

**East Haddam School Building Committee Meeting  
March 8, 2006  
Adopted April 26, 2006**

**Call to Order**

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

**Roll Call**

**Attendance**

Members present:

Todd Moss  
Kerri Willis Budzik  
Mary Beth Mordecai  
Dana Barnes  
Craig Parker  
John Gibson  
Melissa Ziobron  
David LaFemina – arrived 7:30 p.m.

Member absent:

Denise Gable

Others present:

Jennifer Mangiagli, KBA  
Tom DiMauro, Newfield Construction  
Stephen Melingonis, KBA  
Shirley Judge  
George Giesey, Board of Finance  
Dr. Steve Durham, Superintendent

**Approval of Agenda**

**Motion by Mrs. Ziobron to add Town Summons to New Business under New Business. Seconded by Mr. Barnes and unanimously passed.**

**Approval of Minutes**

**Motion by Dana Barnes to approve the minutes of February 22, 2006 meeting amended as follows. Seconded by Craig Parker.**

- Page 5, second to last line, insert, “Mrs. Budzik stated that the situation was unfortunate, but that there were certainly legal approaches to addressing the issue. Responsive to a question by Mrs. Ziobron, Mrs. Budzik responded that she was not legal counsel to the town and didn’t want to speculate on what strategy the

town might employ, as that was a decision to be made by the town and its attorneys”.

### **Discussion of February 22, 2006 Minutes**

Mrs. Ziobron stated her question on the 5<sup>th</sup> page was not about strategy but how the injunction would affect the process. Mrs. Ziobron stated that without hearing the tape she would have to abstain from approving the minutes.

**Favor: Moss, Budzik, Mordecai, Barnes, Parker**

**Abstained: Ziobron**

**Motion passed**

### **Old Business**

Mr. Moss stated that the Board of Selectman had been asked to attend the meeting.

### **BOE Report**

Mrs. Ziobron stated that the Board of Education had not met since the last meeting. Dr. Durham informed the Committee that he had met with the technology people, significant time had been spent reviewing the specs and they are committed to go forward. Mr. Moss requested written confirmation from the Board of Education that changes are not going to be made to the Educational Specifications, program or furniture budget at this time. Dr. Durham stated that this is included in the Board of Education’s last meeting minutes. He stated he could draft a letter if necessary.

### **BOF Report**

George Giesey thanked the Committee for the work they have done to date. He expressed concern for the location of the entrance and traffic. He stated of the importance of informing people of the original budget of over 27 million dollars, how the figure had been reduced and of explaining the uncontrollable inflation on construction costs. He stated the current Middle School would be used as municipal space and that although it may appear a cost savings to move furniture out from it into the new school, it would be more cost effective for the town to take advantage of the reimbursable rate and get new furniture for the project. Responsive to a question from Mrs. Budzik, Mr. Giesey responded that David Meade is the liaison from the Board of Finance to the School Building Committee.

### **Construction Manager Report**

Tom Di Mauro distributed and discussed the following documentation:

- Newfield Construction, Inc East Haddam 4-8 Middle School Preconstruction Schedule, 3/8/06. Of particular interest, Activity ID # 2140 Inland Wetlands Submission & Approval Finish has changed to April 20, 2006 and Item #2160

Site Plan Submission and Approval (P & Z) Finish, has changed to April 25, 2006.

- Newfield Construction East Haddam Public Schools, Final Estimate, dated March 8, 2006.

Mrs. Ziobron questioned if more than 1 hearing for Planning and Zoning or Inland Wetlands would affect the budget. Mr. Di Mauro responded the schedule would need to be changed. Mr. Moss stated that he was unable to attend the March 14<sup>th</sup> state submittal date. Mrs. Mangiagli stated that it was a meeting that would not require a Committee Members attendance but that they were welcome to attend. Mr. Barnes requested that an activity Id of end date be added.

