MAIN +1 860 395 0055 FAX +1 203 779 5661



# Regional School District No. 14 Woodbury / Bethlehem

## Nonnewaug High School – Renovations Project

### **Public Building Committee Meeting**

April 25, 2017

PBC Attendees:	Absent:
----------------	---------

George Bauer	Don Fiftal
JP Fernandes	John Chapman
Brian Peterson	
Tom Hecht	
Andie Greene	
Patrick DiSarro	
Janet Morgan	
Alan Rubacha	
Matthew Cleary	
Robert Piazza	

#### Also Present:

Kurt Lavaway	Colliers
Scott Pellman	Colliers
Amy Samuelson	SLAM
Glen Collenberg	SLAM
Eric Romeo	CES
Scott Sullivan	CES
Lorel Purcell	O&G
Bruce Gebar	O&G
Alice Jones	Region 14
Suzie Green	Region 14
Wayne McAlister	Region 14
Mike Molzon	Region 14
Maryanne Van Aken	Region 14 BOE

From / Notes Prepared by: Kurt Lavaway / Scott Pellman - Project Manager

Colliers International

### Attachments:

A meeting of the Public Building Committee was held on Tuesday, April 25, 2017 in the LMC of Nonnewaug High School, 5 Minortown Road, Woodbury, Connecticut.



The following notes are to record the most significant issues discussed at the above referenced meeting. If anyone attending the meeting feels these notes are inaccurate, additional items need recording, or further detail is required, please forward your written comments to Kurt Lavaway for inclusion.

<u>Call to Order</u> - George Bauer called the meeting to order at 6:37 PM.

- 1. OPM Report Kurt Lavaway reported on the following:
  - Colliers met with the estimating and design team three separate times for budget reconciliation of the design development estimates.
  - There will be a presentation of the project to the teachers and staff tomorrow 4/26/17, a similar presentation will take place for the community at a date to be determined.
  - The design team has met with the local code officials, zoning and VoAg department to review issues that may be impacting the project.
  - Currently the project is navigating the Inland Wetlands Commission (IWC) approval. There were a few meetings in March, a walk-through also took place on April 2, 2017 to review the 5 locations where the project touches inland wetlands regulated areas. There was a public hearing last night (April 24, 2017) which has been continued to May 8, 2017 and it was stated that the IWC will be asking additional questions at that time. Amy Samuelson briefly discussed their concerns and how they have all been addressed to date.
    - Area 1- The IWC had concerns with the diesel fired generator and potential spills. The design team provided documentation that showed the generator has three levels of spill containment and protection.
    - Area 2 The design team added bollards as requested by the IWC to discourage parking on the lawn areas adjacent to the handicapped parking at the lower fields.
    - o Area 3 The design team added wetland plantings as requested and are working to protect a large tree near the baseball field. The project may need to hire an arborist to address the IWC concerns over the potential for the root structure being damaged during construction of the ADA walk paths. SLAM's landscape architect felt confident that the tree will do well due to the proximity of the proposed work near the tree.
    - Area 4 This area is only affected if the synthetic track and field is installed,
       the IWC has been provided details for drainage of the synthetic turf.
    - Area 5 This area is only affected if the two alternate tennis courts are installed.
    - There was only one public comment at the hearing regarding drainage of the fields that was answered by the design team.
  - The design team is trying to determine when the drawings should be submitted for zoning. The drawings may be submitted by the end of the week with a focus on a desired June 6 public hearing.
  - The design team met with the State OSCG&R for the phase 1 PCR meeting on the March 29, 2017 and the phase 2 DDR meeting on April 18, 2017the project received approval for phase 1 to go out to bid and the overall project has been approved to continue with the production of construction documents.



- Colliers is working on moving procurement; the movers can be hired through the State contract, Colliers will also coordinate with Wayne for the Central Office move. The project will be looking for an initial allocation of \$20,000 to cover the first of the phased moves.
- Colliers is also looking into materials testing services which can also be secured through State contract.
- Colliers received a proposal from Joe Versteeg who was recommended by the Town code officials to be the third-party plan reviewer services, the value is \$30,360. The funds are available through miscellaneous expenses.
- It was suggested by Colliers that the existing building will be tested for moisture in the slabs to identify a base line and to determine whether a floor moisture mitigation product is required for new flooring.
- It was also suggested to have the existing drain lines scoped with a camera to mitigate future surprises.
- Bids are due for phase 1 on May 10<sup>th</sup>.
- The next two building committee meetings will be May 2<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup>.

JP Fernandes commented on the Design Development Budget that the design team and Colliers has been working very hard to keep the project on budget, the committee needs to provide direction to the design team for the alternates and value engineering suggestions to keep the project on schedule and budget.

- The design development estimates came in approximately \$2.3 million dollars over budget prior to the reconciliation process. Based on using the O&G estimate, the high school project is currently \$1.3 Million dollars over budget.
- A combination of both the High School and Central Office projects result in a budget shortfall of \$1.04 million due to the fact that the Central Office has currently been estimated with a budget surplus.
- Design contingencies, constriction contingencies and material and labor escalation were reviewed.
- It was mentioned that some reasons for the overage in the project budget as due to added scope from the SD phase including kitchen equipment \$260,000. Permit fees (at \$317,000) which amount to half of the overage, the remaining increase were mostly in MEP systems due to document development and construction phasing that could not be determined accurately at the schematic design level.

