

**East Haddam School Building Committee Meeting
January 25, 2006
Adopted February 1, 2006**

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Dana Barnes at 7:02 p.m. at the Nathan Hale High School - Room 117.

Roll Call

Attendance

Members present:

Melissa Ziobron-departed 8:27 p.m.	David LaFemina
Denise Gable	Craig Parker
Dana Barnes	Kerri Willis Budzik
Mary Beth Mordecai	John Gibson

Members absent:

Todd Moss

Others present:

Jennifer Mangiagli, KBA
Stephen Melingonis, KBA
Chuck Grabowski, Newfield Construction
Tom DiMauro, Newfield Construction
Dave King, KBA
Selectman Brad Parker
Alan Burr
Shirley Judge

Meeting Format Discussion

Craig Parker stated that the meetings needed to move along more effectively. He stated the length of the meetings should be in the most timely and effective manor. It was decided to wait until the next meeting when the issue could be discussed with the Chairman present.

Motion by Mrs. Ziobron to table the Meeting Format Discussion to the next scheduled meeting. Seconded by Mr. Gibson and unanimously passed.

Approval of Minutes

Motion by Mary Beth Mordecai to approve the minutes of January 11, 2006 meeting amended as follows.

- 12 page, 2nd paragraph, 2nd line, strike “several members”.

Discussions of January 11, 2006 meeting minutes.

Mrs. Ziobron referred to page 12, 2nd paragraph, 2nd line. She stated she questioned the line “The SBC wrote the traffic study, several members reviewed it”. She stated that it was her recollection that only Todd Moss had read it. She questioned which other Committee Members had the opportunity to read it, stating if no one had read the traffic study then it should be stricken from the minutes.

Mrs. Ziobron referred to page 12, 3rd paragraph, last sentence “The secretary responded affirmatively”. She stated that it should include “when the secretary is emailed messages, it is made a part of public records”.

Seconded by Mrs. Budzik and unanimously passed.

Motion by Craig Parker to approve the minutes of January 18, 2006 meeting as amended. Seconded by Mary Beth Mordecai.

- 4th page, 2nd paragraph, 6th line, replace “High” with “Middle”.
- 10th page, middle of 2nd paragraph, insert “all but” before 1.

FAVOR: Mordecai, Parker, Budzik, Gibson

ABSTAINED: Ziobron, Barnes, LaFemina

Motion carried.

Responsive to a question from Mrs. Ziobron, Brad Parker replied that each Board and Committee would have the same meeting minutes; each would amend and change them. Mrs. Ziobron stated concern that there will be 5 sets of minutes with 5 different renditions.

4. Audience of Citizens

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

5. Old Business

BOE Report

Mrs. Ziobron stated that she had nothing to report because they had not met.

A) Construction Manager Report

Tom DiMauro distributed and discussed the following documentation:

- Preconstruction schedule.
- Document by Newfield Construction, dated 1/25/06. This document includes but is not limited to the reduction of the size gymnasium with itemized costs in relationship to quantity, unit and unity price. The total to reduce the size of the gymnasium is \$371,509.

The preconstruction schedule highlights the key dates necessary for the project. Mr. DiMauro stated that the design development approval had not been approved by the Committee. Mr. DiMauro stated the schedule was conducive provided there are no major problems or design difficulty. Mrs. Mordecai questioned how the outlined time frame would change if bids are to be received first, to get the numbers before referendum and if it would change the schedule. Mr. King responded the schedule contemplates going out to bid first. It was stated that going out to bid first would not impact the schedule.

John Gibson stated that the Committee would not go back to the public until the bids are available. Responsive to a question by Mrs. Budzik, Mr. King responded there would be a budget available prior to OSF approval, but not hard numbers reflecting bids. He stated the budget would need to be approved by the School Building Committee and the Board of Education prior to submittal. Mrs. Budzik questioned if the bids come back higher than budgeted if it would have an effect on OSF approval. Mr. King responded no.

Mr. Barnes questioned which of the activities on the preconstruction schedule needed immediate attention with in the next 30 days. Mr. DiMauro responded finish the drawings and the final budget. Mrs. Ziobron and Mr. Gibson stated more time would need to be allocated for Inland Wetland approval. Mrs. Ziobron stated concern with the aggressive schedule with Inland Wetlands and Planning and Zoning. She stated the schedule does not reflect an initial hearing date with Planning and Zoning.

