

**Select Board Meeting
April 24, 2014
Steele Block Conference Room - 3:00pm**

Present: C. Nordle, C. Viens, J. Grenier, Select Board; A. Nelson, B. Farr, L. Oates, A. Tuscany, A. Imhoff

Public: Darren Misenko, Sandy Fead; Fead Construction Law; Harriet Grenier, Everett Coffey

C. Nordle called the meeting to order at 3:05pm.

AGENDA

C. Nordle added two items to the agenda. One item was to approve the MOU for the dog pound contract for the upcoming year and the second item included a Stowe Street update from A. Tuscany.

C. Nordle noted that the dog pound MOU, which will be identical the MOU from last year, with a slightly adjusted price, includes language regarding possession of animals by the Animal Control Officer.

C. Viens made a motion to approve the dog pound MOU that has currently been in place with the adjusted price and to authorize A. Tuscany to sign. The motion was seconded by J. Grenier and passed by those present.

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT & PROJECT SCHEDULING UPDATES

C. Nordle introduced Sandy Fead and Darren Misenko of Fead Construction Law. The attorneys were present at the meeting and offered their services to provide any assistance necessary for the duration of the municipal building project. Sandy Fead mentioned that his firm has worked closely with municipal governments and is also very familiar with the Waterbury and the municipal building project.

A. Nelson discussed his recent work on the Construction Management (CM) RFP. Once reviewed by B. Farr, VIA, and the Select Board, the RFP will be sent to Ray Marzbani at the State for his review and confirmation that the RFP is in line with all federal procurement requirements.

There was a lengthy discussion on the schedule for CM RFP approval, release and hiring. This discussion included input from Sandy Fead and Darren Misenko, A. Nelson, B. Farr, and present members of the Select Board. Fead noted that the CM RFP should include a draft construction packet, which will have a tentative construction start date this fall. This schedule may change as the project progresses, but Fead stated that construction managers will assume that parts of the schedule will change and are well-equipped to adapt to a changing schedule. Fead mentioned even giving a construction manager two alternatives for a start date and allow him/her to make that decision. C. Viens asked if interior renovation work could begin in the fall and continue through winter. Fead said that it is not necessarily cost effective to spend money for a top-level construction manager to work on interior renovations on a small piece of property, noting that working on the entire project in spring or fall would possibly be more efficient and a better use of money. J. Grenier said that he was in favor of staying on the accelerated schedule and let the construction manager decide if a spring or fall start date is more viable and/or cost effective. He said that cost is a big concern with this project so it would be unwise to push back the project preemptively without knowing the cost implications.

B. Farr mentioned that Act 250 permitting does not require a construction manager to be present and said that permitting needs to begin sooner rather than later, while hiring a construction manager could be pushed back slightly.

After the discussion, the following schedule was agreed upon. The CM RFP will be issued on 5/15 and a site visit for interested parties will be held on 5/22. Questions regarding the RFP will be due to B. Farr by 5/28. All proposals will be due 6/2, references checked 6/3 and 6/4, and proposals will be reviewed at the 6/5 Select Board meeting. At this meeting, the Select Board will select top choices for interviews. Interviews will be held on 6/12 and the selected party will be notified on 6/13. The Select Board will approve the contract at the 6/16 meeting. This agreed upon schedule will be published by B. Farr.

A. Nelson mentioned that he has completed 75% of the CM RFP, but would appreciate some support and assistance on some of the complexities.

C. Viens made a motion to move into executive session to discuss procuring attorney assistance for the CM RFP. The motion was seconded by J. Grenier and passed by those present.

The executive session ended at 4:10pm with no action taken.

J. Grenier made a motion to have A. Tuscany sign a letter of engagement with Fead Construction Law to assist the town in legal services connected to the building complex project, subject to changes associated with any conflicts of interest. The motion was seconded by C. Viens and passed by those present.

C. Nordle said that he would prefer the upcoming Waterbury Record ad to say that the town is negotiating for community garden space at the end of Winooski St below the cemetery. B. Farr suggested adding a bullet to the ad to state that the \$1 million CDBG-DR grant is subject to an approved bond vote by 6/30. Everett Coffey asked if the 6/30 grant extension needed to be made regardless of the rescission vote outcome. C. Nordle said that no extension would be needed if the rescission is voted down. However, if the rescission vote is to un-approve the bond as approved on Town Meeting Day, then the Town will have to request an extension. J. Grenier said that he was in favor of adding this language to the ad.

J. Grenier excused himself from the meeting at 4:18pm, adjourning the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Lauren Oates – AmeriCorps VISTA

Approved on: May 12, 2014