1. ROLL CALL
Roll was called and a quorum was determined to be present.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The group Pledged Allegiance to the Flag.

3. REVIEW OF PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION ORDINANCE
SECTION 2-26.

Page 5 (d) Project Management – Mr. Schrumm read the section into the record.

Mr. Schrumm asked Mr. Purtill if the architect would perform the bulk of the role cited in the ordinance, and hiring a clerk of the works, project manager if it is a larger project.

Mr. Purtill said that whether a clerk of the works is used depends on the complexity of the job, and the input from the town engineer and extent to which it is arranged for in the architect’s contract/design professional’s contract. In many cases it can be done cost effectively. If they are on top of it very regularly then that is the best thing for the PBC, financially.

Mr. Schrumm said that (d) is done as a matter of course, based on no set guidelines over a certain dollar amount for hiring a clerk of the works. It is the scope of the work that the PBC is looking for, and he asked if this is how PBC wants to do it.

In response, Mr. Purtill said the way it is written is fine. It gives flexibility to make decisions.

Attorney Johnson asked if this step should require Council approval.

As a matter of course, Mr. Schrumm said the Council has been getting written recommendations. PBC has been doing small projects all along, and they do not tell the Council whether the architect is doing the work. PBC has come to the Council in the past for projects like the pool, with money for the clerk of the works. The Council wanted to see a clerk of the works on a project like this.
According to Mr. Purtill the clerk of the works would be put in as part of the overall financial plan.

The section reads that the Commission shall make its written recommendations...on the best method for the use of a particular project. Mr. Schrumm said PBC does not do that except for big projects. The question is whether this step would logically be taken.

Mr. Slocum said the question is whether the Commission has to ask the Council if they have to use an architect. The Council has to be told PBC is using an architect or clerk of the works. The schematic design is what the Council sees to discuss this need.

This talks about a method, and Mr. Michaelangelo said it is like asking the PBC for a formal game plan. There is no written method.

Mr. Purtill said it would be reasonable for PBC to inform the Council what the plan is.

The section says “the Commission shall make its written recommendation...” but Mr. Schrumm said there is nothing about the Council approving it. PBC has not been doing this for smaller projects, and Mr. Schrumm said it is assumed that 80% of the projects done have this function done by the architect.

Mr. Michaelangelo informed the group that a clerk of the works was used for the Humiston School project, part time at $15 per hour, with about 20 hours of work. This insured the contractor was there, how many workers were there, safety provisions in place, etc.

Mr. Sima suggested taking out the word “shall” and insert “may” alleviating the burden on small projects having to go to the Council. Larger and more complex projects would go to the Council.

When he read this section, Attorney Johnson assumed it had no been properly drafted, and the intent was to require Council approval. One possible approach is that the PBC “shall advise” the Council of the method it expects to use. He does not have a sense from everyone involved that this is important.

If the whole thing is deleted, Mr. Purtill asked how we get to the schematic design phase.

Mr. Johnson suggested deleting the reference about going to the Council.

The Council does not get involved in whether to get a clerk of the works, construction manager, etc. and Mr. Schrumm said it is only when it pops up in a line item in the budget for the project.
It was recommended to delete the sentence…Commission *shall* make its written recommendations…on the best method for the use of a particular project.

Mr. Purtill said if we have an architect geared up for it, it is potentially more cost effective to have the architect provide that service.

On the Commission subcommittee, Mr. Schrumm said there are people with particular skill sets about a particular type of project…so, why spend the extra money.

Mr. Sima asked if it is not an architect, but an engineering company, there could be some issue there.

Mr. Purtill said it puts the responsibility on the PBC to make a decision about the best way to carry out the project, which is what the Council holds them accountable for.

According to Mr. Sima, over the last 10 years, there have been multiple designs which have not been totally vetted out in the design phase. The PBC had to go back and struggle getting everything done properly.

Design Phase – Mr. Schrumm read the section into the record.

Mr. Schrumm explained that a schematic design is the rough idea on paper of what we are looking at. The architect fees are assumed to be 15% of a project.