Selectman Parker stated Planning and Zoning and Inlands and Wetlands could have a joint meeting with the School Building Committee in an effort to expedite the process and to clarify issues of concern. He suggested the Committee request a joint meeting. Responsive to a question from Mr. Barnes, Selectman Parker responded that he could not speak for the Commissions, but that a letter should be sent into the Land Use Office requesting a joint meeting. Mr. Barnes questioned who shepherds the project through the Land Use Office. Selectman Parker responded the School Building Committee and the Architect. It was decided to send a letter to the Land Use Office requesting a special joint meeting. Mr. Barnes stated that the construction document approval and a final budget need to be approved within the next 30 days.

Craig Parker informed the Committee that the budget could not be approved until the drawings are approved. Jennifer Mangiagli stated the design development needed to be approved. Ms. Mordecai stated it included the value engineering items. Craig Parker stated the Committee was awaiting the joint special meeting for advice prior to

proceeding. He informed the Committee that the two pending items were the roof design and the PBX phone system. He stated that the majority of the feed back from the meeting was to leave the items in the project. Ms. Mordecai stated there was discussion at the joint meeting about keeping the acoustical blocks. Mrs. Ziobron informed the Committee that items which are a part of the Educational Specifications must be presented to the Board of Education prior to removal from the plans. Craig Parker stated the gymnasium and air conditioning design needed consideration and that a motion should include the value engineering items which were yes to remain yes. He stated the value engineering items which were no would remain no and the pending would be no until further investigation by Committee Members. He stated of the importance of approving the design development phase so that KBA could move forward with the project to establish final drawings and maintain the schedule.

Mrs. Ziobron informed the Committee that it would be best to itemize the value engineering items with in the motion for clarification. She also stated the decision could be made at the February 1, 2006 meeting. John Gibson agreed with Mrs. Ziobron and stated of the importance of being mindful to the taxpayers when decisions about the project are made. Craig Parker stated that based on his professional experience, Newfield can not tighten the budget without the acceptance of the value engineering items. Ms. Mordecai stated all of the value engineering items had been discussed at length at meetings as indicated in previous meeting minutes. She stated decisions were made with due diligence and that she was ready to move forward.

Mr. Barnes questioned the phone system. Mrs. Budzik stated there was a discrepancy between what the IT person at the school wanted and what the Consultant had recommended. Mr. Barnes stated that it was his understanding that the Committee had agreed to install the PBX system. Dr. Durham stated that the when the technology specifications were developed, the Voice over ride IP system was specified because of its cutting edge technology. Dave LaFemina questioned if leaving the current system in there, and changing it at a later date, would affect the design of the school. It was responded no. Responsive to a question by Mrs. Ziobron, Mr. Grabowski replied that there was no end date on the time line to value engineering because it would be an ongoing process throughout the project. Mrs. Ziobron stated the value engineering items should be listed individually on the motion. Craig Parker stated that the value engineering items are attached to the January 18, 2006 meeting minutes for reference to the motion.

Motion by Craig Parker to accept the value engineering items, accepting the yes and no decisions made and all pending and deferred decisions will be no. Seconded by Mrs. Budzik.

**Accept: Budzik, Gibson, LaFemina, Parker, Mordecai, Barnes
Oppose: Ziobron
Motion Passes**

Mr. Grabowski stated the gymnasium reductions were not determined with actual drawings. Square foot analysis determined the cost difference. Responsive to a question from Mr. Gibson, Mr. Grabowski replied that the analysis did not take into consideration extra fill. Mr. Gibson stated all real costs should be in the estimate and requested the extra cost associated with bringing in fill be included. He questioned if the gymnasium was fully reimbursable with the reductions. Mr. King responded beside the cost of the structural fill, the cost associated with the additional gymnasium would be \$371,509. Denise Gable stated without drawings a precise dollar figure can not be established. The original approved referendum dollar amount was \$330,000. There would be additional architectural fees involved with reducing the gymnasium. The fee amount would be about the difference to make the changes or approximately 10% of \$330,000 to change the drawings. Mrs. Ziobron stated that the numbers clarify the costs associated with the tournament size gymnasium as was requested by the Board of Education Chairman. She stated that the numbers accurately correlate with the referendum question.

