

Colliers
135 New Road
Madison, CT 06443
MAIN +1 860 395 0055
FAX +1 203 779 5661

Regional School District No. 14
Woodbury/Bethlehem
Nonnewaug High School – Renovations Project
June 26, 2018

PBC Attendees:

John Chapman
Brian Peterson
George Bauer
Andie Greene
Tom Hecht
Patrick DiSarro
Robert Piazza
JP Fernandes

Absent:

Don Fiftal
Matthew Cleary
Janet Morgan

Also Present:

Scott Pellman	Colliers
Amy Samuelson	SLAM
Thomas Swaile	SLAM
Nelson Reis	O&G
Mark Jeffko	O&G
Mike Molzon	Region 14
Suzie Greene	Region 14
Ian Lacey	Tom Irwin Associates – joined via phone

From / Notes Prepared by: **Scott Pellman** – Project Manager
Colliers International

Attachments:

A special meeting of the Public Building Committee was held on Tuesday June 26, 2018 in the Relocated Central Offices at Woodbury Middle School 67 Washington Avenue 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 Scott Pellman for inclusion.

1. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 6:36pm.
2. Site Athletic facility Discussions. – Amy Samuelson and Thomas Swaille from SLAM and Nelson Reis from O&G reported on the following:
 - a. **Existing conditions review and what the project owns.** – The existing base bid scope of work was reviewed for baseball, softball, football and soccer fields. The planarity report described two options: Option one was to bring the low areas of the fields up in lifts of no more than $\frac{1}{2}$ " at a time, the second approach was to strip the existing grass, till and re-grade. Full renovation of soccer and football fields (Option 2) was included in the bid for approx. 50% of the area. The contractor bid a hybrid option based on the planarity reports two separate recommendations along with the SLAM specifications. The project specifications described overseeding with lifts of soil for minor depressions and the deeper dips where the soil would be infilled after the lower 4" of soil is tilled. Currently the field restoration work is on hold and has been on hold for almost a month after the first 100' of the work was started in the football field. Amy Samuelson noted that PR-17 was issued for 3 prices on addressing the following areas: Area A football, Area B soccer and Area C field hockey baseball and softball. Nelson Reis stated that what you own is what the site contractor bid on which was a hybrid approach. The Blue area shown on the provided sketch is the base bid renovations which is the hybrid approach and areas around the walkways will be re-seeded. The green area would be aerated and seeded. The hybrid approach will look like a puzzle as observed prior to the meeting. Andie Greene stated that he is concerned that the edges created by the hybrid approach have unconsolidated top soil and may result in lower areas or higher areas compared to the existing. He did not see how this approach would result in an even playing field. Robert Piazza asked after all is said and done would the field be even and if not, will the contractor have to come back and re-do the fields? John Chapman noted that the issue is in the hybrid approach and the documents were not clear on picking one option or the other. The progressive layering of soil would take longer than the schedule allowed for and that option should not have been included. Andie Greene noted that the dips were larger than anticipated. Nelson Reis stated that the contractor provided a number of successful projects that they have completed but those previous projects did not necessarily follow the hybrid approach. The bids are lump sum but the O&G estimators reviewed the per s.f. price that was in line with other projects. Tom Height noted that taking off the turf is efficient. Amy Samuelson noted that not a lot of additional material would be imported and SLAM is struggling with the total add cost. Andie Greene believes that the project owns approx. \$100,000 worth of work. JP Fernandes questioned the first planarity report that shows 1.5" of difference in the fields and did not describe the larger dips that exist. Andie Greene noted that they only tested 20 points per field and he originally thought the same thing but the drawing is deceiving. Either way the top dressing will take 4 or more years to complete. Mike Molzen noted that you need to give the fields some time to grow so you cannot immediately play on a field that has been top dressed. Nelson Reis stated that in the scope review Richards did not bid option #1 (topdressing over multiple years) and they never anticipated coming back over 4 years. Amy noted that in the scope review SLAM did not fully understand what the contractor bid. John Chapman noted that the approach should either be Option #1 or Option #2 and not a mix and match. George Bauer asked if the project could do the complete tear down of the football and re-seed the soccer.
 - b. **Discussions with Ian Lacey the turf specialist** - Ian Lacey believes the most efficient way to renovate the fields was to strip the and re-seed (option #2). It's a longer-term solution that avoids the problem of matching surfaces and grasses. Option #2 will be ready just as quickly as the hybrid approach and you end up with a much better product and he fully recommended Option #2. The only downside is the cost. John

