

Penfield Building Committee

Special Meeting

Board of Education Center

501 Kings Highway, 2nd floor

Fairfield, CT. 06825

Thursday, August 20, 2015

penfieldcommittee@town.fairfield.ct.us

Present: Mr. Bradley, Mr. Graceffa, Mr. Speciale, Mr. Bellitto, Mr. Plotkin, Ms. Corbett, Mr. Pitaniello, Mr. Bass, Mr. Zieff

Others: Mr. Vincent, Mr. Procino, Mr. Heer, Mr. Chamberlain, Ms. Holland, Ms. Dyer, Mrs. Ewing, Mr. Lombardo, Mr. Mayer

1. Call to Order

Mr. Bradley called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

2. Confirmation of Quorum

Quorum confirmed.

3. Confirmation of limited Special Meeting Agenda

Limited Special Meeting Agenda confirmed.

4. Status Report from Shawmut Design and Construction regarding the final project bid and rebid process and presentation of revised total project budget for Committee review and approval.

Mr. Procino reviewed the Bid Summary Sheet. He said that he received 7 general trades bids, 5 roofing bids, 1 painting bid and 1 moving bid. He said that at this point, they are \$351,694 over approved funded cost. He said that he met with Mr. Chamberlain to come up with items to reduce the cost. Mr. Procino then reviewed the Voluntary Deduct Alternatives.

Mr. Zieff asked what were the ramifications of not painting the interior. Mr. Procino said that you will see wood lockers and wood framing.

Mr. Procino said that by accepting all of the Voluntary Deducts the overage is reduced to approximately \$180,000.

Mr. Plotkin asked about the moving bond. Mr. Bradley said it was around 1%. Mr. Plotkin said that was \$70,000.

Shawmut recommended that over the next two weeks they review the budget with Mr. Chamberlain to find more reductions.

Mr. Bradley asked based on the bids and bid analysis did they think they could get \$180,000 out of the project. Mr. Procino said that the goal was to find ways to reduce the Guaranteed Maximum price without using the contingency.

Mr. Bradley asked about the schedule. Mr. Procino thought that, if they were able to receive approval on the GMP in two weeks, they could finish the project by mid July, 2016.

Mr. Zieff asked about the rental lockers as income. Mr. Bradley said that they are talking about building a shell and putting in as many lockers as we can afford. Mr. Bass disagreed with putting in only half of the lockers and then waiting for further funding to put in the rest. Mr. Bellitto said that it was not unusual that items are cut or changed to get it in line with the budget. He said he sees it as a reality with municipal projects.

Mr. Pitaniello said that he was concerned about some of the bids. Ms. Corbett asked about low bidders as they related to change orders. Mr. Pitaniello said that he knew some of the bidders and that he was comfortable with them. Ms. Holland said most of the contractors on the list have worked well with the Town. She said all change orders have to be approved by the Building Committee.

Mr. Pitaniello asked about the spread of the bids. Mr. Heer said it was \$450,000 in the General Trades (between lowest qualified bidder and the second lowest qualified bidder).

Mr. Plotkin pointed out that Mr. Tetreau said that no contracts will be signed unless the project was under budget. He asked what they had to do to get the budget down low enough to have a cushion built-in for change orders. Mr. Bradley asked Mr. Chamberlain about his confidence in being able to make these deductions. Mr. Chamberlain said that we can get there but it's a question of what we want to cut out.

Mr. Zieff reiterated his comment about lockers being income. He said that he didn't think reducing or eliminating lockers was an option. Mr. Bellitto agreed with Mr. Zieff and said that lockers were a big deal.

Mr. Speciale said that Shawmut has to come in the right number.

5. Presentation by Kevin Chamberlain, representing DeStefano and Chamberlain, regarding the cost reduction redesign options study.

Mr. Chamberlain presented the redesign cost reduction options. He said that he studied ways to reduce the size of the building.

Scheme 1 – East Wing was removed and not replaced, the decks around the building were maintained, changing rooms were created, the covered deck was bumped out towards the bulkhead, the elevations were similar to the existing design but there is less building, same beach access and stairs were shifted over to the center line of gathering room.

Scheme 2 – New East Wing with breezeway, lockers and bathrooms maintained, smaller East Wing with 70 lockers.

Scheme 3 – Same foot print as Scheme 2, breezeway eliminated, 119 lockers, smaller public bathrooms and stairs going to breezeway eliminated.

Scheme 4 – Tear down East Wing and build substantial bathrooms, build a deck that wraps around and connects at rear of building.