Colliers worked with the design team to develop a series of Value Engineering suggestions that were careful to not accept State reimbursement, Educational programs or have an impact on code or permitting area. These were reviewed with the following action:

### Site civil and landscape

C-5	Delete blue stone caps	yes
C-12	Eliminate concrete steps to field	yes
	Possibly make this an Alternate?	
C-13a	Eliminate dug outs	no
C-13b	Change to pre-fab dug outs	yes
	Look at alternate materials	
C-14	Eliminate 4 tennis courts	no
C-15	Reduce walking paths between BB and SB	yes



### Structural - none

### <u>Building - Interior envelope</u>

BX-9	Keep existing roof at main entry	no
BX-10	Eliminate screen wall at gym stair	yes
BX-11	Eliminate entry canopy	no
BX-12	Eliminate metal panel at auditorium wall	yes
	Review alternate materials	
BX-13	Change operable windows to fixed	yes
Building	g <u>– Interior</u>	

BN-5 (	Gym floor refurbish vs replace	no
BN-16 S	Solid surf sills to PLAM	yes
BN-17 (	Change guardrail panels	yes
BN-18a F	Reduce wood paneling in corr	yes
<u>(</u>	O&G to price using less expensive material	
BN-18b E	Eliminate all paneling in corr	no (see above)
<u>/</u>	<u> Add 18c – less expensive material – see 18a</u>	
BN-19 E	Eliminate wood look paneling in Auditorium	yes
BN-20 (	Change Auditorium Ceilings to gyp board	yes
BN-21 (	Change ceiling in café	Yes
1	Need rendering of proposed materials	
BN-22 (	Change lobby ceilings	no
BN-23 (	Change locker wet walls to epoxy ptd	no
BN-24 (	Change locker room floors to epoxy ptd	no
BN-25 (	Change food service floors to epoxy ptd	no
BN-26 F	Reduce bleacher quantity	no
BN-27 (	Change to commercial grade washer dryer	yes

### Fire protection

FP-2	Change to flex heads	yes
FP-4	Remove pre-action at IDF rooms	yes
	Alan also suggested to include MDF room as well.	

### <u>Plumbing</u>

P-3	Change water heaters to PVI	NA
P-3a	Change type, quantity and warranty water heaters	no
P-4	Eliminate 19 floor drains	no
P-5	Change underground san from CI to PVC	yes
P-6	Change storm from CI to PVC	yes
P-7	Change all vent piping from CI to PVC	yes
	Alan suggested adding P-8 to change to propress f	<u>ittings</u>

### **HVAC**

H-11	Reduce quantity of HRV units	yes
H-12	Reduce SS ductwork	yes
H-13	Eliminate VAV boxes	need more info.
	Defer to 5-2 mtg.	
H-14	Relocate VRF from attic to grade	yes



### <u>Electrical</u>

E-6	Reduce theatrical lighting	no
E-7	Change to aluminum feeders - secondary's	yes
E-8	Change to alum feeders to 110A and above	yes

VE Accepted tonight totals to \$1,135,390 (\$89,380 over required).

The Alternates have also been re-priced in the DD set and all will remain on the list at this time.

### The following questions were posed by the committee to the design team:

- I. Can the engineers eliminate welding of fume hood duct after the run out?
- II. Did the design team look at using HDPE pipe on site ILO concrete?
- III. Can VAV boxes be shared between two classrooms? What would the long-term cost savings or impact be if the VAV boxes were shared?
- IV. Is there an alternative to eliminating the VAV boxes that could be incorporated into the project to save money?

Motion was made by JP Fernandes to accept value engineering totaling \$1,135,000 and to authorize SLAM to proceed with CD's, motion as seconded by George Bauer. Motion passed unanimously.

### 2. Architects progress update

• No further updates, will provide further details next week.

### 3. Construction Manager Phase 1 Progress Update

 Phase 1 Bids are due May 10<sup>th</sup>, but may be extended upon review after pre-bid walkthrough. O&G will provide an update at the next building committee meeting.

#### 4. Other Business

None

#### 5. Public Comment

#### Jim Crocker -

- Have we impacted the schedule negatively yet?
   Response: No it has not been impacted negatively.
- Is the delay less than 1 month? Response: Yes.
- Will inland wetlands be resolved on May 8<sup>th?</sup>

  Parameter of the language of the second of the
  - <u>Response:</u> It is a public hearing meeting and we hope everyone attends and provides support for the project but we cannot speak for that committee.
- Every meeting it seems that there is a money issue where scope has to be deleted, as a citizen and taxpayer this is frustrating, with that said you guys are doing a great job. When someone takes the money (approx. \$317,000) from the kids and moves it to another pocket there needs to be a good reason for this.



<u>Response</u> – This is the amount we calculated for the building permit. As this has not been waived yet, we must anticipate the cost for it in the project budget but hope it can be waived.

### 6. Meeting Adjourn

• Meeting Adjourned 9:11 pm

The next meeting will be May 2, 2017 to follow up on VE and estimate reconciliation and planning approvals.