In that regard, Mr. Purtill said he does not know why the 15% is identified here. There is another fee noted of 30%. He would have to look at some contracts to recall the breakdowns, and does not remember paying attention to holding somebody to a particular percentage. PBC gets a lump sum contract and the architect or design professional gives a breakdown of how they expect to spend money and time, and it has to depend on the job.

Mr. Slocum stated it is like a preliminary design fee; then there is a design fee; and this is setting the preliminary design fee of 15%. He asked if this is correct.

Mr. Michaelangelo said it is like progress payments when you build a house for work completed, and you’re always ahead of the game.

The question was raised by Mr. Schrumm if we are using more up front planning money to get a handle on project costs before they are into the formal process. It may be a way of saying to not get into too much detail, unless PBC comes to the Council for more money.
Mr. Purtill said what he is talking about precedes this…don’t hand the PBC projects unless there is a good idea of how much money it will cost. He commented on a situation where the schematic design phase stopped, and went back to the Council and went to the voters. Then the architect worked with PBC, BOE, action committees to show the voters what benefit they were getting. PBC provided a specific sum of money to do this which was based on the amount of money expected to be needed, and a definition of the work.

Mr. Slocum said it may have been 15% of the total, or just a fee paid.

PBC cannot spend planning money without Council approval.

Mr. Purtill said this makes sense, and is the step to shake down the project and see if it is affordable. While not necessary for smaller projects, he said this section is necessary for big projects.

If we are putting up a $10 million building, with 10%-15% of that amount for architect fees, Mr. Schrumm said this section says no more than 15% or $150,000 can be spent on preliminary drawings.

Internally, schematic design is an important part of the process, and Mr. Purtill said this is when you find out what you can build, the money you have to work with and attempt to reconcile the money with the objective. Whether its in the ordinance or internal procedures, he said it is something that is a best practice.

Attorney Johnson has seen the 15% in other towns. In the ordinance it can state that no more than 30% of the estimated design professional services fee can be spent by the time you complete the designs. That also requires Council approval…so you have Council approval at 15% level, and at completion of the design. This is two more trips back to the Council.

This step is important, and Mr. Purtill said whether it requires a trip back to the Council is a different issue.

Mr. Sima commented on the issue of a schematic design coming forward, PBC does some estimating during this phase, and says the project at $500,000 is now $700,000. At that point in time, this is a reflex from the PBC to go to the Council. If the number is right on target, Mr. Sima does not see why PBC has to go back to the Council.

Mr. Adinolfi said that during a preliminary design or schematic design he has seen companies ask for the estimate associated with that, plus or minus 30%. So the percentages are focused on what level of accuracy is estimated for the project, which drives the level of detail and understanding so there can be an estimate. When you get to the design phase it should be plus or minus 10% because you want as accurate a forecast as possible of the cost. Mr. Adinolfi
has seen the focus being different, not on fees expended, but you don’t want to spend 50% of the budget for professional services and then have the project go under. What is more valuable is being at a level of understanding and estimating which gets you to a cost estimate, plus or minus some range. When you get to the next level (f) the estimate is of the cost, actually build, or plus or minus 10%. The focuses can be very different for the level of understanding and ability to estimate the cost, plus or minus a certain percentage. He is expecting, at the end of the schematic phase, plus or minus 30% and it better not be out of that range. For the PBC it seems to be focused on services…percentage of fees as opposed to percentage of accuracy.

Mr. Schrumm commented on knowing what a project will cost, i.e. $10 million for a police station, having to go through all the steps, with 10% architect fees. This section of the ordinance says PBC cannot spend more than $150,000 or go back to the Council for the money. PBC can say that, for a building like this, more accuracy is needed up front because of going for funding, referendum, etc. and maybe more than 15% is needed. The other piece is on a project for which there is no clue as to cost, or doing it one way or a different way (locker room and showers at the high school). No one has put a pencil to this project as to the cost. In this case the schematic design could determine whether the project is logical to be done in its current space, how the whole thing might work. Or, put it in this space, but don’t spend more than $500,000 doing it.

Mr. Purtill can see going either way at this phase, finding we are way short, and going back to reconcile the money with the objective. He recalls situations where the PBC was somewhat over, and following discussion, the project was re-designed or re-defined, not to use up the money but to include things that had been held back. There is an important dialogue which takes place at this point between the Council and PBC and the user about what there is to work with and what is deliverable.