Selectman Parker stated that people who voted for the tournament size gymnasium voted so knowing that it would not be totally reimbursable. Craig Parker stated there is cost avoidance for not redesigning as well as a schedule impact. John Gibson stated of the importance of letting the taxpayers know what the additional costs will be, as well as the reimbursable rate for the gymnasium. Mrs. Mordecai stated it would be good information to give out at a public meeting. It was stated that changing the gymnasium size would add a month to the schedule and add additional costs to the project for redesigning. Mr. Gibson stated concern with the tax impact associated with the larger gymnasium.

Architect Report

Mr. King distributed and discussed the following documentation:

- KBA Memorandum prepared by Whitney A. Talcott, dated January 24, 2006. The document summarizes a meeting which was held. The letter outlines Mr. Thumm's concerns over the traffic study in his memo of 12/28/05. Mr. Greenberg agreed to write an addendum to the report addressing these concerns.

Mrs. Ziobron questioned if there was a copy of Mr. Thumm's concerns. Mrs. Mangiagli responded no. Mr. Gibson stated there would be a savings to build a shorter driveway from Sillimanville Road. He stated the problem is not knowing the off site road costs involved with changing the entrance way. Responsive to a question by Mr. Gibson, Selectman Parker replied that Fred Thumm has driven the route and has preliminarily determined that the Clark Gates Road entrance is more suitable than the Sillimanville Road. The Clark Gates entrance would not require as many off site improvements. Mrs. Ziobron referenced a document from Milone and MacBroom, dated June 3, 2004. She stated that it was informative and should be included with the traffic study. She stated BL Company should not charge for the extra work as it should have been included in the original documentation. It was responded that the project would not be charged extra. Mrs. Ziobron stated BL Companies report was inferior to Milone and MacBroom's report. Selectman Parker stated there was a big difference in the fee charged for each

report. Mrs. Ziobron stated she would like to have a copy of Mr. Thumm's memo sent to Selectman Parker dated 12/28/05.

Craig Parker stated he wanted the Architect's opinion to the consideration of air conditioning the school. Dave King stated extra design to include air conditioning would require more time and additional fees and could affect the time line. Craig Parker questioned if air conditioning could be revisited later during the project, provided there was sufficient contingency available. Mr. King responded it would be in the projects best interest to conclude it early on in the project. Mrs. Ziobron questioned that since the Committee had not voted on the design development phase, if they are responsible for additional design fees to include the air conditioning. Mr. King responded the approved schematic design was for the partial air conditioning of the school and that changing to full air conditioning represents a significant change to the plans.

Mr. Gibson questioned if the current air conditioning design was conducive to adding air conditioning at a later date. Mr. King responded no. Mr. Barnes questioned if changing to air conditioning the whole school would affect the move in date. Mr. King responded no. Mr. Barnes questioned, if the question of adding air conditioning were to go to referendum, if the total cost could be quantified. Mr. King responded that if it were to go to referendum, it would need to be bid, meaning it would need to be designed. There would be additional fees involved with the design. Setting the groundwork for air conditioning the rest of the school in the future will involve extra fees beyond the proposed \$330,000. The roof design would need to be modified. Responsive to a question by Ms. Mordecai, Mr. King responded that the additional figures would be available at the next meeting. Mr. Gibson questioned if providing energy efficient items to the school could be quantified. Mr. King responded yes, although there are too many variables for determining long term cost savings.

6. New Business

Budget discussion plan from 1-18-06 meeting

Committee Members agreed to table discussions until the next meeting.

7. Determination of Next Meeting

Motion by Mrs. Ziobron to have a special meeting February, 1, 2006 at the Nathan Hale High School – Room 117. Seconded by Mr. LaFemina and unanimously passed.

8. Audience of Citizens

Mr. Burr stated it was his opinion that road improvements to Sillimanville Road should not cost more than those to Clark Gates Road. He requested that hard numbers be reviewed. Selectman Parker stated the building of the school and getting the project completed is the job of the School Building Committee. He stated the Committee would

make the final decision as to the location of the road. Selectman Parker stated that off site improvements would be attained through the regular town budget process and are not part of the project. He stated that off site improvements are not reimbursable. Mr. Gibson informed Selectman Parker that this point needs to be brought to the Board of Finance so that the School Building Committee does not have to answer to that number.

