

**Town of Rehoboth
Municipal Building Study Committee
Notes of the Meeting on November 1, 2018
Location: Council on Aging**

Present: Frank Barresi, Helen Dennen, David Foss, Bill Maiorano, Joseph Nunes, James Medeiros, Carolyn Panofsky, Richard Panofsky

Guests: Selectman James Muri; Edward Rowse, architect; Daniel Tavares, CGA Project Management; Marc Zawatsky, CGA Project Management

Excused: Scott Meager

Call to Order: 5:05 pm

Minutes of Meeting on October 1, 2018. The draft had been distributed by email; later, a revised version was sent as the one to consider. D. Foss moved approval of the revised version as written; F. Barresi seconded; motion carried.

1. Consider process and timing

- OPM had sent a draft document by email presenting three options for developing the design documents and seeking town approval. Each option was described including potential pros and cons. D. Tavares summarized the document.
 - Option 1 seeks town approval based on concept design cost estimates;
 - Option 2 seeks town approval based on a construction document estimate prior to request for construction bids;
 - Option 3 seeks town approval based on actual construction bids.
- Discussion of Option 1 led to a consensus that it is not preferred. M. Zawatsky explained the concept of a “cost certainty curve” and that option 1 has the least certainty.
- Discussion of Option 2 also led to a consensus it is not preferred. CGA explained that the up-front design costs are expected to be similar to that of Option 3, since it lacks only the step of going out for bids.
- Discussion of Option 3
 - The committee conducted a systematic review.
 - Discussion brought out that, although it would take longer than Options 1 and 2, this option gives a more certain cost as well as specific plans for town consideration. M. Zawatsky explained that option 3 presents the highest certainty of cost at the time of Town Meeting vote for funding approval.
 - Because Option 3 involves a number of planning decision steps, there will be more opportunities to inform the town citizens about details of the project as it moves forward.
 - The process used to obtain funding for Option 3 depends on future determinations as to the costs for retaining the services of an OPM, Architect, and Design Team. The funding mechanism is also dependent upon available town resources. If a cost could be covered within the existing available budget, there would not be a need for a town meeting vote. A budget adjustment, if needed, would require town meeting vote. Borrowing, if needed, would require both a town meeting vote and a ballot vote.
- D. Foss moved that the Committee prefers Option 3; J. Nunes seconded; the motion carried unanimously.
- Discussion then turned to details of how to proceed.
 - J. Medeiros, assisted by H. Dennen, will inform the BOS of the recommendation from the Committee to move forward with Option 3 as the preferred approach, and request that the topic be placed on the agenda of the next BOS meeting (November 5, 2018).

- As many Committee members as are available should plan to attend the November 5, 2018, BOS meeting.

2. Continue review of plans for a new municipal complex

- E. Rowse reported on input from stakeholders, who have submitted “red-lined” changes to the initial discussion-draft drawings. R. Panofsky explained that the Animal Advisory Committee had forwarded to E. Rowse a detailed conceptual plan that realizes the functions needed for an animal shelter.

3. Other business: Any other business which may come before the Committee

- The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 5, at 5:00 pm at the Senior Center.

Adjournment

- Carolyn Panofsky moved to adjourn at 6:10 pm; J. Nunes seconded; motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

James Medeiros, Chair

Richard Panofsky, Clerk

Attached: OPM Report dated November 1, 2018

<p>MBSC Agenda Workshop Meeting November 1, 2018 Senior Center 5:00 pm — Call to Order Business for discussion Continue review of plans for a new municipal complex Consider process and timing Other business: Any other business which may come before the Committee</p>
