

## RIVERFIELD SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

A special meeting of the Riverfield School Building Committee was held on Tuesday, November 12, 2013 at 7:30 pm in the Sullivan Independence Hall, First Floor Conference Room.

### Attendance

Present Committee Members: Thomas Quinn, Chairman; Christine Messina, Vice Chairman; Bill McDonald; Maureen Sawyer; John Shaffer; Scott Thompson

Absent Committee Members: Lawrence Ratner; Secretary; Harry Ackley; Dan Graziadei; Pam Iacono, BOE Liaison; Nick Mirabile, RTM Liaison

Others Present: Kenneth Boroson, George Katinger, Kenneth Boroson Architects; Derek Bride, Rick Camara, Consulting Engineering Services; Peter Adamowicz, Peter Manning, Gilbane Building Company; Dave Rojas, Marc Sklenka, Strategic Building Solutions; Sal Morabito, Manager of Construction, Security and Safety for FPS; Brenda Anziano, Riverfield principal; Judy Ewing, Liaison from the Office of the First Selectman, Kristen Tharrington

### 1) CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Thomas Quinn at 7:30 pm.

### 2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

### 3) APPROVE MINUTES FROM 10-15-2013 AND 10-29-2013

Minutes will be addressed at the next regular meeting.

### 4) INVOICE REVIEW AND APPROVAL

**Motion made** by Maureen Sawyer

To approve the following invoices:

<b>Payer</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Invoice Date</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Gilbane	Preconstruction services	10/25/2013	\$27,706.67
Kenneth Boroson Architects	Design development services	11/01/2013	\$14,812.25

Motion seconded by Christine Messina. **Motion carried 6:0:0.**

## 5) REVIEW LIST OF RECOMMENDED VALUE ENGINEERING ACTIONS

Current estimates price the project at \$1,860,000 above budget. Mr. Quinn stated the key issue is prioritizing the add alternates and invited Mr. Sklenka to review the document prepared by Strategic Building Solutions dated November 7, 2013.

The document organizes the items in blocks: General/Non-Architectural, Program Revisions, Architectural Features – Interior, Architectural Features- Exterior, Structural, MEP and Site & Site Utilities. From previous discussions, items were identified as possible bid alternate (highlighted in blue), recommended for elimination (highlighted in yellow) or to keep (no highlight). Mr. Sklenka reviewed the bidding process the strategy and stated better pricing is achieved with add alternates vs. “deducts.”

The first add-alternate item to generate comment from the committee was Architectural Features- Interior item 4 – To delete painting of existing classrooms. Mr. Quinn believes it should be a high priority add alternate. Ms. Sawyer agreed stating the Riverfield community has seen this kind of work be postponed with the understanding it would be done when the building was renovated. In response to Ms. Messina’s question about painting schools, Mr. Morabito said painting is done as needed on a limited budget.

Significant savings were found in the Architectural Features- Exterior block by deleting the RTU screens. In a note to Mr. Quinn from Mr. Fallon (the RSBC attorney) if located in a residential area these roof top screens are not required by TPZ regulation. Mr. Katinger stated the RTU screen is being carried as an add alternate. In response to Mr. Thompson’s question about the roof overhang, Mr. Boroson stated it was a visual feature, designed to match the existing building. Mr. Katinger said it was about 12” and is slated to be deleted.

MEP is a large block with about \$300,000 of the \$804,000 being the Pod A/C. Another \$75,000 could be saved by combining the Gym and APR units. In response to Ms. Sawyer’s question about opportunity to gain efficiency, Mr. Camara explained the combined Gym/APR unit could be smaller (but require more controls) because there will never be “a full house” in the Gym and APR at the same time. The estimated cooling capacity would be reduced from 100 to 60-65 tons. Currently the Pod A/C is an add-alternate, and the combining of the Gym and APR units is recommended.

As much as Mr. Thomson supports A/C in the Pod, he thinks using LED lights is a higher priority. Mr. Thompson asked for life cycle cost comparisons and ROI figures for items in the MEP block. According to Mr. Camara simple ROI for using LED instead of fluorescent (item 4A) is 4-5 years.

