

**East Haddam School Building Committee Meeting
November 22, 2005
Adopted December 14, 2005**

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Craig Parker at 7:06 p.m. at the Nathan Hale High School - Room 117.

Roll Call

Attendance

Members present:

Todd Moss-arrived 7:30 p.m.

Melissa Ziobron

Denise Gable

Dana Barnes-arrived 7:13 p.m.

Mary Beth Mordecai-arrived 7:13 p.m.

David LaFemina

Craig Parker

Kerri Willis Budzik

Member absent:

John Gibson

Others present:

Jennifer Mangiagli, KBA

Alan Burr

Bob Carroll, Board of Education Business Manager

Joe Albuquerque

Tom DiMauro, Newfield Construction

Dave King, KBA

Chuck Grabowski, Newfield Construction

Damien Davis, Newfield Construction

Josh Mrozinsk, Middletown Press

Whitney Talcott, KBA

Manny Misenti

Approval of Minutes

**Motion by Melissa Ziobron to approve the minutes of October 26,
2005 meeting amended as follows:**

- 6th page, first paragraph, last line, add “Mrs. Ziobron stated that she was disappointed that the last several days had been spent via email talking about an email about a letter, but that she was not notified of an Inland Wetlands or Planning and Zoning Meeting and the Committee was not given the Traffic Study.

She urged the Committee to stop talking about things like letters to the editor and get back to business”.

- To adopt the minutes as amended to reflect spelling errors.
- 3rd page, 1st paragraph under Construction Management Services, second to last line, strike “Mr. Davis” and replace with “Craig Parker to the Selectman”.

Seconded by Denise Gable and carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Mrs. Ziobron to approve the minutes of November 9, 2005 meeting amended as follows:

- To adopt the minutes as amended to reflect spelling errors.
- 7th page, last paragraph, strike “MPAC” and replace with “East Haddam 4-8 PAC”.
- 4th page, last paragraph, strike “MEEP” and replace with “Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Consultant”.

Seconded by Dave LaFemina and carried by unanimous vote.

Audience of Citizens

Motion by Mrs. Ziobron to move the Audience of Citizens segment to the end of Old Business on the Agenda. Seconded by Kerri Willis Budzik and carried by unanimous vote.

Old Business

BOE Report

Mrs. Ziobron informed the Committee that the only comment which the Board had made was of concern for the amount of site removal (earth work) which would take place and associated costs. She stated she did not have information to give, but that this meeting should give the answers needed to bring back to the Board. Manny Misenti elaborated he would like consideration made to economically placing the school on the site.

Construction Manager Report

Tom DiMauro, Chuck Grabowski and Damien Davis from Newfield Construction distributed and discussed the following documentation:

- Schematic Budget Estimate by Newfield Construction for the East Haddam School Building Committee dated November 22, 2005. The estimated total project budget is \$29,274,825. This document is filed at the Selectman’s office.

Mr. Grabowski informed the Committee the estimate is an up to date cost estimate and that Newfield had worked with the design team to get a better handle on costs. Committee Members questioned the definition of various line items and the total costs associated with them. Dana Barnes inquired if the initial budget could be used for comparison purposes. Craig Parker stated the CSI specification standard was not broken down per division and they were broadly based on unit cost. Mr. Barnes advised the Committee to compare the Schematic Budget Estimate with the initial budget on a line for line basis to see where costs can be reduced. Kerri Willis Budzik asked how much of the increase in price was due to escalation costs. Craig Parker responded that the Committee had asked for a higher escalation than the Board of Finance would give them, allowing 2% plus 2%. Responsive to Mrs. Budzik's question, Mr. Grabowski responded the industry escalation cost in the past 1- 1 ½ years has been 10 to 20%. Mary Beth Mordecai questioned if the biggest difference in the increased cost was due to budgeting incorrectly or industry escalation. Mr. Grabowski responded a combination of both as well as inflation; and that reviewing category by category would give the Committee a better picture of how the initial budget differs from the up to date cost estimate.

Mrs. Ziobron questioned the project contingency of \$979,000 and if it is over and above what is listed on page 2. Mr. Grabowski stated he was using the numbers which Todd Moss had given him. The project contingency represents the change orders contingency for the project as well as the owner's soft costs. Mr. Grabowski stated the estimate contingency of 5% will shrink as the project progresses and that Newfield has allowed an escalation between now and bid of 3%. Mr. Barnes questioned if 2.3 million was being held in contingency. Mr. Davis responded yes and that it is a normal amount to have in contingency this early on in the project.