Following the discussion about the 15% fee, Mr. Schrumm said it can be left that way, or go back to the Council for more money. He questioned if PBC wants this, in writing, for a level of accuracy within 20%, 30%.

Mr. Michaelangelo said that with 10 bidders on a job, the architect is the 11th bidder, and they are taking their shot like everyone else. The architect is making an estimate just like the other bidders.

Attorney Johnson said his reaction is that it sounds like a very important time, and it should still be required to go to the Council.

According to Mr. Slocum it is setting 15% for the total design fee for the preliminary design. We do want to set a fee.
Attorney Johnson noted it could require Mr. Purtill or Mr. Michaelangelo coming to the Council saying we need to spend another $5,000 before bringing the design to the Council.

It needs to stay in the ordinance and Mr. Schrumm said this is because a project may not have a total from which to take 15%.

Mr. Purtill said that PBC does not have to go to the Council for every schematic design phase job, i.e. a roof or bank of windows. There are steps which are superfluous in certain kinds of jobs. He is also talking about PBC being required to go to Council with the results of the schematic design.

There was a brief discussion about the Dodd Kitchen project. Mr. Schrumm said this project would never have happened as it did if it had come to the Council. Mr. Michaelangelo said PBC accomplished everything in phase #1 of this project, and phase #2 is the additional things to be done. Phase #1 escaped referendum.

It was determined that e (1) is okay for now. Mr. Schrumm read an excerpt into the record.

The real key here is thinking through the scope of the project before it gets referred to PBC. The question is how big a project should be for the Council to see a schematic design, i.e. roof projects. Upcoming roof projects include the police station and roofs at the high school.

Attorney Johnson commented on “the schematic design cannot exceed the criteria for the project authorized by the Council…” but is not sure what this means.

Mr. Purtill interprets this to mean that PBC won't design a project that over runs the budget. This also speaks to Mr. Adinolfi’s point.

The locker room and showers at the high school were cited by Mr. Schrumm, with added items such as offices for coaches, steam room, etc. The authorization says locker room area, and if it says locker room facilities including coaches’ offices and team rooms…this is another ball game. This section of the ordinance is designed for the PBC to fully understand what is being handed to them.

Mr. Purtill noted that sometimes at this stage, a wall is opened up, or we look under a ceiling, and are surprised at what is found. At that point PBC has to revamp its plans, and this can involve some tradeoffs. This is always done with the user.
Mr. Slocum said BOE planning money could be used if it is their project must be expanded beyond what the Council expected.

Mr. Schrumm stated that this section governs how the PBC should act whether the money is coming out of the BOE account or Town Council money. With some of the roof projects, more work may be required, but the scope of the project is to fix the roof, with more money required.

If the user allows some deferred maintenance to be taken care of, Mr. Purtill said this is what this is…and the user realizes there is a fixed amount of money available to them. So, they don’t want the new office as planned; it can be deferred; but the user wants the other items fixed.

According to Mr. Schrumm the critical piece here is the criteria of the project authorized by the Council. If the user wants something special, the Council can be informed, and it can be put in the authorization to PBC.

Mr. Michaelangelo noted that these are all usually capital projects to the PBC, so whatever is on the single sheet describes the problem and the solution.

In the past, Mr. Schrumm said we have seen $500,000 for high school improvements, and the question is what does this mean. Some things never get done; others get done that were unanticipated; and other things do get done. In turning information over to PBC, things should be chiseled down a bit. The Council, by resolution, should be giving PBC things to be done.

Mr. Purtill asked, to what extent does the Council delegate to the PBC, the authority to make trade offs. If the trade off goes back to the Council it is back to the lengthy process. He cited Darcey School as an example when a new roof was put on. When PBC got to this phase they saw an opportunity to put on a 30 year roof rather than a 20 year roof, costing the same money, with enough money in the budget. There was an opportunity to make a long term decision to the Town’s benefit, and PBC thought it should be done, and it was done.

An example was cited by Mr. Sima using the large window project at the high school, having money left over, with other windows added to the project. He said the question is whether PBC should come back to the Council to do the extra work. PBC did a great job with extra money left over. Does the user make the decision or does it come back to the Council for a decision.

