

**East Haddam School Building Committee Meeting
January 4, 2006
Adopted January 11, 2006**

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Todd Moss at 7:04 p.m. at the Nathan Hale High School - Room 117.

A) Roll Call

2. Attendance

Members present:

Todd Moss	
Melissa Ziobron	David LaFemina
Denise Gable	Craig Parker
Dana Barnes-arrived 8:37	Kerri Willis Budzik
Mary Beth Mordecai	John Gibson

Others present:

Jennifer Mangiagli, KBA
Stephen Melingonis, KBA
Chuck Grabowski, Newfield Construction
Tom DiMauro, Newfield Construction
Dave King, KBA
Robert Carroll, Central Office, Board of Education Business Manager
Alan Burr- arrived 8:30

Mr. Moss informed the Committee that Dana Barnes was attending the Board of Selectman's meeting for the purpose of property negotiations and would be arriving later during the meeting. The agenda was altered to accommodate Mr. Barnes.

Motion by Mary Beth Mordecai to change to order of the agenda sections 4B-E to after section 6. Seconded by Mrs. Gable and passed unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion by Melissa Ziobron to approve the minutes of December 14, 2005 meeting amended as follows:

- 4th page, number 2, change estimated savings to "\$85,000" and replace "totally remove" with "yes".

- 6th page, first paragraph, insert” Ms. Mordecai and Mrs. Ziobron discussed at length the importance of not cutting any items which were specified in the Educational Specifications with out first seeking Board of Educational approval”.

Seconded by Ms. Mordecai and passed unanimously.

4. Audience of Citizens

There were no people to contribute to the Audience of Citizens at the time it was offered.

5. Old Business

A) BOE Report

Mrs. Ziobron informed the Committee that the Board of Education had not met since the last update. She stated that Dr. Durham had requested that she inform the Committee that KBA would be holding informational meetings; February 6, 2006, 7 p.m. for MPAC, in the Middle School Cafeteria and February 9, 2006, 7p.m for the PTO in the Elementary School Library. These meetings will contain information about the transition from a K-4 school to K-3 school.

Mr. Carroll informed the Committee that once the budget is determined, the overage would require grant revisions. Mr. Moss stated that an increase in the budget requires a grant application (EDO-49R) to be filed with the State. He informed the Committee that the State is good about approving the EDO-49R, especially considering current school construction conditions. He stated that the EDO-49R would be approved for 10% over budget. The following year, anything over the 10% would require a special grant. He stated he has not seen them not approve the process. Mrs. Gable questioned how it would affect the schedule. Mr. Moss responded the schedule would remain the same. Mrs. Ziobron stated that the only caveat of the special grant over the 10% overage would require the Town to pay all expenses until the grant is approved by the State, at which time the reimbursable rate would be refunded.

6. New Business

A) KBA Invoices

Mr. Moss distributed and discussed KBA invoices dated December 27, 2005.

Motion by Craig Parker to pay the amount of \$68,674.46 to KBA for invoices dated December 27, 2005. Seconded by Kerri Willis Budzik and passed unanimously.

Committee Members requested that KBA change the format of the daily shipment detail report section of future invoices. It was requested to white out sections which do not pertain to the project.

7. Determination of Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting will be January 11, 2006 at 7:00p.m.at the Hale Ray High School, room 117.

Mr. Moss informed the Committee that Selectman Brad Parker had scheduled a joint meeting to include the School Building Committee, Board of Finance, Board of Selectman and Board of Education for January 18, 2006 at 7p.m. in the Hale Ray High School cafeteria. He stated that the purpose of the meeting with each Board and Committee is to update them on where the project is in regards to the budget. He informed the Committee that it will be an informational a public meeting. Ms. Mordecai questioned if there would be an audience of citizen's segment offered. Mrs. Ziobron responded that special meetings do not contain audience of citizen segments. Mrs. Budzik suggested that Mr. Moss contact Deb Denette, (Town Clerk) with regards to the proper format of the Agenda.

Mr. Moss informed the Committee that he had asked Dave King and Tom DiMauro to attend the meeting. He stated that he would explain to the Boards and Commissions the work done on the project to date including cost alternatives to the plans followed by a question and answer format

4B) Construction Manager Contract Review and Approval

A copy of the contract was mailed to Committee Members for review prior to the meeting. Mr. Moss informed the Committee that Attorney Bennet had reviewed the contract. He stated that the Town Insurance limits had been reviewed and were correct on the contract. He stated that Craig Parker, Mrs. Budzik and himself had reviewed the contract with Mr. DiMauro and Chuck Grabowski.