Mr. Barnes inquired if the spike in costs has come down. Mr. King responded no; that the recent storm damage, current big building projects in the State of Connecticut and recent increase in gas prices will continue to contribute to escalating building costs. Committee Members continued to review the definitions of the various line items as well as the costs associated with them. Craig Parker questioned Todd Moss if the allocated contingencies were over stating the numbers. Mr. Moss replied no. He stated there are 2 contingencies; the construction manager's contingency and the estimate contingency. The construction manager's contingency protects Newfield and their bids. The estimate contingency will be complete when documentation is finished and will be adjusted at that time. The estimate contingency is brought to zero once the drawings are complete, as it would be defined and would be representative in the divisional breakdown as an item of work. Mr. Moss stated the owner's contingency is allocated for overages and changes. He stated when he had worked through the numbers; he had estimated that the project would cost approximately \$30 million.

Ms. Mordecai questioned if the estimate contingency could ever be zero or come back to the Committee. Mr. Moss responded it could come back to the Committee but more than likely would be absorbed into the project. He stated it is not a cost which can be eliminated and that 5% is not out of line. Mr. Moss stated by the Committee changing materials, tighten up room configurations and changing the pitched roof for example; it

could help reduce the cost, because it is a percentage of the construction costs. Mr. Barnes stated that Newfield and KBA needed to get together to see where the plans could be changed, to decrease cost without reducing program and to bring the numbers back to the Committee at the next meeting. Mr. Moss stated of the importance of meeting with the Board of Finance and the Board of Selectman in further determining options. Mrs. Ziobron inquired what the possible cost over runs whether the Committee needed to go to referendum or Town Meeting. He stated he did not know but would find out.

Ms. Mordecai inquired if the estimate would affect the time line. Mr. King responded it would add about a month to the schedule because they would not be able to leave the design and development phase of the project. It was stated that ownership of the land does not impact KBA's work to this point, but does affect the permitting process. Ms. Mordecai questioned the gymnasium on the estimate and if it is a separate entity or cost. Mr. King responded no. He stated the drawings reflect the square footage of the total school. Mr. King stated that KBA and Newfield would be working together to review the budget and encouraged Committee Members to attend the working sessions to be a part of the process.

Construction Manager Contract Update

Craig Parker informed the Committee that Newfield had reviewed the updated contract. It will be reviewed once again by Attorney Bennet, Committee Members, voted on and then executed.

Architect Report

Mr. King distributed and discussed the following documentation:

- Design development phase of documentation. Including 1 set of drawings of approximately 190 sheets.
- 2 volumes of design and specification.
- Design development book, which shows records of meetings and records of sign offs by staff.
- Overall Site Plan East Haddam 4-8, dated November 22, 2005.

Mr. King informed the Committee that the set of documents which Newfield used for their estimate were earlier versions. He stated that it would take Newfield a couple of weeks to parallel the estimate to the up to date design development documentation and they would work together to alter the plans to trim costs. He stated the new documents reflect the alterations to the pitch roof design as discussed at the previous meeting and are not reflected in Newfield's estimate.

Mr. Talcott stated that he was awaiting the final soils test (borings). Mr. King informed the Committee the Overall Site Plan map was composed of an Arial photo of the site with the school imposed on it. Jennifer Mangiagli stated that Mr. Talcott and an Electrical Engineer had met with CL&P. There will be 3 phase power on the site, located

on Sillimanville Road and traveling up the emergency access road. The costs involved are being reviewed. Phone lines and other utilities will also be routed up the emergency access road. Mr. King stated they will evaluate if overhead or underground lines should be used.

Mrs. Ziobron questioned the design development documentation and why the kitchen is larger than requested with an overage of 571. Mr. King responded; during review with the director of food service for the school, it was determined that more space was needed. Spaces were removed to make up for the additional space such as elimination of a manager's office. Mrs. Mangiagli stated the staff dining room was eliminated because administration felt staff dining in the cafeteria would more than likely not be used. They want a more private area, so kitchenettes have been added into the staff workrooms.

Mr. Moss distributed and discussed the following documentation:

- A letter from WMC Consulting Engineers to Mr. Talcott dated November 16, 2005.