For the Library, Mr. Purtill said there was a tight estimate, and the user asked about furnishings for the reading room. It was informally discussed with the Council, and it was approved.

Mr. Adinolfi said that, to him, criteria is being within budget and within estimated time frame. Scope could include locker room and team room. He is confused
about what exceeding the criteria for the project means. It should be scope which is more descriptive than the criteria.

Attorney Johnson would be inclined to say “exceed the scope or the budget or the estimated cost.”

Mr. Schrumm said it could be the schematic phase, discovering the fact that we are short or way over.

When the Council sends something over to PBC, Attorney Johnson said it is usually based on the budget amount of the project. So, if we want the architect to design a project that is going to cost more than the budget, we want to go through that without going back to the Council.

With the CHS locker room project, Mr. Schrumm said we have been hearing about it for 4 years, and we need something which says to build what is needed. There is no dollar figure on this project. The Council needs something from PBC to get a better handle on this, with definition of the scope. In this case, the Council does not send the project to PBC with a dollar amount involved.

Mr. Purtill said this would be the Council commissioning a feasibility study, which is provided for in the ordinance.

Attorney Johnson said is hearing that, if there is a specific budget given to the PBC, and it looks like it is too low, they will come back to the Council for more money.

(3) Mr. Schrumm read the excerpt into the record.

When the blueprint is given by PBC to the Council, Mr. Schrumm said this is when they will give a cost within 30%. This section remains as written.

(4) Mr. Schrumm read the excerpt into the record.

The question is what size project must come back to the Council. This section says that before proceeding to the design phase the PBC shall submit to the Council…with the implication being all the projects.

Mr. Sima said there are many projects that do not need to come back to the Council.

As a Council, Mr. Slocum asked if it can decide what projects it wants to see. To him, the Council should give some guidance to the PBC.

Some projects can be very expensive, but Mr. Purtill said they are not complex, i.e. a roof.
There is some criteria, such as the dollar amount. Mr. Schrumm asked if the Council should see the final schematic design for anything over a set amount, or upon recommendation of the Town Manager.

Mr. Sima said the dollar amount will not come out as the most important issue, as what becomes complicated and how it fits in with the rest of the Town structure.

For the two projects assigned to PBC, the Dodd kitchen phase #2 and the CHS track, PBC can do a great job. Mr. Michaelangelo said when the project comes to the Council there will be issues discussed regardless of what the design is for these projects.

Mr. Schrumm commented on the Town Manager sitting down with the Council Chairman on what is to come before the meeting, this is the place to decide if a project comes to the Council.

Attorney Johnson thought Mr. Schrumm was saying that, after consultation with Mr. Michaelangelo, the committee says it does not make sense to go through the 15% approval process for this project. The Town Manager puts the item on the agenda, asks for a waiver at a time when it will not hold up the project. PBC does not have to bring the schematic to the Council to be approved. This is something which staff handles. It is an exception which has been talked about.

There could be some exceptions noted in the ordinance. Attorney Johnson said it could read that “Council waives after recommendations from the Town Manager.” And, there could be another waiver for projects costing less than $100,000.

Mr. Schrumm stated the following wording: “The Council may waive this provision based on the recommendation of the Town Manager.”

MOTION by Mr. Adinolfi; seconded by Mr. Schrumm.

MOVED to waive the review of bids on the XYZ projects.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Basically, there would be a recommendation made by the user to the Town Manager, and Mr. Slocum said the Town Manager confers with the Council Chair.

Mr. Adinolfi likes the idea of the Council approval and Town Manager’s recommendation to the Council.
Regarding the waiver, Mr. Schrumm commented on a project coming up, ready to go to final design phase…but it must wait for the next Council meeting to waive the requirement.

Mr. Purtill suggested advising the PBC ahead of time, that a project does not need to be brought up…come back and tell the Council it is done.

The Senior Center elevator was raised by Mr. Schrumm who asked why it was designed as it was…for cost or design. In August the Council signed off on this project, without PBC having to come back to the Council again.

Mr. Slocum said this project would only come back to the Council if it exceeds the budget and more money is needed.

