

Penfield Building Committee

Special Meeting

Old Town Hall

611 Old Post Road

Fairfield, CT. 06824

Thursday, September 3, 2015

penfieldcommittee@town.fairfield.ct.us

Present: Mr. Bradley, Mr. Bass, Mr. Graceffa, Mr. Pitaniello, Mr. Speciale,
Mr. Zieff, Mr. Bellitto, Mr. Plotkin, Mrs. Nelson

Others: Mr. Heer, Mr. Procino, Mr. McDonald, Mr. Vincent, Mrs. Ewing, Ms. Dyer,
Ms. Holland

1. Call To Order

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

2. Confirmation of Quorum

Quorum confirmed.

3. Confirmation of Special Meeting Requirements

Mr. Bradley reviewed the criteria for a Special Meeting including discussion and actions limited to the Special Committee agenda as published.

Mr. Bradley took an opportunity to briefly review the recent history of the Penfield project. He mentioned the high construction bids, outcome of the last meeting, recent FEMA information, the estimating work being done by the Construction Manager, the choices facing the Committee and the fact that the project would not likely be delivered in time for summer next year.

4. Presentation and review of final construction budget by Shawmut Design and Construction, review current project status.

Mr. Procino distributed the Bid Summary Sheet. He said that they have been working to get the project on budget and as of today that has been nearly accomplished. The bid summary sheet described three possible outcomes from close to meeting funding limits to the possibility of \$694,065 over approved funding depending on outcome of a third round of general trades bidding. Shawmut did not recommend proceeding with bidding again. The Committee discussed cost risk and contingency.

Mr. Procino reviewed the Bid Summary Sheet, line item by item.

The Alternate and Cost Breakout Sheet was also distributed. Mr. Vincent said that from item #30 down were deduct alternates and from #30 and above were VE items initiated during the last two weeks. Mr. Vincent reviewed the items on the list.

Mr. Bradley invited comments from the Committee in regard to the Alternate and Cost Breakout Sheet items. Mr. Bass said that he didn't recall seeing some of the items on

the original sheet, i.e. snow plowing. Mr. Vincent said that it was included in one of the line item bid packages.

Mr. Graceffa said that he takes exception to the deduct involving the bulkhead. Mr. Bellitto agreed with Mr. Graceffa.

Mr. Zieff said that these deducts will effectively reduce the contingency.

Mr. Bradley asked if there was a rough cut in the VE list of things that are essential or at risk to a complete project. Mr. Vincent said no. Mrs. Nelson said that from a safety perspective, she was concerned about taking out the building protective skirt surrounding the foundation. Mr. Vincent said that there are other things to prevent people from going under the building and that there is only 2-3' of clearance.

Mr. Pitaniello said that he appreciates the VE effort however he is concerned about the contingency.

Mr. Procino discussed the issues related to the apparent low general trades bidder and DAS certification and said there was a protest from the second bidder. It concerned the low bidder may not being approved for the general trades.

5. Presentation and review of revised construction scope and cost estimates as prepared by Shawmut Design and Construction for redesign options based on design schemes 1-4 as provided by DeStefano and Chamberlain, previously presented to the Committee and dated August 20, 2015.

Mr. Heer reviewed the Alternate Re Design Options Sheet (Alternates to the Current Project).

Mr. Bellitto asked if Schemes 1-5 were different from two weeks ago. Mr. Heer said that the pricing was different. Mr. Heer said that the Document dated 9/3/15 used the base design (not VE) and it has more accurate numbers based on recent bid information.

Scheme #1 – No East Wing. Add changing rooms to West Wing. Mr. Bradley asked if this is original Option 7. Mr. Heer said it was similar but the scope was increased due to design detail developed over the past several weeks.

Scheme #2 - Smaller East Wing with Lockers and Breezeway (70 lockers). Mr. Heer said it was a small version of what we have now with a reconfigured East Wing.

Scheme #3 – Smaller East Wing with Lockers, No Breezeway. This would have 126 lockers.

Scheme #4 – Smaller East Wing without Lockers, just Bathrooms. This looks a lot like Option 7. Mr. Bradley commented that Schemes 1 and 4 are basically are very similar in total program but differ in just location of the additional restrooms.

Scheme #5 – Move the Entire Building, Repair, and Move Back.

6. Presentation and review of conceptual project scope and cost estimate to be provided by Shawmut Design and Construction to totally demolish and replace the Penfield facility to current FEMA and code standards.