Mrs. Ziobron questioned page 9 of the contract section 5.2.1 under the Guaranteed Maximum Price. She questioned if the 60% owner / 40% construction manager was enough incentive to keep the project at the guaranteed maximum price and if the percentages were typical in the industry. Mr. Moss responded that it was in the range of industry standards. Responsive to Mrs. Ziobron's question, Mr. Moss responded yes, that he felt that it gives them incentive to stay with in the parameters. Mr. DiMauro agreed that it was a typical split. Mr. Moss stated that Newfield had originally asked for a larger percentage and that the current 60%/ 40% was negotiated. Craig Parker stated that the incentive is higher because the contingency is higher. Responsive to Mrs. Ziobron's question, Mr. DiMauro responded that Newfield's management of the Wethersfield project was different so they were able to give back money under general conditions.

Motion by Mrs. Budzik to accept the Newfield contract and authorizing Todd Moss to sign it on behalf of the Building Committee and Town. Seconded by Ms. Mordecai and passed unanimously.

4C) Architect Report

Jennifer Mangiagli distributed and discussed the following documentation:

- 5 page graphic representation of roof configurations for the Cafeteria and Media Center.
- Notes from Whitney Talcott referring to the mandated “Traffic Meeting” between KBA and Banner Lodge engineers dated January 4, 2006. In attendance were: Jim Bubaris Traffic Engineer (Banner), Allen Wengell PE (Banner). Robert Jontos PE (East Haddam Town Engineer), Jim Ventres, Planner (East Haddam Town Planner), Fred Thumm, (East Haddam Public Works), Steve McDonnell PE (Middle School-Civil Engineer), Whitney Talcott LA (Middle School-Landscape Architect). Inspection of the bridge and culvert passing under Clark Gates Road appeared in good condition. Various parts of the road were narrow and could be widened by the public works department as part of a street improvement program. It was agreed that Andrews Road should eventually be widened to at least 20’. It was decided that all bus traffic should be directed to the Andrews Road, Route #149 intersection which had much better sightlines. Town public works will look at expanding the curb radius to the East of Andrews/ Route #149 intersections. This intersection will serve as the primary school bus route to the East. The intersections of North Moodus Road/ Route #149 Intersections have the best sightlines and road widths for all traffic from the West. No improvements were seen as necessary. It was planned that later on in the process, if necessary there would have to be detailed survey information and a highway design tailored to these initial findings.

Mrs. Mangiagli stated that the roof configuration drawings were still a work in progress and that they were working with Newfield to determine the costs associated with them.

Mrs. Mangiagli informed the Committee that the joint traffic meeting occurred December 21, 2005. Mr. Moss stated that Mr. Talcott had informed him that the roads were in pretty good condition. Mr. Moss had been informed that Andrews Road needed to be widened. The joint meeting determined that all bus traffic should be directed to the Andrews Road/ Route #149 intersection which have much better sightlines and the distance between the abutments on Clark Gates Road was more than 21’, adequate for passing school bus lines. Mr. Moss informed the Committee that most of the road work can be completed by the Town and not by State contractors. There is no need to upgrade Route #149. A letter would need to go to the State Traffic Commission but approval is not necessary.

Craig Parker questioned if Banner Lodge was participating in a cooperative way. Mrs. Ziobron stated that she was troubled by the last paragraph of Mr. Talcott's notes from the joint Traffic Meeting. "Mr. Thumm did voice some concerns over the traffic study; generally that it did not make any firm recommendations for improvements and that it did not go into depth in addressing concerns". Mrs. Ziobron questioned who would make the recommendations for really firm design alternatives. Mr. Moss responded that if there were design requirements, Fred Thumm would solicit the designers to complete the work. He stated that he did not know Mr. Thumm's capabilities. Mr. Moss stated that the Traffic Engineer was hired to gather data so that an engineer could make design recommendations. Volumes and counts help determine the firm design of the road. Responsive to Mrs. Ziobron's question, Mr. Moss responded that Mr. Thumm is a part of the process and that he would get further clarification as to Mr. Thumm's future involvement on the project. Mr. Moss stated that there was a miscommunication as to the specifications of the traffic study. He stated it was to be counts and data which was complete and that the design will come later in the project.