Mr. DiMauro discussed the Final Estimate to the Committee. The document breaks down the Construction Costs, Total Project Budget and Amount Over- Funding. The Total Costs are as follows:

Construction costs	Final Budget 3/8/06	24,839,438
CM Fee@ 2.2%		546,468
CM Contingency	3%	745,183
Estimate Contingency	1%	248,394
Escalation Factor	.75%	<u>197,846</u>
Total Construction Costs		26,577,329
Other Project Costs		<u>5,870,125</u>
<b>TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET</b>		<b>32,447,454</b>

Project Funding	Schematic Design Est. 11/22/05	Design Dev. Est. 12/14/05	Final Est. 3/8/06	Final Est.. Vs. DD Est.
Construction Costs 20,165,125	24,609,950	26,986,167	26,577,329	(408,838)
Other Project Costs 4,664,875	4,664,875	4,664,875	5,870,125	1,205,250
Total Project Budget 24,830,000	29,274,825	31,651,042	32,447,454	796,412
Amount Over Funding	4,444,825	6,821,042	7,617,454	

Total Other Project Costs are \$5,870,125.

Craig Parker questioned Newfield Construction and KBA if they were comfortable with a 1% estimate contingency, not knowing what the comments that the state may have. Mrs. Mangiagli responded that she did not anticipate any significant changes which would need to be made. Mr. Moss stated he understood that there was a lot of information to review and that it could be reviewed and brought back with further questions at another meeting prior to March 14<sup>th</sup> for approval. Mrs. Ziobron stated she needed time to review the budget prior to voting. Mr. Moss stated he would also like time to review it prior to voting.

Ms. Mordecai questioned further clarification on the costs of the access road. Mr. Moss stated the Committee had originally budgeted \$500,000 for the access road. He stated

that based on the information which has been obtained by boring tests, to get the correct profile, build-able drawings were made determining the dollar figure of \$491,600. This figure is 49.8% reimbursable by the state. Mr. Moss stated the Committee did not originally account for rock removal and soils conditions. He stated the soil conditions are not good for understructures or roads for the entire site. The total site costs went up by approximately 1 million dollars due to testing and more knowledge about the site than was known when the estimate was made.

Ms Mordecai questioned if changing the road would decrease the site cost estimates. Mr. Moss responded no. He stated that \$491,600 is allocated for the main access (it has been reduced due to the value engineering item removal of the bike/walk path), to eliminate it, would be a credit of \$491,600, then the emergency access road would need to be upgraded, at a cost of approximately \$125,000. The \$125,000 only includes the road it does not include additional architectural fees to flip the building (eliminating driving into the back of the building), changing all parking lots and roadways and adding a secondary access road. The off-site road improvements are unknown because there has not been a traffic report completed for it. The travel time for the busses would be longer if the access road were to be changed. Dr. Durham confirmed that any additional time between the distances of the schools will be significant to the bussing schedule. He stated that the high school may have to start earlier or the elementary school later.

Mr. Barnes stated that the traffic numbers from Fred Thumm would be helpful. Mr. Moss stated that it has not been submitted to the Committee and agreed it would be helpful to have it for a reference.

Responsive to a question by Mrs. Budzik, Mrs. Mangiagli responded that it would cost over \$100,000 in architectural and engineering fees to change the configuration of the building if the access road were to be changed. She stated the back of the building contains; dumpsters, transformers, emergency generators and above ground oil tanks.

Mr. Gibson stated that it would be helpful to have someone from the town, such as Mr. Thumm to attend a meeting to get further clarification of the impact of traffic from both access roads for a better understanding of possible off-site road work which would need to be done. Mr. Moss stated that the Traffic Report would be discussed under New Business.

Mrs. Budzik questioned if it was possible to estimate what a secondary access road on another location would cost. Mr. Moss stated that the other access road would need to be where the current access road is off Clark Gates Road. Due to wetlands and ledge, there are limitations to the location of the emergency access road. Mrs. Ziobron reviewed various line items on the budget in comparison to past budgets for further clarification.

Mr. Barnes questioned if air conditioning was on the budget. Craig Parker stated that it was his understanding that the Committee was not going to pursue it because of its impact on schedule and associated costs. Responsive to a question by Mr. Gibson, Mr. Moss responded that the budget needed to be approved by March 14<sup>th</sup>. He stated that

another meeting could be scheduled which would give Committee Members the opportunity to review it prior to voting.

Mr. DiMauro stated that the budget was formulated from drawings dated February 10<sup>th</sup> and some updates. He stated the budget includes all the Value Engineering items approved by the Committee from the January 26<sup>th</sup> list. Responsive to a question from Mr. Barnes, Mr. DiMauro responded that the 0.75% Escalation Factor is derived with consideration to 3 months until the bid date. He stated that the 1% Estimate Contingency is a judgment call that the estimator made based on the level of the drawings.