Scheme #6 – Demo Existing and Rebuild New. Mr. Heer said the estimate includes everything in the Chamberlain drawings. Mr. Bradley commented that it was a 1:1 replacement plus added design details developed over the past several weeks, primarily involving site design due to enhancement of the existing building. A brand new building would be almost identical to the size and program of existing building. Mr. Plotkin thinks this is a risk. Mr. Bradley said that we have to wait for the FEMA worksheet to see what FEMA will reimburse. Mr. Bellitto said that the net cost to the Town would not change. Mrs. Nelson said that her understanding from the last meeting was that change orders would be covered by FEMA. Mr. Bradley said that, in regard to a repair type project, FEMA would get to the point where they cap the project and the Town would be responsible for the balance. Mr. Procino said that with each Scheme, they could possibly break ground in May 2016. Mrs. Corbett asked what the price per sq. foot was. Mr. Heer said \$336 per sq. foot. Mr. Plotkin was concerned with next year's costs and what Mr. Chamberlain will charge for 6 more weeks of work. Mr. Graceffa said that he thought Scheme 6 was the current layout. Mr. Bradley asked Mr. Heer if he had discussed Scheme 6 with Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Heer said no. Mr. Bradley said that they had to consider the condition of the existing building and its risk.

Mr. Bellitto thought there were only two realistic options, the building as approved or a 1:1 replacement. He said that with the current Bond resolution, we could do a smaller version but thought it would necessitate going back to the Town bodies because smaller is not what they expected. He said we have a project that is over budget or a 1:1 replacement basing all our assumptions on what Mr. Mayer said. He said there is no verified evidence that FEMA reimbursement will happen or if they will deliver on it. He said he didn't know what the answer is and wants direction from the Selectman and the BOS.

Mr. Graceffa said that he is frustrated because there is no analysis on paper what the net cost is at the end of the day.

Mr. Bass said that Scheme #6 is an exercise in insanity regardless of who pays for it. He said there were inconsistencies in FEMA reimbursement. FEMA ruling says up to 75%. You never know what their reimbursement will be until it is done. There are no guarantees from FEMA. Mr. Bass thinks we should look toward Option 7 or 7A and scale it down. He said we need to spend less than 6 million dollars and stop being side lined by politics.

Mrs. Nelson said she is uncomfortable with proceeding with the current numbers. She said we have to go with a smaller building. She believes the Committee has to go back to the Town bodies and explain what is going on.

Mr. Pitaniello said the project is over budget and it has to be cut to the bone. He said nothing is guaranteed when it comes to FEMA. He said we have to look at the difference between the existing project and the new. He is not comfortable with the current numbers. He agreed that this has to be presented to the Town.

Mr. Bradley asked if there is any doubt that the existing building can be repaired.

Mr. McDonald said the existing structure is in good shape but the unforeseens are a risk. Mr. Plotkin said that he leans towards Scheme 1 and do away with the lockers.

Mr. Speciale said the key is the worksheet from FEMA and that we need directions from the BOS.

Mr. Zieff said that this Committee works for the Town of Fairfield. He said the Committee needs to pick a Scheme and talk about what is cosmetic and nail down the exact costs.

Mr. Bradley said that the General Trades and Carpentry is what brought this in over budget. He said that he doesn't see the existing project surviving.

7. Hear from the Office of the First Selectman and/or the Town Fiscal Officer regarding the current status of FEMA funding criteria and reimbursement given the options of current project, a redesigned project or a total replacement project.

The First Selectman and the Town Fiscal Officer were unable to attend the meeting due to schedule conflicts.

Mr. Bradley announced a 10 minutes recess at 7:48 p.m.

Mr. Bradley reconvened the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

8. Review, consider and act upon a recommendation to proceed with the current reconstruction and repair project or an alternate redesigned project including specific next steps and estimated milestone dates.

Mr. Bellitto said a sense of the body motion makes sense. He said we need something in writing from FEMA.

Mr. Bass said that we have been given a charge to come in at 6 million dollars or less. He said he could support the option with no lockers or a rebuild with a target of 5.5 million.

Mr. Plotkin agreed that we have to move ahead and find a budget that makes sense.

Mr. Graceffa said that they can't ignore the numbers. He wants to pursue Scheme 1. He would like an analysis from the Town.

Mr. Bradley asked Shawmut to work with Mr. Chamberlain to come up with a smaller option for 5:5 million.

Sense of the Body Proposed by Mr. Bellitto and Seconded by Mr. Plotkin:

1. The Committee should focus on one project similar to original option 7 that meets funding requirements.

2. The Committee should seek direction of Bond Counsel regarding impact of fewer or no lockers.

3. The Committee should request FEMA reimbursement analysis regarding proposed one project.
4. The Committee should hold the current project in abeyance.
5. Shawmut should proceed as directed and in addition confirm owner's soft costs as suggested.

In order to accommodate the published regular meeting schedule, the next meeting will be on September 24, 2015.

9. Adjourn

Mr. Bellitto moved and Mr. Graceffa seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Bradley adjourned the meeting at 8:32 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