Mr. Moss responded affirmatively. He stated that WMC, the School Building Committee's project Civil Engineer is Banner's Traffic Engineer. Mrs. Ziobron questioned who Robert Jontos was. Mr. Moss responded that he is an East Haddam Town Engineer consultant for Land Tek. Craig Parker requested that KBA include the emergency electrical loads which was referenced in their minutes, he stated that they should be attached. Mrs. Ziobron questioned when the next scheduled traffic meeting would occur. Mr. Moss replied he would speak with Mr. Talcott to get an answer. Mrs. Ziobron questioned how some schools in other parts of the country can be build for less per square foot. Mr. King responded that Connecticut requires higher minimum wages and building codes differ throughout the country which contribute to the per square foot cost for construction.

4D) Construction Manager Report

Tom DiMauro distributed and discussed the following documentation:

- East Haddam Middle School Design Development Budget by Newfield construction, Inc dated 12/14/05.
- East Haddam 4-8 Middle School Project Budget Summary Update January 4, 2006. These costs include land costs.
- East Haddam 4-8 Middle School Proposed Value Engineering Items, January 4, 2006.

Mr. Grabowski, referring to the Design Development Budget, informed the Committee that that option "C" access road (moving further from Mr. Burr's home), would cost an additional \$14,500. Mr. Moss informed the Committee that he had attended the December 20, 2005 Board of Selectman's meeting. He stated that they had requested a cost analysis/ breakdown to make the primary access road from Sillimanville Road. Mr. Grabowski noted page 5 of the Design Development Budget and the cost to be \$98,747. Mr. Moss stated that this is not a complete number because it does not include the cost to

move the fields or driveways so buses can make the proper turns and access. Responsive to Mrs. Ziobron's question, Mr. Moss responded that the costs are construction costs and does not include the cost of the property. Ms. Mordecai questioned the location of the secondary access road if Sillimanville were to be the primary access. Mr. Moss responded where the drive way currently, Clark Gates Road or near the triangle where the house is. Ms. Mordecai questioned if the movement of the main access road was for the purpose of avoiding the purchase of parcel E. It was stated that it would change the scope of the project. Mr. Moss stated that the School Building Committee can not change the size of the building, deviate from the educational specifications or change the location of the site because it was voted on.

Mr. Moss stated that the electrical does not include the cost of the phones. Responsive to Mrs. Ziobron's question, Mr. Carroll responded that he would determine if the phone system from the current Middle School can be brought over to the new school. Mrs. Ziobron stated that it would be helpful to have a comparison of the current budget with the original budget (Newfield's May 14, 2005). Craig Parker stated that doing a budget on a schematic design is totally different. Mrs. Ziobron stated that she understood this but that it would still be helpful to have both for questions which may arise. Mr. Moss stated that the original budget was reduced and is not a good comparison. Mrs. Budzik stated figures should be distributed with proper education upon how they are derived because she does not want bad information passed along. Mr. Moss agreed stating that there are so many caveats with the comparisons and if there is not someone there to explain the differences in the comparisons it would be bad information.

Mr. Gibson stated that when people get there new electrical bills, the subject of the Green School will probably be reconsidered. Mr. Moss stated that this would be a subject to be discussed on the January 18, 2006 meeting.

Mr. DiMauro discussed the up to date summary with the Committee. The document breaks down the Construction Costs, Soft Costs, Total Project Budget and Amount Over Funding. The Total Costs are as follows:

Construction costs	DD Budget 12/14	24,214,568
VE Items Accepted to Date		<u>(992,000)</u>
Revised Construction Costs		23,222,568
CM as Constructor Fee@ 2.2%		510,896
CM as Constructor Contingency	3%	696,677
Estimate Contingency	3%	696,677
Escalation Factor	3%	<u>753,805</u>
Total Construction Costs		25,880,623
Project Soft Costs		<u>4,664,875</u>
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET		30,545,498

	Project Funding	Schematic Design Est. 11/22/05	Design Dev. Est. 12/14/05	Design Dev. Est. Rev. 1/04/06
Construction Costs	20,165,125	24,609,950	26,986,167	25,880,623
Soft Costs	4,664,875	4,664,875	4,664,875	4,664,875
Total Project Budget	24,830,000	29,274,825	31,651,042	30,545,498
Amount Over Funding		4,444,825	6,821,042	5,715,498