Attorney Johnson stated that if language is put in providing for a waiver, the waiver could be provided either when the project is first submitted to PBC, or at any time in the future. If we keep an eye on the project, then there is no need to wait until the schematic drawings are completed to go to the Council for a waiver. Even though the Council may want to see what is there before approving a waiver, it may be done 30 or 60 days before the schematics are completed, so the Council has an idea of it. Therefore, the project is prevented from being held up.

Further review of the ordinance will be done by Attorney Johnson to find the appropriate place for the waiver statement.

If the waiver is put in at the beginning of the project, Mr. Sima asked if the same language would be included which says…as long as the project remains within the scope.

At the start of the project, Attorney Johnson said there may not be enough known to provide for a waiver.

Mr. Purtill asked if the PBC or Council representative could decide that even though a waiver has been given, they should go back and tell people what they are going to get. He cited the example of the elevator…if we stay within budget by using ropes instead of cable.

Attorney Johnson discussed the dollar amount, and whether there should be exclusion of the need for following the approval provision if the total project cost is estimated to be less than a certain dollar amount.

Guidelines are to be provided to the Council to determine whether to send a project to the PBC. Attorney Johnson said the dollar amount could be one of the factors considered.
5. Mr. Schrumm read the excerpt into the record.

“After the Council approves or waives the schematic design…”

Mr. Purtill recommended saying “after that process is done”…

Mr. Schrumm asked if this is the section where other reviews are required such as handicapped review, state fire marshal, energy, etc.

It was suggested by Mr. Purtill that there be some broad language which shows that PBC should align with local and state approvals, without defining them in the ordinance.

At the last meeting there was discussion about a requirement for all building projects being blessed by the Disabilities and Energy Committees. Attorney Johnson said this would be the local committees, but Town staff knows the ADA requirements. Going to the committees could result in negotiations on things not required by law. These are policy decisions.

Mr. Michaelangelo said that the project is pretty much designed before going to any committees.

It is presumed the project has a design professional who can design something to meet standards.

The section states “comments or recommendations from other appropriate town officers or agencies shall also be obtained.” Mr. Schrumm noted it does not say “approved”. So, if the Energy Commission does not like the design of the building, it can send recommendations to the Council. He asked if Mr. Purtill is saying wait until the final design phase is done before letting other committees know.

Mr. Purtill said that getting input is a process of having the appropriate people partake in the subcommittee process. If there is an issue then someone from a commission can be on the subcommittee, as was done with the pool.

For Disabilities Committee, Mr. Michaelangelo said a quorum must be scheduled to show them the plans and educate them on the plans.

Mr. Sima said they should be given a time frame in which to review the plans, and if they don’t do it and meet, then the project still goes ahead.

In response, Mr. Purtill said that Mr. Sima makes a very good point, because review by other committees/commissions can be a bottleneck.
Attorney Johnson asked if there are any existing requirements that this review and approval be given.

Two commissions are Disabilities and Energy, and Mr. Schrumm asked if there were any others.

When the project gets well into design development, Mr. Purtill said the design professional goes out on a mission to talk to all the various people with a say in the project. Many will not consider anything without blueprints because they are signing off on them.

From an administrative standpoint, Mr. Michaelangelo and his staff send out a note to Energy, Handicapped and others, advising that the project is at the schematic design level. Mr. Schrumm said this raises their awareness, and they can send any recommendations. Then, leave it at that. Comments are due before the design phase is done, and are sent to the PBC.

With the Dodd kitchen project, Mr. Michaelangelo said there was a design by the user, Education Department, to have a heating system on the loading dock. It was an electric generated heating system, and the Energy Commission did not feel it was necessary. This is a time when the user is pushing in one direction and the commission in the opposite direction.

Attorney Johnson commented on the Council adopting in 1992 a requirement for the PBC…”The Council directs that no municipal agency supervising the design of any public building which uses energy or has disability issues shall approve or recommend approval of the final design until the design has been referred to the Commission for People with Disabilities and/or the Energy Commission for a report.”

This requirement gives the commission(s) 35 days to get back to the PBC.