The letter requests an amendment to the scope of services and fee schedule to accommodate the need for a professional water system operator and manager, to assist with the permitting process. The professional is Ron Black, President of R.J. Black, a company that permits, designs, builds and operates small water systems. Mr. Black's credentials were discussed. The letter explains the complexity of the permitting process. The permitting process is a multi-stage process consisting of three phases with one sub-phase as follows:

Phase 1A	Initial Permit Application and Well Siting
Phase 1B	72 hour pump test of wells and water quality testing
Phase 2	Submittal of Final Design Plans and Specifications
Phase 3	Construction of the System and Final Approval for usage.

It was stated the fee requested was less than expected. Mrs. Budzik stated she was uncomfortable paying a company for personal contacts with an agency; and wanted assurance of the savings, in time and cost on the project, by hiring this person. Ms. Mordecai reflected upon a past meeting, in which WMC had spoken about the time which would be saved, with the help of a professional to get through the permitting process. Mr. Moss referred to the past meeting in which Selectman Parker advised the Committee of the slow down in opening the Senior Center, because there was not permitting assistance available on the project. Mr. Barnes stated that all of the experts have advised the Committee to hire a Permitting Specialist. He stated that the final savings in time completing the project exceeds the initial cost. Craig Parker stated of the benefit of Newfield being able to mobilize in the spring verses the summer which could have an effect on the completion date. It was stated that the Committee had been advised that R.J. Black was the only company available for this type of work because it is a very specialized line of work. Mr. King agreed.

Motion by Mr. Barnes to have KBA hire R.J. Black to do the consulting as outlined in the above letter of November 16th, 2005 not to exceed the amount of \$5,750. Seconded by Mrs. Ziobron and carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Talcott informed the Committee the additional borings had been prepared on site to determine ledge location, in an effort of altering the design of the roadway. He referred to the contours of ridge on a site map. He stated they are trying to determine how much ledge would be hit to if the roadway were to be moved. He stated the entrance driveway has been changed, moved 25ft from the property line and re-aligned avoiding the ledge. He informed the Committee the roadway will be lower than the property and house by 3 – 4 feet. Responsive to Mrs. Ziobron's question, Mr. Talcott responded the road is not being moved to the natural tree line, because drilling and blasting costs are more expensive. It was stated that they will need to wait for Inland and Wetlands review.

Mr. Barnes questioned if the road was already in the upland review area. Mr. Talcott responded affirmatively and that the whole frontage is in the upland review area. Ms. Mordecai questioned once the final test of the borings is in, would it give a better monetary value to the placement of the road. Mr. Talcott responded affirmatively. Mr. Barnes questioned if changes had been made since the last meeting and if costs had changed. Mr. Talcott responded yes, changes had been made, costs had not been calculated and that he felt the latest changes should save money. Mrs. Ziobron inquired if additional fill would need to be used. Mr. Talcott responded no, fill would be moved from one side to the other. Craig Parker questioned if it would be beneficial to move the walkway to the other side of the road. Mr. Talcott responded no.

Mrs. Ziobron questioned why consideration was not being made to move the road near the natural tree line. Mr. Talcott responded the tree line is the high side and the current placement keeps the grades as even as possible eliminating steep slopes. He stated the other area is near the wetlands and entails a steeper roadway. He stated the walkway has a constant grade of 5% which is wheel chair and bike accessible and that O.S.F likes to have accessible walkways to schools. Responsive to Mr. Barnes question, Mr. Talcott responded that the walkway will be paved light duty asphalt. Alterations to the design of the roof were reviewed in the Design Development Plans which is not reflected in Newfield's budget.

Property Update

Mr. Barnes stated he had nothing to report.

Traffic Report Review

Mr. Moss stated that WMC, the Civil Engineer, is also the Engineer doing the Traffic Study for Banner Lodge. He stated that WMC is coordinating with the Traffic Consultants BL and companies and the director of Public Works. Responsive to Mrs. Budzik's question, Bob Carroll responded the upper grades (6th, 7th and 8th grades) would be bussed with the High School students. Currently the 5th and 6th graders are bussed

with the upper grades. Mr. Moss stated the Department of Public Works would send the report out for engineering. He stated the Board of Finance has allocated money in the budget of capital improvements for the roads around the school, so the cost may not come out of the Building Project budget. Mr. Moss stated he had assumed off site costs would come out of another budget, so it was not put into the Newfield estimate. Mrs. Ziobron stated she was not impressed with the Traffic Study Report and its pages of repetition. She questioned if personal property needed to be taken to make the radius of turn suggested by the report. Mr. Barnes replied that easements should take care of the extra land needed.