Chapman asked his opinion of the contractor creating a hybrid approach and should the design and construction team have required the contractor to follow one of the two options? Ian stated that he was not sure what happened with the contractor and that there were two separate options provided in the documents. John Chapman asked O&G what was the total value of field renovations the project owns? Nelson Reis stated that it's approximately \$84,000 because they already did 100' of the tear down. Andie Greene noted that the annual maintenance budget for the Nonnewaug fields should be 30-40 thousand dollars a year. John Chapman stated that looking back prior to bidding the committee's approach was to get the best grass fields as possible because the committee did not believe they could afford the synthetic field due to the delay. Nelson Reis stated that the football field can be broken out and the Soccer field is due to be renovated in the early spring. Ian stated that if the seed was placed on the football field by October 15th the field would be playable in the spring but we don't know what the weather will do. The PR 17 process (option #2) should take approximately two weeks to be ready for seed. Andie Greene stated that he would recommend doing the football field now. Scott Pellman noted that the buyout savings from FF&E could cover the improvement costs to the football field. Amy Samuelson stated that during the design phase and VE decisions the budget was cut and the fields were only reimbursed at ½ the rate. The design team produced a specification to do the minimums at the fields because of budget pressure. Robert Piazza stated that Richards owes the project a green level field. Patrick DiSarro asked if Richards would be relieved if they went with a full option #2? Nelson Reis stated that the bid documents had a fixed quantity of CY of top soil – approximately 240 and 200 CY's for Football and Soccer. George Bauer asked how close is the existing survey compare to the planarity report and how much top soil has been placed? O&G did not have an immediate answer. John Chapman stated that the issue was accepting the hybrid approach and that he has a concern about the contractor being able to perform on this project. Andie Greene stated that it would be the coaches option to play on the grass field or artificial field once completed however the existing grass soccer field is one of the largest in the area. The turf field will be smaller, they may play some on the artificial based on weather. John Chapman noted that the first field will be a test. Patrick DiSarro asked if there are any other fields that have been renovated in this way. Ian has seen it in the UK but not in the States, the field came out OK but it was a huge amount of work. The maintenance of a field that went through the hybrid approach will be more difficult due to different soils and you will end up with a patchwork quilt because the existing turf will require different fertilizers. The cheapest solution in the long run will be option #2 and it will be easier to maintain and provide the most consistent surface. Andie noted that at a previous meeting the committee approved money on equipment for the auditorium to eliminate future costs, if the hybrid option is used it will add maintenance costs in the future. Andie asked Ian what the difference in cost would be from Option #1 to Option #2 and he believed they would be close. Amy asked why then would the cost for PR-17 be so great only crediting back \$85,000. Andie asked when you would need to make a decision on the artificial turf field, the submittals are ready with classic turf, O&G will find out a date for a decision without a penalty. John Chapman asked the committee to discuss and determine the priorities. It was discussed if grass fields should be the priority over the artificial turf field. Ian recommended a new subcontractor be utilized for a total field renovation with laser grading. Ian did not see the qualifications of the current contractor but did not believe they were qualified on paper to deliver a quality product. Ian stated that the costs look very high, the Town of Fairfield did exactly option #2 including irrigation and did the entire project for \$92,000 in 11 days. He would suggest that he review the numbers to make sure they match the approach, they may have overestimated because they were unsure how to achieve the final project goals. The committee agreed that additional information is necessary. Andie Greene asked if the work could be re-bid and could Ian provide a list of trade contractors Ian has used and

could we get costs from them working through Richards. Ian clarified the original planarity report option #2 was generalized as guidance only with a reasonable understanding of the work. If option #2 was chosen a spec would be written and PR17 included the exact approach that is required. Three laser grading steps are required as part of the recommended approach due to breaking up the existing soils, rough grade, soil conditioners and re-grading with seeding. You could remove one of the laser grades from the process and go with 2 to save some cost. John Chapman asked if the grading process is dependent on the qualifications and equipment used by the contractor. Scott 'Pellman noted that if the optimum time to seed is later August to early September and the reconstruction should take 2-3 weeks the committee does not need to make a decision tonight and can postpone action to the next regular meeting with additional information provided by the design and construction team.

The following direction was provided to O&G and the design team for the next meeting:

1. Get the list of qualified contractors – Ian believes that the contractors should be able to turn the costs around in a week.
2. Review the estimate – O&G to send to Ian with as much detail as possible with the breakdown.
3. Confirm that option #2 scope is clear. Is the spec similar to the project in Fairfield? Yes – Ian used the Fairfield spec used in Fairfield.
4. O&G to provide a drop-dead date to make a decision on the artificial field.

John Chapman made a motion to authorize Ian Lacey to proceed with assisting the committee as noted above and provide an updated hourly rate as part of his CA oversight proposal to assist in obtaining subcontractors to complete the field work – seconded by JP Fernandes – All in Favor - Unanimous

3. Other Business – Amy Samuelson

There is a submittal in place for re-coating the existing roof and SLAM does not recommend matching a 17-year-old faded blue color. The Agri science building is coming up on 20 years old and may need to be re-coated in the near future as well but that is not part of this project. The Agri science building has unique features that set it apart and SLAM feels that it can stand alone with the existing blue roof. The proposed grey color will match the new metal panels. The student services building will still have blue window frames that will match VoAg building, the grey will match the new windows I the HS academic building.

Suzie Greene stated that there was not enough blue and red in the building so those colors were added on the interior and the blue roof identifies the school as Nonnewaug, the blue roof is one of the school colors. Julie Luby also believes that the roof coating should match the VoAg building.

Andie Greene stated that some people like the blue and some hate it.

Amy Samuelson again noted that the new color would never match the faded existing blue color and they do not recommend the blue.

Patrick DiSarro stated that a different color blue will look like we did something different and that the VoAg building is distinctly different. When would the VoAg building need to be re-coated? The architect did not have an answer.

It was agreed that the grey was the best choice and the architect should stay with the specified color.

4. Public Comment – None

Meeting Adjourn

- Meeting ended at 9:30 pm