Mr. Thompson stated for a project being built to last 50 years, any item that pays for itself in 5 year and even those with ROI between 5-10 years need to be evaluated. Mr. Quinn agreed ***Ceteris paribus*** (all things being equal) but that's not the case. The dollars might need to be saved now to come in on budget. In response to Mr. Thomson's question, Ms. Holland stated the town has a clause in the bid document to allow bidders to provide a life cycle cost analysis, and the town can use life cycle cost to determine the lowest qualified bidder. Discussion followed about the ROI on the Pod A/C (item 11-1a) and how the cost of current operation and maintenance compare to those of a new unit. The system is 40 years old and is an add-alternate because of its high cost and the need to meet budget. At \$276,000 Mr. Camara didn't expect the ROI to be in the low 5 years. Mr. Katinger stated the committee has the difficult job of prioritizing the add alternates if there is extra money from favorable bids. In response to Mr. Camara's question Mr. Katinger said we will need to find out if a prioritized add alternate list is needed for the BSF interview. Mr. Quinn commented the question is how high on the priority list should the A/C be. The committee has the Ed Spec to drive the committee's decisions: the enlarged gym is in the Ed Spec, the Pod is not. Ms. Tharrington stated the recent Veteran's Day celebration demonstrated the gym is not sufficiently large to house a whole school assembly. She estimated about 10% of the parent population to be there. Ms. Sawyer recalled classes needing to be shuffled in by grades on Patriot's Day when rain forced the celebration inside and stated the gym needs to happen. Mr. Thompson views the whole school assemblies as infrequent use of the space, and thinks it warrants discussion. Ms. Messina thought there was also the potential to hold 2 simultaneous gym classes as the enrollment approached 504 students. And Ms. Sawyer commented the various town basketball leagues use the gym. Mr. Katinger added the larger gym enables the stage to be moved from the APR allowing both spaces to support the 504 enrollment.

Six items under the Site & Site Utilities group were listed for a total possible savings of \$115,000. Much of the savings would be in using different materials for walkways. Mr. Thompson asked to be on the record for not wanting to delete neighborhood screening (Item 5 List landscaping as an add alternate for a savings of \$29,600).

Mr. Quinn told the committee this is not an easy decision, not where we want to be, but we have to move forward. We already have dates to go up to Hartford on February 18, 2014. We have to lock down our plans. Before that we get final approval from the BOE on February 12, 2014.

Ms. Sawyer asked about the current bid environment in the area, referencing work to begin soon at Fairfield Prep. Mr. Adamowicz said it was pretty good, with only light coverage on

mechanical and electrical, but that bid is private. Ms. Holland added private bids aren't subject to a prevailing rate requirement. Mr. Manning said in the public school sector they typically see good coverage for mechanical and electrical and Fairfield Prep may be an anomaly since it is a private bid. Mr. Sklenka added they had decent coverage in New Haven in the last couple months for a \$27M project.

Mr. Quinn asked for comment. Ms. Holland said to stay within the Ed Specs, that the committee has identified the items most easily added, and deleted the items that don't apply to the Ed Specs. Mr. Cullen stated the committee did a tremendous job looking at the value engineering items and addressing the goals to eliminate the portable classrooms and deficiencies.

More discussion followed about the LED lighting, and Heat Wheels.

#### 6) VOTE TO ACCEPT CURRENT VALUE ENGINEERING ACTIONS

**Motion made** by Christine Messina

To adapt Strategic Building Solution's value engineering document dated November 7, 2013 but leaving in:

- the Heat Wheels (page 2, item 11-2a) and
- the LED lighting fixtures (page 1, MEP item 4A)  
and offering the LED lighting fixtures as a deduct-alternate.

Motion seconded by Maureen Sawyer. **Motion carried 6:0:0**

#### 7) DISCUSSION AND DECISION ON SITE PHASE 1 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Mr. Katinger has advised he owns this.

#### 8) DISCUSSION AND DECISION ON EVERSIGHT PROPOSAL FOR CT. HIGH PERFORMANCE BUILDING GUIDELINES

This item was in the budget but was not in the scope of any group. Van Zelm submitted a proposal but it is not clear if the scope of the project is for the addition or the entire project.

**Motion made** by Christine Messina

To accept the proposal from Van Zelm engineers dated October 28, 2013 for supervision of high performance building guidelines in an amount not to exceed \$28,500.

Motion seconded by John Shaffer. **Motion carried 6:0:0**

9) PUBLIC COMMENT

10) ADJOURN

Mr. Quinn adjourned the meeting at 8:42 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathleen C. Grande  
Recording Secretary