Mrs. Ziobron questioned if there would be review by the State Traffic Commission. It was responded no, the building is under 100,000 and fewer than 200 parking spaces. Responsive to Mrs. Ziobron's question, Mr. Moss responded there will probably be a traffic light at the intersection of Route 149 and North Moodus Road because of the Banner Lodge project. He stated the cost associated with a possible traffic light needs to be worked out.

Mrs. Ziobron questioned why the bridge on Clark Gates Road was not mentioned in the report. It was stated that they are road engineers and talk about volumes, not road widths. These recommendations are used for the designer to make changes based on road standards. It was stated they were out for 15 minutes each study time. Mr. Moss informed the Committee that he would determine if the bridge has been taken into consideration in the study. Mr. Talcott stated they are Traffic Engineers and are not responsible for doing design of the roadway. Mr. Barnes questioned with the exception of the bridge if they had completed the work they said they would do. Mr. Moss and Mr. Talcott responded affirmatively.

Audience of Citizens

Alan Burr re-invited Committee Members to visit his land and view the proposed roadway. He stated he had emailed pictures to the Committee. He stated it was a personal and distressing issue to him. He informed the Committee that there are other alternatives to the road and urged Committee Member's to reconsider the placement of the road. He stated that if improvements needed to be made to Sillimanville road, for the Committee to consider the location of the access road be relocated to that area. Mrs. Budzik stated that she didn't want to speak for the entire Committee however; she would like to accommodate Mr. Burr's wishes and if it can be done within the budget, she would like to see it happen. Mrs. Ziobron referred to the Arial photo and the heavy tree line for the possible placement of the road. Responsive to Joe Albuquerque's question, Mr. Talcott responded that the placement of the road was predicated on cost. He stated that access alternatives were discussed indicating Sillimanville Road as not being the best means of access. It was stated that off site costs are not reimbursable from the State and that the driveway is reimbursable.

Ms. Mordecai stated it is the intention of the Committee to work with Mr. Burr. She stated that the bottom line for the Committee is staying within budget. She referred

to his comment that he would be willing to add resources to change the configuration of the road. He responded affirmatively.

Mr. Misenti stated the Banner Lodge project had been drastically reduced limited to the existing foundations. He stated they may have no requirements to participate on the improvements of the road. He questioned if there was a generator on the project. Mr. Moss responded yes, there would be a generator which would be used for emergency lighting, life safety, elevators and freezers. Mr. Misenti referred to the Colchester project designated as an emergency evacuation center with the State. He stated the State had put in significant dollars and questioned if the Committee had researched it. Mrs. Ziobron stated it had been discussed before, and because the Colchester project is so close, the school would not qualify. Mr. King stated they would look into it again. The additional costs involved were discussed.

Mr. Moss read a letter which Mr. Misenti had written. In the letter, Mr. Misenti referred to his past experience as serving on a Building Committee and urged Committee Members not to let political considerations or animosity become the influence or a defining factor in the Committees decisions and actions. He also stated of the importance of having Public input and suggested it be included at the beginning and the end of the meetings.

New Business

KBA Invoices

Mr. Moss distributed and discussed the following documentation:

- September and October Invoices for completed work by KBA.

It was stated that the disputed reimbursable is not included in the amount to be paid to KBA. Committee Members reviewed the invoices.

Motion by Mary Beth Mordeci to pay the amount of \$116,367.90 to KBA for invoices for from September and October. Seconded by Mr. Barnes and passed unanimously.

Determination of Next Meeting

Motion by Ms. Mordecai to have a special meeting on December 7th, 2005. Seconded by Mr. Barnes and passed unanimously.

Other Discussion

Mr. Barnes requested his email address not be shared as it is his work address. He requested that concerned citizen's be referred to the Building Committee established email address.

Adjournment

Motion by Mrs. Ziobron at 9:27p.m. to adjourn. Seconded by Mr. Barnes and unanimously passed.

Filed at Selectman's office

Attendance

Schematic Budget Estimate by Newfield Construction for the East Haddam School Building Committee dated November 22, 2005.

Design development book, which shows records of meetings and records of sign offs by staff.

Overall Site Plan East Haddam 4-8, dated November 22, 2005.

A letter from WMC Consulting Engineers to Mr. Talcott dated November 16, 2005.

September and October Invoices for completed work by KBA.