Mr. Heer said that in addressing the cost of the redesign schemes, they incorporated information learned during the overall design process. They included a 10% design contingency.

Mr. Bradley pointed out that the redesign schemes have a higher cost than the design the Committee is looking at. Mr. Procino said that soft costs are increased and there has been an escalation of the General Trades.

Mr. Bass said that he is concerned with the numbers presented on Schemes 1-4. He is concerned about the contingency and feels there is an expectation to come in significantly lower than 6 million.

Ms. Corbett wanted to know about the FEMA impact. She feels more comfortable with bid numbers versus estimates.

Mr. Plotkin didn't think the Schemes were helpful given the numbers.

Mr. Zieff felt the redesign Schemes didn't make sense numbers-wise.

Mr. Bellitto felt the Schemes were non-starters because it takes out program.

Mr. Speciale asked if anything on the Schemes should be incorporated in the original. Mr. Chamberlain said not from the standpoint of quality of program.

6. Presentation by Robert Mayer, Town Fiscal Officer, regarding current status of FEMA requirements, guidelines and proposed project cost reimbursement.

Mr. Mayer said that the project recently met the 50% rule/designation.

He said all costs associated with replacing the facility, and the cost of raising the building is eligible for FEMA reimbursement.

Mr. Bellitto asked Mr. Mayer to elaborate on the conditions. Mr. Mayer said the conditions were – same design, same function and capacity. Mr. Bellitto asked if this was in writing. Mr. Bass asked if there was documentation from FEMA. Mr. Mayer said that he has documentation in an email saying we met the 50% rule but no official letter from FEMA has been received.

Mr. Mayer said that the safest financial decision is replacement.

Mr. Bass said that he wants written confirmation from FEMA that the project has met the 50% rule and is eligible for up to 75% reimbursement.

Mr. Pitaniello thought that this opens up interesting options.

Ms. Corbett said that if we go back to square one and replace the building, is that a better option given the condition of the existing.

Mr. Plotkin asked if it had to be the same design. Mr. Mayer said that the foundation was a mitigation.

Mr. Zieff said he wants something in writing.

Mr. Bellitto said that he feels this project is being held hostage by reimbursement. He said the net cost to the Town is the same with rebuilding or fixing what is there.

Mr. Mayer said that this project might be deemed a salvage-replace but he can't confirm the cost to the Town as being the same.

Mr. Bradley recapped. He said a modified design (Scheme 1-4 or other) may be at risk of not getting full FEMA reimbursement. The salvage-replace option could be less of a risk. 1:1 replacement (full demolition and replacement) could be the least risky.

Mr. Speciale said that the original building's foundation was faulty from the start and he doesn't want the foundation replaced as it was originally designed.

Mr. Graceffa said that as a Committee, we need to be careful and let input from the Town impact our decision.

Mr. Bradley said that they will have to make FEMA part of the discussion. Mr. Bradley asked Mr. Mayer what he thought was in the best interest of the Town. Mr. Mayer said that he couldn't say. He said he would have to run the numbers.

7. Committee Discussion and action regarding: Proceeding with the original project as designed and bid or reducing the project scope to the extent necessary to conform with approved project funding.

Mr. Bradley summarized the discussion and emerging sense of the meeting: "A" Proceed with the reconstruction project as designed and bid subject to proposed cost reductions. "B" Proceed with a redesigned and likely smaller project to reduce the risk of cost overruns. "C" Proceed with a complete replacement of the Penfield facility.

Shawmut was instructed to complete the revised construction budget based on current bids and proposed cost cutting. PBC Member Andy Graceffa to join Kevin Chamberlain and Shawmut regarding this effort. Shawmut was directed to revise the "redesign schemes" cost estimates. Shawmut was directed to create a conceptual cost estimate for complete replacement of the existing building based on current bid and file data. The regularly scheduled meeting for 8/27 will be cancelled. A Special Meeting could be required prior to regular 9/10 Committee meeting. The Chair will request a FEMA cost reimbursement "net cost to the Town" analysis from Mr. Mayer regarding the different options. The Chair will approach the First Selectman regarding confirmation of direction.

8. Adjourn

Mr. Bellitto moved and Mr. Graceffa seconded a motion to adjourn. Mr. Bradley adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

Andrew Graceffa, Secretary
Ellen Marks, Recording Secretary.

DRAFT MINUTES SUBJECT TO REVIEW, CORRECTION AND APPROVAL BY THE PENFIELD BUILDING COMMITTEE OF THE TOWN OF FAIRFIELD