Mrs. Ziobron questioned if the amount of money which had been taken out of contingency was reflected in the budget. Mr. Moss responded yes. Mr. Moss stated that the Committee needs to discuss, in the future, what the proper amount should be to carry, for contingency, prior to approval from the public on the budget.

Mr. Moss stated that the figures represent the plan which the Committee has approved. Mr. Barnes stated that reading the budget in detail would not change the figures or plan to date. Mrs. Ziobron stated she would like to have the opportunity to review the figures prior to voting on them. She stated she could not in good conscious approve a budget presented to her in the amount of over 32 million dollars and vote on it the same night and she strongly urged Committee Members to do likewise. She stated by having a brief meeting on Monday, March 13<sup>th</sup>, it would allow Committee Members the opportunity to review the budget and ask questions. She stated that approving the budget at the current meeting would be an injustice to the people of the town.

Ms. Mordecai questioned if the Building Committee's contingency could be changed within the budget. Mr. DiMauro stated that the current contingency was not enough and recommended 4 -5% as an owner's contingency. Mr. Moss reviewed owner's contingency with the Committee. Mr. Gibson stated of the importance of being accurate with the figures so that the Committee will not have to ask for additional funds. He stated of the agreement with the Board of Finance, that the Committee would update them as to the expenditures of the Contingency prior to using it.

Responsive to a question by Mrs. Ziobron, Mr. Grabowski responded yes, there would be backfill to bring into the site if needed. The figures proposed will not go to the town or referendum, Mr. Moss stated that the Committee would make a recommendation to the Board of Selectman and they would make the final decision on the budget amount.

Mr. Barnes questioned the Committee of their opinion of the budget as proposed. He stated that the figures would not change before the Tuesday submittal date. Mrs. Budzik questioned Mr. Barnes if it was his point that the Committee should approve the budget at the current meeting. He responded yes. Mrs. Budzik stated that Mrs. Ziobron raises a good point, that the Committee needs to show the town that the Committee has performed due diligence. Mrs. Budzik stated that the Committee has been reviewing the numbers for the past few months and that the numbers have not changed significantly. She stated that she felt the Committee has performed due diligence with the budget. Mr.

Moss stated that the biggest change in the figures is the FF & E, primarily due to technology and furniture. Mr. Gibson stated that the value engineering items are included in the figures and that he agreed that to change the figures significantly, the school plan would need to be changed, which could cost additional money and change the move in date.

Mrs. Ziobron stated the budget is not about manipulating or changing numbers but understanding the numbers. She stated she did not want to be forced to vote no on the budget simply because she did not have adequate time to review it. She stated if it is to be voted on at the current meeting, she will vote no and that it sends a dangerous message that the Committee has received a budget for 32 million dollars and are ready to approve it approximately an hour later. She stated she would like an opportunity to ask questions about where the numbers came from and that she is not suggesting they are not valid, reflective or been discussed previously by the Committee. She stated she would like to vote yes on the budget, but that she would not without ample time to review it.

Ms. Mordecai stated the budget is lower than reviewed before. Mrs. Ziobron stated she would like the opportunity to review the budget and ask questions as to how and why, as had been done in the past. Ms. Mordecai stated she was very happy that the estimate came in lower than the last one. Mrs. Ziobron stated that it is not about the number or changing it, but about understanding the number and that she did not know how it could be accomplished after only an hour review. Mrs. Mordecai questioned Mr. Grabowski to explain the difference in the budget. He stated that it was partially due to the value engineering items, allowances and more detailed drawings.

Mrs. Mangiagli stated that the proposal would be brought to the state as phase 1 of 2 phases. She stated that phase 2 would be near late fall and that the FF & E, technology could be changed prior to it.

Mr. Barnes stated the Committee must trust the work from the people who have been hired and that he felt there was no need to wait a few days to approve the budget.