Mr. Sima said this should be put in the ordinance. 35 days from when the PBC gets a project, it notifies the other commissions, and they have 35 days to get back to the PBC. The bottleneck is happening. PBC comes up with the schematic design, and now it goes out to these two committees, and there is over a month to 6 weeks backup.

Step 5 could be sending a notice to these groups about project X, letting them know that if they want to provide input going into the final design phase, they should let PBC know. Mr. Schrumm said ADA people have no say until the blueprints are back to be looked at.

Mr. Purtill said they have no assurance what PBC will put in the final design what was in the schematic design, because there is no requirement for that.
It was noted by Mr. Slocum that the Energy Commission wanted a seat at the table for all PBC meetings, so they could decide while they were at the table. And, this is a problem.

If these groups are not in the loop at the schematic design level, Mr. Schrumm said we go through the design phase, and then have the blueprints. The likelihood that anything will change to accommodate Energy is remote.

Mr. Purtill said the practical thing is that Energy has to be offered a seat in the subcommittee process so they can have a say. He also thinks they can make a contribution there. The job with a problem was the high school when PBC was about to finalize design and go out to bid, and an Energy Commission member wanted a peaked roof. It had already been designed otherwise, and if you want a gabled roof you need sprinklers and all that goes with it. This would have been very expensive. If they had participated in the schematic design or in the subcommittee process they would have had a chance to make their feelings known.

Mr. Schrumm read an excerpt from step 5 into the record. He asked if PBC notices the relevant boards and commissions that a project is coming forward, even with copies of the agenda and minutes. This would allow comments early on, and if not, they will have another look when the final plans come in.

Mr. Purtill stated that PBC can more effectively deal with the intent of #5 by including in the internal procedures the necessary representation of other committees/boards/users, etc.

Mr. Slocum said that makes sense. For PZC approvals an application goes through approvals by other boards, i.e. The Beautification Committee. There are steps along the way, but during the 65 day process which is set up by the State for application approval, there is time to get these approvals. If PBC does this at the subcommittee level it will solve much of the delay.

In the ordinance, Mr. Purtill said it does not provide for the subcommittee process that has evolved.

Attorney Johnson advised he would be suggesting some language in this regard.

Mr. Purtill noted that this contemplates that the entire Commission will work with every single job, and that is not done.

Mr. Schrumm said that #5 will be left alone, other than “after the Council has approved or waived”, or some such language.

Mr. Schrumm read the description of Design Development into the record.
Regarding the 30%, Mr. Purtill said this is not a good number at this point because PBC might have the entire project, i.e. a roof, and the entire design money might be in this phase. Holding out the design fee money is inappropriately restricting the design budget.

Mr. Schrumm sees no reason for the 30% to be in the ordinance.

Mr. Sima said the issue will come in on a complicated project when there is a change order, when the entire budget has been shot, or the architect has to do multiple site visits, and do a change order re-design. There has to be money left aside.

If we do what has been discussed about roofs, finding one design professional, quality the person, and set up a master contract with them, Mr. Purtill said this turns the project over to the company. If they perform well then they have the job. A project would not need much schematic design because there would be set up of the necessary policies and procedures. It is a matter of a person going in and assessing the structure, existing roof, how much cost for the tear off, etc. Most of the person’s time would be put into the design development, and it would not be much at the end because all the documents will be set up in boiler plate. They would have to try out something which has already been approved by legal counsel. It would be an inexpensive way to get the project done. But, the number stated will not work.

Mr. Sima asked about leaving back 10% of the architect’s money, to leave some room.

Attorney Johnson advised that is a contract by contract question, with some contracts having a percentage held back. It is a good point but not to be put in the ordinance.

Mr. Purtill said that, sometimes, the PBC approves additional money within the Commission for change orders for unforeseen things. There is a contingency.

Attorney Johnson will review the two paragraphs for language changes.

Mr. Schrumm read another excerpt of the ordinance..."Upon completion of the design development phase of any project, the Commission shall submit the design to the Council for approval together with the Commission’s updated estimate of project costs for proceeding with the contract documents, bidding and construction phase."

This language was briefly discussed and considered prudent.
Going back to the size and scope of the project, Mr. Schrumm said this is assuming the Council waives the approval of the schematic design. He asked if this also means the Council waives the final design, and asked if it should do so.

