Technical Proposal Score (Max Points = Score)
Technical (70% of 60 points = 42 points)	60						
Proposed Methodology (Attachment II Section V (2))		93.5%					56.12
Cost	35						
Management, Time and Cost (Attachment II Section V (3))			87.1%				30.48
Small Diverse Business (SDB)	5						0
TOTAL SCORE	100						86.60

I hereby certify that I have audited this evaluation form for the above mentioned Proposer.

Auditor Signature: _____ Date: 11/14/16

Historic Resources Survey for the City of Greer

QUALITATIVE EVALUATION FORM

Proposer: Environmental Services, Inc.

Evaluation Category	Maximum Potential Points	Excellent (90-100%)	Good (80-89%)	Moderate (70-79%)	Marginal (60-59%)	Unacceptable (0-59%)	Evaluator's Technical Proposal Score (Max Points = Score)
Technical (70% of 60 points = 42 points)	60						
Proposed Methodology (Attachment II Section V (2))				76.8%			46.08
Cost	35						
Management, Time and Cost (Attachment II Section V (3))				75.3%			26.35
Small Diverse Business (SDB)	5						5
TOTAL SCORE	100						77.43

I hereby certify that I have audited this evaluation form for the above mentioned Proposer.

Auditor Signature: _____ Date: 11/14/16

Historic Resources Survey for the City of Greer

QUALITATIVE EVALUATION FORM

Proposer: **JMT**

Evaluation Category	Maximum Potential Points	Excellent (90-100%)	Good (80-89%)	Moderate (70-79%)	Marginal (60-59%)	Unacceptable (0-59%)	Evaluator's Technical Proposal Score (Max Points = Score)
Technical (70% of 60 points = 42 points)	60						
Proposed Methodology (Attachment II Section V (2))			83.5%				50.1
Cost	35						
Management, Time and Cost (Attachment II Section V (3))			82.7%				28.96
Small Diverse Business (SDB)	5						0
TOTAL SCORE	100						79.04

I hereby certify that I have audited this evaluation form for the above mentioned Proposer.

Auditor Signature: _____ Date: **11/14/16**

Historic Resources Survey for the City of Greer

QUALITATIVE EVALUATION FORM

Proposer: [WLA Studio](#)

Evaluation Category	Maximum Potential Points	Excellent (90-100%)	Good (80-89%)	Moderate (70-79%)	Marginal (60-59%)	Unacceptable (0-59%)	Evaluator's Technical Proposal Score (Max Points = Score)
Technical (70% of 60 points = 42 points)	60						
Proposed Methodology (Attachment II Section V (2))			83.5%				50.08
Cost	35						
Management, Time and Cost (Attachment II Section V (3))			82.7%				28.96
Small Diverse Business (SDB)	5						0
TOTAL SCORE	100						79.04

I hereby certify that I have audited this evaluation form for the above mentioned Proposer.

Auditor Signature: _____ Date: [11/14/16](#)

Category Number: VIII.
Item Number:



AGENDA
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
1/10/2017

Adjourn