It was stated that the Budget Summary includes the projected costs involved with purchasing the land. Responsive to Mr. Gibb's question, Mr. Moss responded that soft costs include architect's fees, bonding costs, attorney fees, surveys, phase I environmental, project contingency, land costs, furniture and computers. He stated that the \$500,000 for off site improvements was taken out. He stated that there was an agreement that the town would take care of it. Mrs. Ziobron questioned if it was an official agreement. Mr. Moss responded that it was an assumption. Mrs. Gable questioned if the soft costs were realistic. Mr. Moss responded that he was not sure and that at the next meeting the Committee needed to review the value engineering as well as have a number which can be discussed at the January 18, 2006 meeting.

Responsive to Mr. Moss's question, Mrs. Mangiagli replied that cataloging of the current Middle School did not take place during the holiday break and should occur January 17th. It was stated that at the next Board of Education meeting the consideration of which furniture/computers could be brought over to the school would be discussed. Mr. Gibson requested that the term "soft costs" be changed, stating that the title can be misleading. Committee Members agreed to change it to "non construction costs". Mr. Moss stated that at the January 18, 2006 meeting these costs would be listed.

Mr. Grabowski reviewed the proposed value engineering items as discussed at the last meeting. To the list Committee Members reviewed an additional 7 items to accept to eliminate or keep within the plans. Committee Members reviewed and discussed each item prior to making a decision. These items and results are as follows:

	<u>Estimated Savings</u>	<u>Accepted to Eliminate</u>
30. Site Work, Raise grade at athletic fields.	TBD	Yes
31. Add firewall in lieu of spray fireproofing.	TBD	Yes
32. Revise lighting fixture specifications.	60,000-75,000	Yes
33. PBX phone system in lieu of voice over IP system.	@20,000	*
34. Eliminate segmented fire rated frame and glazing.	TBD	Yes

- | | | |
|--|--------|-----|
| 35. Hollow Metal doors in lieu of wood doors. | 16,000 | Yes |
| 36. Revise roof design at Media Center and Cafeteria | TBD | * |

***Committee Members needed more information prior to making a decision.**

Mrs. Mangiagli stated that the number of interior sophists in the school had been drastically reduced. Responsive to Mr. Grabowski's question, Mr. Moss replied that the Committee was interested in providing conventional sinks in lieu of Bradley sinks in the gang toilet rooms (#22). Committee Members stated that they did not want to move the electrical, deduct phone system to the FF & E (#25) because they considered that just shifting money from one line item to another and that it does not necessarily change the budget.

Mrs. Mangiagli stated that they had received a greater breakdown from Newfield and determined that raising the height of the building was not as beneficial as raising the height of the fields because this would help diminish the cost of removing surplus fill from the site. Mr. King stated that Mr. Talcott had plotted the boring tests, determining that the rock under the school is actually below the footings, which could contribute to cost savings in not having to remove the rock. It was stated that utility trenching could require rock removal. Craig Parker questioned when Newfield will feel comfortable with the design documents so that the estimate contingency can be reduced. He stated that \$700,000 is pretty significant. Mr. Moss stated that he has seen 5% at this stage. He stated that 3% was not high and that it should be reduced after the construction documents are complete (the bids).

Mr. King stated that it may be possible sell the additional topsoil which would need to be removed. Mr. Gibson suggested that the stone from the stone walls which need to be removed also be sold. Mr. Moss stated that anything on site which could be sold for a cost savings on the project should be thoroughly investigated. Craig Parker stated that by putting Newfield as a CM at risk, there are certain aspects to their scope that the Building Committee needs to be understanding of.