**Motion by Mr. Barnes to approve the budget as outlined on  
March 8, 2006 final estimate for submission to the State.  
Seconded by Craig Parker.**

Dave Lafemina stated that it would be favorable to have the consensus from the Committee to be unanimous. He stated that he understood Mrs. Ziobron's point of view but wasn't convinced that waiting to vote would change the numbers for the submission to the state. He stated the FF & E is a significant dollar amount, but that it is a later submission. Mrs. Mordecai questioned if the Committee reviewed the budget over the weekend and found an item which needed to be changed, if it could be revised in the future. Mrs. Mangiagli responded yes. Ms. Mordecai stated she understood Mrs. Ziobron's point of view and questioned her if she would be comfortable, if there was something found which needs to be changed, could a special meeting be called to make the changes. Mrs. Ziobron stated no, she needs to look at the divisions before she can

vote on the budget and would not have enough time to look at it in less than the required 24 hour allotment for calling a special meeting. Ms. Mordecai stated that she didn't feel that the numbers were any different and that it would not change her vote. Mrs. Ziobron replied that they were different and should be reviewed. She stated that each division could be reviewed by the Committee line by line to show the discrepancies. Ms. Mordecai stated that the differences were responded to. Mrs. Ziobron stated she was not looking to manipulate or change the numbers, but wanted to have more time to review them prior to voting. She stated that she did not want to hold up the Committee but that without review of the budget before hand, she would have to vote no.

**Favor: Moss, Budzik, Mordecai, Barnes, Parker**

**Oppose: Ziobron**

**Motion passed**

### **Architect Report**

Mrs. Mangiagli stated that Planning and Zoning would hold a hearing for the project on April 11, 2006. She stated that there were no big concerns. She informed the Committee that there was a request for the break out of open, municipal and school space. She informed them that it is the Board of Selectman's decision. Mrs. Ziobron stated the consensus of the Open Space Committee is that the wetlands should be considered the open space parcel. The Inlands and Wetlands Commission hearing is March 16, 2006.

Mrs. Mangiagli informed the Committee that the well locations have been changed further away from the building and play areas. Changing the location of the wells allows for future expansion of the school. She informed the Committee that KBA had solicited a Third-Party Review of the new school's structural design. Four firms were solicited to provide this service with the following results. Joseph L Calabrese, P.C. Waterbury, CT. \$6,500, Macchi Engineers, LLC Hartford, CT. \$7,500 Szewczak Associates Avon, Ct \$15,000 and Cianci & Cianci Hartford,Ct. \$20,000. She stated that KBA would be using Joseph Calabrese. Mr. Moss stated that the line item amount budgeted for this service is \$15,000.

Mrs. Mangiagli stated that KBA has received 2 out of 3 applicants for the code review and are awaiting the 3<sup>rd</sup>. She stated Henry Miga's estimate is \$4,350 and Pierz Associates is \$16,500. It was stated that the line item amount budgeted for the service was \$10,000. She stated that KBA is still awaiting the 3<sup>rd</sup> proposal but would probably be going with Mr. Miga. She stated they have worked with him before. Mr. Barnes stated the savings could be added to the project contingency to get it closer to the 4%.

Mrs. Mangiagli offered to review the drawings and specifications (dated March 8, 2006) prior to voting on them. She stated there were no major changes to the plans besides the value engineering items. Responsive to a question from Mr. Gibson she replied that they would be submitted to the state. Mrs. Ziobron questioned Mr. Grabowski if he was comfortable formulating a budget without seeing the revised drawings. He responded

yes. Mrs. Budzik questioned if KBA would be attending the Informational Meeting. Mrs. Mangiagli responded Mr. Celmer and herself. Mrs. Ziobron requested small handouts to be available at the Board of Education meeting with the latest information. Mr. Moss suggested the site plan, architectural plans of each floor and elevations. Mrs. Ziobron stated that the layout of the cafeteria and media center had changed and would like pictures to distribute. Dr. Durham confirmed they had received the size reductions but not a drawing. Mrs. Budzik stated that this discussion should be an off line discussion as it relates to the Board of Education and the Board of Education meeting. Mrs. Ziobron stated it is related to the architect's report and what will be presented to the Board of Education. Dr. Durham requested boards reflecting the changes for presentation purposes.

Mr. Barnes requested the decision with regards to air conditioning the remainder of the school. Mr. Gibson stated that redoing the plans to include additional air conditioning would cost more money and effect the timeline. Ms. Mordecai stated that the additional air conditioning was not included in the original educational specifications, would cost extra money and time onto the project. She stated the Committee should move forward without the additional air conditioning. Dr. Durham agreed it was not a part of the educational specifications. Mr. Moss stated the public meeting will help give the Committee better direction on how to proceed on various options within the plans for the school.

**Motion by Mrs. Budzik to approve the drawings by KBA for the submission to the State. Seconded by Ms. Mordecai.**

Responsive to a question from Craig Parker, Mr. Grabowski stated he was comfortable with the budget without seeing the current drawings which would be submitted to the state. Mrs. Ziobron stated she would be abstaining because she did not have enough time to review them.