A citizen stated that the cost increase for the gymnasium is less than 10%, and that the cost escalation values it out.

Other Discussion

Ms. Mordecai stated that she would like to know exactly what would be involved with changing the access road. Dave King stated the upgrade would be about \$98,000. The emergency access road was discussed. He stated with the access road from Sillimanville Road, it comes in from the back of the school, viewing the service area, transformers, kitchen and dumpsters first upon arriving to the school. Ms. Mordecai questioned the time and costs involved with turning the school and changing the field locations to accommodate the access road from Sillimanville Road. Mr. King responded there would be additional costs involved with the redesign. The septic can not be moved. Selectman Parker stated not to have the emergency access road near the main access road because if there were to be an emergency, they both could potentially be unusable. Wetlands and topography predicate the location of the roads. Ms. Mordecai questioned the cost of the current access road. Mr. Grabowski responded he did not have the number but would have it available for the next meeting. Mr. Barnes stated that what the Committee was doing was second guessing their decisions. He stated the Committee has worked for over a year designing the road. He stated that it has been voted on and that the Committee should move forward knowing that due diligence was performed. He stated back tracking sets a dangerous precedent, costs more money and affects the timeline. He stated he is opposed to flipping the school and changing the access road because they are too far along in the process.

Mr. King stated he would provide the Committee with the extra time frame and costs involved with changing the access road location. Responsive to a question by Mr. Gibson, Selectman Parker replied that if the project goes back to referendum and loses, it would be the charge of the Committee to come back, make revisions and come back to the town again. It was stated if the school does not pass at the referendum, the project would lose money paid for architectural fees and that the school would not be built on the time line.

Dave LaFemina stated of the importance of being able to explain the cost savings involved with the current access road location. Mrs. Budzik stated that Mr. Dill had requested back up information about the access road and that the Committee will need to put it together. Extensive discussion occurred in regards to the costs involved with changing the access road. Mr. Barnes questioned the timeline with regards to referendum and when it should occur to stay on schedule. It was responded Middle of July.

Craig Parker stated that the design development phase should be approved. Mr. Gibson stated there were some items on the list which should not be approved without Todd Moss or Mrs. Ziobron present. It was stated that all of the deferred and pending actions on the value engineering items are now no, due to the previous motion, so there should be no reason not to approve the design development documents. Craig Parker stated that since the Committee has the answer about the access road, the design development phase should be approved. He stated that KBA has given the project “wobble room” in the construction phase. Mr. King stated the things which are being talked about such as the air conditioning or significant site changes would require additional costs because they contradict what was approved in the schematic phase. Mr. LaFemina questioned Mr. King if voting at the next meeting would hold the project up. He responded no. Mr. LaFemina stated he would prefer to wait until the next meeting to vote so that Mr. Moss and Mrs. Ziobron are present to vote.

Motion by Mrs. Budzik to approve the design development documentation. Seconded by Ms. Mordecai.

Favor: Gable, Budzik, Parker, Mordecai, Barnes

Oppose: LaFemina, Gibson

Motion Passed

Dr. Durham stated the technology 5 year replacement plan had been revised so that more computer hardware will be available to move over into the new school. It was stated the FF & E would be revised at the next meeting for the Board of Finance. Committee Members discussed the current condition of the Middle School’s furniture and how it is inventoried in relationship to the FF & E.

Mr. Gibson complimented Shirley Judge’s work on the school project. He asked her opinion on the project. She responded she was concerned with asking for over 7 million dollars over the referendum number. She stated the increase needs to be well documented and really explained to the voters. She stated the increase could galvanize people who have issues with eminent domain, eminent domain for open space or don’t like the location. She stated she believes in the school and the project and appreciates Mr. Gibson’s comments about the taxpayers. Selectman Parker stated an open public hearing should be scheduled in April.

10. Adjournment

Motion by Mr. LaFemina 9:10 to adjourn. Seconded by Craig Parker and unanimously passed.

Filed at Selectman’s office

Attendance

Pre-construction schedule.

Document by Newfield Construction, dated 1/25/06.

Tape recordings of meeting.