Mrs. Mangiagli stated that currently the plans are for spray fireproofing. She stated that spray fireproofing propose some challenges because it should not be exposed to the weather. She stated that in lieu of spray fireproofing, a firewall could be added which would essentially separate the facility into two buildings. One side of the firewall, if there was a fire and the building was going to burn, would allow the fire to stay contained on that side. This firewall would add about a 12 inch concrete wall to the size of the school eliminating the need of spray fireproofing. Mrs. Gable questioned if there were any statistics showing that one method was safer than the other. Mr. King responded that it is just an alternative way of meeting the code requirement. He stated that there is an intangible cost involved with being able to get the work completed and that spray proofing often poses problems due to weather restraints. Mrs. Budzik questioned if there is a possibility that spray fireproofing could cause delays, why the initial proposal

contained spray fireproofing and not an added firewall. Mr. King responded that until you get into the specifics it is generally cheaper to use spray fireproofing but that this may not be the case with this project. Responsive to Mr. Moss's question, Mr. King responded that a 1 pump fire service is required.

Mr. Moss questioned what revising the lighting fixture specifications specifically entailed. Mr. Grabowski responded that it would entail a more standardized lighting within the school. Quality will not be changed. The alternate choice will not affect the light level or energy costs. The lights will have sensors as is specified on the educational specifications.

Ms. Mordecai stated that she would like a better understanding as to why the IP system is superior to the PBX phone system prior to making a decision. Mr. Carroll stated that they are always playing catch up with respect to technology. He stated that the school system just got voice mail a few years ago (it has been around for over 15 years) and it would be in the best interest to get the most up to date systems. Mr. Carroll reiterated Dr. Durham's sentiment from the past meeting, that it would be a disservice to the project to start off with technology that is not up to date. Ms. Mordecai stated that if the savings is only \$20,000 that she would have to vote no.

Mr. Grabowski stated that the estimate to include air conditioning though out the remainder of the school exclusive of the gymnasium would be \$325,000 to 350,000. The increase cost of materials and roof maintenance were discussed. Responsive to Dana Barnes question, Mr. King responded that the location of the road was the lowest cost alternative. Mrs. Ziobron asked for further break downs for the budget for the access road.

4E) Property Update

Mr. Barnes informed the Committee that he had attended the Board of Selectman's Meeting. He stated that they had voted to acquire the property by eminent domain. The total cost being \$940,500 based on updated appraisals. This is the bottom line price provided it is not appealed. He stated that the price is \$40,500 over budget. He stated that within the next few days, the Town will own the land and that submit permits should be added to the next agenda. It was decided to wait for the joint meeting to discuss the change of the access road and the effect it will have on the project.

8. Audience of Citizens

There were no people to contribute to the Audience of Citizens at the time it was offered.

9. Other Discussion

Mrs. Ziobron stated of the importance of revisiting the formation of a public relations committee. She stated that if the Committee expected people to vote for additional funds

needed, they needed to be out in the community promoting the project with correct information. Mrs. Gable questioned what Mrs. Ziobron would suggest. Mrs. Ziobron stated that information in the newspaper was not the same as going out to the people to answer questions. Mrs. Budzik stated that she was unclear as to what Mrs. Ziobron's ideas were, asking that she send the Committee Member's suggestions via email to be discussed at the next scheduled meeting. Mrs. Ziobron stated that she did not want to take on the whole project on her own and needed help. Mr. Gibson suggested that PAC be resurrected. Ms. Mordecai agreed that an informational public hearing was a good idea. Craig Parker questioned if the regularly scheduled meetings are considered Public. Mrs. Ziobron responded that it is not the same. She stated that she would much rather be proactive, by getting the information out there. Craig Parker stated that he was not disagreeing to be proactive but that the regularly scheduled meetings are public. Further discussion continued about the formation of a public relations committee.

Mr. Barnes informed the Committee that Attorney Bennet had said that a referendum is not needed to acquire more money for the project and that it can be gotten through Town Meeting. Ms. Mordecai stated that it was her understanding that Brad Parker would prefer to have a referendum because it is a significant amount of money.

10. Adjournment

Motion by Mr. Gibson at 9:15p.m. to adjourn. Seconded by Mrs. Ziobron and unanimously passed.

Filed at Selectman's office

Attendance

KBA invoices dated December 27, 2005

5 page graphic representation of roof configurations for the Cafeteria and Media Center.

Notes from Whitney Talcott referring to the mandated "Traffic Meeting" between KBA and Banner Lodge engineers dated January 4, 2006.

East Haddam Middle School Design Development Budget by Newfield construction, Inc dated 12/14/05.

East Haddam 4-8 Middle School Project Budget Summary Update January 4, 2006.
These costs include land costs.

East Haddam 4-8 Middle School Proposed Value Engineering Items, January 4, 2006.