**Favor: Moss, Budzik, Mordecai, Barnes, Parker  
Abstained: Ziobron  
Motion passed**

### **New Business**

#### **Traffic Report**

Mr. Moss distributed and discussed the following documentation:

- Traffic Impact Study Grades 4-8 Middle School, Clark Gates Road, East Haddam, Connecticut. Prepared for the SBC by BL Companies, October 2005, Rev; February 2006.

Mr. Moss stated that Mr. Thumm has not put in writing his thoughts about the Traffic Report. Mr. Moss stated that the architect and he believe that BL Companies completed the work which was requested of them. Responsive to a question from Mr. Gibson, Mr. Moss replied that the Banner Lodge counts have been incorporated into the traffic study. Mrs. Ziobron questioned, now that the building is over the 100,000 square foot threshold, if there is a requirement for permission by the state. Mr. Moss replied that Mr. Talcott would be best to answer this question. Mrs. Ziobron stated that there is concern with the entrance near Andrews Road and questioned if there would be a traffic light at the intersection. Mr. Moss responded that because 149 is a state road, the State determines if it is necessary to have a traffic light at the intersection.

### **P & Z Update – Public Hearing 4-11-06**

The Planning and Zoning Commission has planned a Public Hearing for the building project April 11, 2006 at 8:00 p.m. at the town Grange.

### **Summons to Town**

Mrs. Ziobron stated that she had brought a copy of the newest summons which was served to the town on March 1, 2006 for anyone who would like to read it.

### **Preparation for Informational Meeting 3-22-06**

Committee members discussed format, presentation, handouts, layouts and purpose of the informational meeting. Committee Members agreed that the purpose of the meeting is to build momentum to secure the additional funds needed for the project. Ms. Mordecai stated that questions about why the project is over budget will need to be responded to by the Committee. Committee Members reviewed the history of how the budget has increased, as is indicated in previous meeting minutes. Mrs. Budzik referred to previous meeting minutes in which the Board of Finance recommended the project be built for \$220 per square foot. Mrs. Budzik stated that the clear direction from Mr. Meade and Mr. Giesey is that the original budget was over 27 million dollars and that it had been cut. Mr. Moss stated there was a recommendation made and the Committee Members cut the number, they could have said no. He stated that when the Board of finance requested the amount of 24.5 million, the Building Committee agreed to it. They could have disagreed. Ms. Mordecai stated that the Committee should say they were wrong with the original number. Mr. Moss agreed and stated that it should also be noted that they were more aggressive than they should have been. He stated there are 3 specific items which increased the budget; the 10 – 12% inflation, increase in FF & E and rock and soil conditions. Mr. Gibson stated the Committee could have gone to the Board of Education and tell them that the school could not be built within the educational specifications and stay within budget. Responsive to a question from Mrs. Ziobron, Mr. Giesey responded that the Board of Finance was not prepared to inform the public at the meeting about how taxes will be affected due to the over runs of the project. He stated the long term dept plan would be based on the ratable which are currently unknown. He stated the use of the current town office property and possible move into the current middle school, could effect the over all cost. He stated there would be some information available at the

meeting, but that they could not be specific because the budget is unknown. He stated that the Board of Finance is trying to keep the mill increase below 1 mill point. Mr. Moss stated that the Board of Selectman and Board of Finance have been invited to attend the meeting to help answer questions. Mr. Moss requested that Mrs. Ziobron, Mrs. Mordecai or Dr. Durham extend an invitation to the Board of Education.

### **Determination of Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting will be March 22, 2006 at 6 p.m. at the Nathan Hale High School – Room 117.

### **Audience of Citizens**

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

### **Other Discussion**

There were no other discussions.

### **Adjournment**

**Motion by Mr. Barnes at 9:56 p.m. to adjourn. Seconded by Ms. Mordecai and unanimously passed.**

Respectfully submitted;

E. Ruth Ziobron

### **Filed at Selectman's office**

Attendance

Tape Cassette Recording of Meeting

Newfield Construction Preconstruction schedule, 3/8/06

Traffic Impact Study by BL Companies Rev: February 2006

Letter of Agreements by Henry M. Miga and Pierz Associates

Correspondence from KBA to Todd Moss with Third Party Review Proposals