#2 would be the approval to go out to bid, and Mr. Purtill said the Council must authorize this to be done by the PBC.

It was determined that this section was okay as written.

In g(1) Attorney Johnson said there is the requirement that the Council approve the contract to be signed.

If a project is under the referendum threshold, Mr. Sima said it is a small project and should not have to go to Council. Costs are already built in; they go up incrementally every year; so at 75% of the referendum threshold, a project would be about $250,000. PBC would come back to the Council when it is time to sign the contract. Mr. Sima recommended that a dollar limit be stated.

Once the Council takes ownership of the project, Mr. Schrumm said it goes forward.

At the prior meeting, Attorney Johnson noted that the time frame to advance a project to the Council was dropped to 15 days from 30 days.

Mr. Purtill stated that the PBC is getting better turn around.

Mr. Sima asked that a time line be supplied to the Council for a typical project of the PBC. This would help with streamlining the process.

For time sensitive jobs, Mr. Purtill sees this helping, i.e. with a roof that can only be done in a certain time frame. It is the same with a kitchen project or window project to be done when school is closed.

There are other items from prior meetings which Attorney Johnson said have not been touched on at this meeting. There are other changes to be considered to save time. He cited an example of authorizing PBC to hire an architect or engineer to do all projects costing less than a set amount for a one or two year period. There are things which would take many of these projects out of the full five step process.

Mr. Sima said we must be careful with this process because we end up with a “town’s architect”, and many people will run away from bidding.

Attorney Johnson said we had this problem with the WPCA using the same firm for years and years.
If the Council and PBC decide to hire an architect or engineer for all projects costing under a set amount of money, Attorney Johnson said it must be done for a period of time. At the end of that time, the Town goes out again to the market for another professional.

Mr. Schrumm read Section G excerpts into the record.

Mr. Schrumm said that the PBC is keeping track of payments.

Mr. Purtill asked if the PBC minutes would serve the need under this section. The minutes have a status report of every open contract.

According to Mr. Schrumm the Council liaison to the PBC should be providing an update to the Council. The PBC minutes provide a status of each project.

Mr. Purtill advised that the PBC minutes are organized, with a list of each open project, and each project subcommittee chair gives a report. Motions are put forth for payments, etc.

In the PBC minutes Mr. Schrumm said there should be a report if a project is starting to go off track, and a written history of how this happened.

Mr. Sima suggested referencing the minutes of the PBC in the ordinance.

Mr. Purtill advised that the PBC minutes referenced the timing of the Dodd kitchen job.

In the ordinance Mr. Schrumm said there should be inclusion about what the PBC is doing now with projects. This could be in #2.

Mr. Purtill said that the PBC gets final approval from the customer, i.e. the BOE. The report is not an explicit prepared report. All project information is in the PBC minutes.

In the Town Manager’s report, Mr. Sima suggested inclusion of information on PBC projects to the Council.

Mr. Purtill stated that the fact of completion and approval is part of the PBC minutes. It does not contain a recitation of income and expenses. But, this is included in the Town’s accounting system.

Combining 3 and 4 could be brought to the Council by Town Manager Milone.

Attorney Johnson summarized that the group is saying combine this, simplify it, and have the Town Manager provide information to the Council.
The Town Engineer’s office handles the sign off letter as this is part of their process.

From his standpoint, Mr. Purtill said this is a desirable thing because this is when the PBC stops spending money, and the user cannot come back for anything else.

Attorney Johnson asked if there was agreement that there is no need for Council approval of the final report. We are requiring the Town Manager to make the final report to the Council.

Stating he has enough to start on the ordinance, Attorney Johnson said another meeting will be necessary to finalize everything.

Mr. Purtill stated that he does not think design/build is adequately covered in the ordinance.

Attorney Johnson has attached some things about design/build, and rather than him trying to revise the ordinance to address that issue, it can wait until the entire ordinance is revised.

The next meeting date is November 8th, 7:30 p.m.

4. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Adinolfi; seconded by Mr. Schrumm.

MOVED to adjourn at 9:30 p.m.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Attest:

Marilyn W. Milton, Clerk
Transcribed from tape.