

**Town Planning/Building Committee for Salem School Renovation**  
**July 28, 2009**  
**Salem School Meeting Room**  
**7:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES OF JULY 28, 2009 REGULAR MEETING**

**PRESENT:** Jim Choquette, Stuart Gadbois, Bill Weinschenker, Monica McIntyre, Dinis Pimentel, Richard Asafaylo, Kevin Lyden, Donald Bourdeau (arrived at 8:22 P.M.)

**ABSENT:** Chris LaRose, Mike Siebert, Donna Leake, Jenifer Lee, Horace Lindo

**GUESTS:** Charles Boos, Barbara James, Denise Orsini, David Shopis President and CEO of FIP

CALL TO ORDER: Meeting called to order at 7:03 P.M. by Dinis Pimentel, Chairman.

Everyone at the meeting introduced themselves to the guests.

M/S/C (Asafaylo/McIntyre) to approve the July 14, 2009 minutes as submitted. Vote: Yes-5 No-0 Abstain-2 (B. Weinschenker, S. Gadbois). Motion passed.

D. Pimentel recapped the last meeting with the committee's favoring of a construction manager (CM).

D. Shopis introduced himself and described his involvement with the Town of Avon's BOE, building committees, and his employment with construction and FIP since 1979. He also talked about the bidding process and how it works through different parts of the project.

S. Gadbois asked about a clerk of the works, and Mr. Shopis described their involvement in a project. C. Boos added that a clerk of the works authority is limited, that they're the eyes and ears of the owner, but are not in an authority position.

Mr. Shopis described a commissioning agent as being involved with the planning process and specifications. After the project is completed, they review building systems such as HVAC, electrical, fire alarms, etc. and then test them to see if they are compatible with the design standards. If something is wrong, they alert the trades person to have it fixed. A commissioning agent is an independent person hired by the committee, and it is not currently regulated/mandatory by the state to hire one. A contract administrator is not the same as a commissioning agent.

Mr. Shopis described a general contractor's (GC) position in a project. For pricing, a GC will only price what is shown on the plans, so the price could change because things can change so much throughout a project. With a GC there is no control over the selection of people building in the project; it's the GC and his chosen subcontractors. The interaction between the committee and a GC would really only begin around construction time and at committee meetings, and owner meetings once per month.

When using a CM, the committee would choose the builder based on qualifications and fees. The CM would provide pre-construction services such as scheduling, phasing, teacher's being informed, etc. There would be regular cost updates, discussion of minute details, and making choices for the final design. A CM is good at anticipating what is not shown on the construction plans and can help after the budget has been determined what in the project can fit within that budget.

Two different kinds of CM's were explained: 1. CM at Risk which is more common and guarantees a maximum price and 2. CM Advisor who holds no contract with the subcontractors and assigns management to the committee. Everything would have to be signed by the committee and there is no cap on overall costs.

Mr. Shopis explained guaranteed maximum pricing (GMP) based on plans, specifications, etc. that will guarantee the project will not cost more than the set amount. The CM firm signs that contract with the committee.

Mr. Shopis passed around the Griswold Middle School Guaranteed Maximum Price Proposal and Project Progress Report No. 8 for the committee to review.

Mr. Shopis explained that with a CM all the numbers, money spent, and bids and subcontractors are available for review. Any monies left over during or after construction in line item savings or not spent out of contingency goes back to the committee. All the monthly reports made by the CM are public records and are readily available for auditing.

D. Pimentel asked for the committee's opinions:

- J. Choquette liked the idea of a CM before and after the presentation.
- S. Gadbois liked the CM approach but questioned if the job is too small for it?
- C. Boos said the job is not too small, cited other successful smaller projects with a CM.
- B. James remembers problems with a clerk of the works with a past school addition.
- B. Weinschenker said when East Lyme High School used a CM in their project it was smooth and efficient and a GC experience was not as good.
- M. McIntyre in theory likes the idea of a GC because of not being so involved but a GC may not be in the best interest of the Town.
- R. Asafaylo would like to try to pursue the CM approach first; he liked the idea of control, transparency, and avoiding controversy.
- K. Lyden said the CM approach looks worthwhile.
- D. Bourdeau cited the last school addition with the difficulty of a GC, but that either one works. A CM project in Montville went well but there was a cost overrun.
- D. Pimentel liked the idea of a CM, feeling there was greater value, more cooperation and a less adversarial role by the contractor who becomes on owners representative under the CM approach.

M/S/C (Gadbois/Weinschenker) To authorize the committee in conjunction with the architect to build an RFQ to qualify a construction management firm. Vote: Yes-7 No-0 Abstain-0. Motion passed.

Next meeting is August 11, 2009 at 7:00 P.M. at Salem School.

M/S/C (Weinschenker/Asafaylo) to adjourn. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 9:06 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by:  
Lindsay K. Chester  
Recording Secretary