



Center Elementary School Project

Hopkinton Elementary School Building Committee

89 Hayden Rowe Street
Hopkinton, MA 01748

Meeting Minutes

Hopkinton Elementary School Building Committee
December 6, 2010 7:00 PM
School Administration Bldg. Conference Room

Attendees:

Rebecca Robak, Chairwoman
Diana Beck
Todd Cestari
Jim Hervol
Joe Karner
Norman Khumalo
Jen Parsons
Jack Phelan
Tom Towle
Andrew Wailgum

Mark Collins, HCAM
Ralph Dumas, School Finance Director
Troy Mick, School Committee (SC)
Michael Morton, Metrowest Daily News
John Mosher, Board of Selectmen (BoS)

David Finney, Design Partnership of Cambridge (DPC)

Chairwoman Rebecca Robak brought the meeting to order at 7:04PM.

Housekeeping:

- Joe move and Jack seconded a motion to approve payment of an invoice to Design Partnership of Cambridge (DPC) for Professional Services in the amount of \$38,500. The motion passed unanimously.

Rebecca asked Norman to explain changes to the membership of the committee. Norman explained that when the committee was formed in 2007, the BOS set a membership for 3 year terms. These terms will require members to be re-sworn in the near future. Rebecca also suggested that membership would be expanded to include a second SC member, and a representative from the Building Maintenance organization of the School Department.

Rebecca then gave a brief review of a Construction Management at Risk workshop held last week. At that workshop, the members ended up being fairly evenly divided on whether to use a Design, Bid, Build (or Hard Build) approach, or a Construction Management at Risk (CMR) approach. The attendees of the workshop that have experience in the construction industry were more in favor of the CMR approach, citing that it generally led to a higher quality pool of bidders, and that it generally led to a smoother project. They also pointed out that CMR was particularly effective in complex projects. There was general agreement that Hard Build would be somewhat less expensive at bid time, but that costs after construction began could rise due to legal costs and change orders.

A lively discussion ensued with various members weighing in on their impressions of the two approaches, and with good information from Jim, Andrew, Tom, and David from the construction industry. Norman introduced an opinion from Town Counsel that legal costs for CMR should be increased in his opinion by \$100K due to contract negotiations. Andrew pointed out that there were two types of legal costs to be considered, transactional costs (such as those cited by Town Counsel), and litigation costs. He felt that while the Town Counsel was probably correct to point out that transactional legal fees would be greater in the CMR approach, that it was quite likely that litigation costs could be higher, and much higher in the Hard Bid scenario.

Jack pointed out that in his discussions with MSBA, neither approach was preferred over the other. While a firm number on how much additional cost the CMR approach would be, the three numbers that seemed to come up most often were 3%, 5%, and “up to 10%”. An Owner’s Project Manager (OPM) would be required in either scenario.

Rebecca pointed out that a recommendation on the matter was needed to be provided to the School Committee, who would make the final decision. Jim moved and Andrew seconded a motion for the committee to recommend the CMR approach to the SC. The committee deadlocked 5-5 in the first vote.

The committee was in general agreement that this conclusion would be unsatisfactory, so discussion went on. Several points made earlier were reiterated, and some new insight was brought forward. It was pointed out that there was some additional protection offered the town in the case of CMR, in that the CMR had a maximum bid which they legally had to live within, and it was the responsibility of the CMR to bring the project in within that budget framework. Once again Jim moved and Andrew seconded that the committee recommend the CMR approach to the School Committee, and this time the motion passed 6 (Andrew, Diana, Jim, Rebecca, Tom, Todd) – 4 (Jack, Jen, Joe, Norman).

A brief discussion ensued regarding whether the committee wanted to revisit the routing of the new road in from Victory Lane to delay demolition of the existing DPW garage. It was pointed out that demolition was the ultimate disposition of that facility, and that even if it were delayed the garage would not be approachable from two sides as the embankment to the road would come very close to the building. It would also shorten turning radiuses on the new road, and increase the pitch of the embankment requiring an

expensive retaining wall, that would not otherwise be required. This would lessen the safety margins built into the existing design of the road, leave a structure that had greatly restricted access that ultimately required demolition. Rebecca sought a motion to reconsider our vote on the site layout to accommodate the existing road design and avoid the demolition of the DPW garage, but none was forthcoming.

David Finney of DPC then led us through a number of budget points, asking for some guidance on some, and explaining the process as it pertained to the filing with MSBA. Several additional questions were asked, and some final issues remain under consideration.

A brief discussion of upcoming meetings was made, with a joint meeting with the School Committee being scheduled for 12/16/2010 from 6:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m., and additional meetings proposed for 1/10/2010 and 1/24/2010.

Joe moved and Jen seconded a motion to adjourn at 9:31 p.m. The motion passed unanimously.