

BET Consolidation Day: Open Questions on BOE Capital

Capital

- 1. Digital Learning Environment: Confirm that the FY22 request can be reduced from \$1,400,000 to \$1,348,000 (changed was indicated during the discussion at the meeting with BOE/Administration).**

While that was the number approved by the BOE in their budget proposals; yes, the DLE capital request can be reduced by \$52K from \$1,400,000 to \$1,348,000. Within the total amount, the IT Staff has identified that Peripheral Hardware should be reduced from \$109,000 to \$57,000.

- 2. Cardinal Stadium: The detail for the appropriation for Phase 1 included funding for the Phase 2 planning funds to get through the land use and MI approvals. Requesting confirmation that the planning funds are already available.**

As Sean O'Keefe confirmed earlier this week with Roland Geiger, planning funds for phase 2 are part of the phase 1A appropriation and are already available.

- 3. CMS Feasibility Study: There was a long discussion on the specific scope of this project – is it (a) to determine how much maintenance capital is really needed until the renovation project (e.g., \$20M budgeted in next 5 years as shown on the chart I already sent you); or (b) to perform an engineering study of the building to better identify the timing of the replacement project based on when/if the building should not be used and how much money does the District really need to invest to keep it going (is it less/more/same than in the plan); or (c) both of the above plus to develop Ed Specs for the replacement building? The Budget Committee discussed:**

The intent of the study is to look at campus planning in totality (school and fields), and determine if there is a phased approach to start a portion of the work sooner to address where the building is starting to fail structurally. This study would include having an engineering report along with an architectural view, which goes beyond the master plan. Currently, the building is so far out in the CIP that many of the infrastructure items will need to be done if there is not assurance about timing of the project. The reason GPS has asked to study the campus is because we are slated to spend significant funds to maintain a safe and secure building for our students and staff, before the major construction is scheduled; and as such, the team here would prefer to have an expert's opinions as there are concerns about this building and its longevity if construction or maintenance are delayed.

a. How this project would impact the identified priorities of the 3 elementary school projects and if those 3 go first, then how do you change the timing of CMS?

The four projects are all important, and must be completed in a timely manner. The buildings lack adequate ADA, HVAC, and need safety upgrades. CMS has Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU) walls which have cracks, presenting a safety issue. Our process currently is not aggressive enough given the age of the buildings. If we push a project back, it means we need to invest more in infrastructure to keep the buildings going.

b. If this is really an engineering study to determine the necessary level of investment till the major project, then why are Ed Specs one of the deliverables?

This was more than an initial investment opinion. GPS is looking for a campus plan so that the students don't go without an adequate field for another decade, or have a wall which caves in because it is no longer supported adequately. Therefore, we are exploring options which were not part of the Master Facilities Plan.

C. The answers to this question may impact the funding of some of the maintenance projects that includes CMS projects. Not sure a revised CIP Sheet was requested which clarified some of these questions was requested, but it would be beneficial to do.

GPS can not revise the CIP sheets without BOE approval. In addition, in the out years we do not want to provide a false narrative that larger infrastructure projects will not need to be done. If the building does not have a concrete date for construction, we must plan to fix items like the roof, HVAC, CMU walls, etc.

4. GHS Security Entrance: One member questioned if the Building Committee will need the appropriation for the construction funding in FY22. [There was a discussion about the need to sign contracts to be able to start work at the end of the school year, but not sure that satisfied this member.

The building committee led by Steve Walko discussed this at their January 28th meeting. Please see a portion of the meeting minutes where the committee discussed timing. [The full minutes are available on our website.](#)

Greenwich Board of Education Minutes of the GHS Front Entry Committee Meeting DATE: January 28, 2021 LOCATION: BOE, Havemeyer Board Room and Virtually via Google Meets TIME: 8:00 - 8:50 am

Discussion on Timing

- *Need to select an Architect and General Contractor.*

- *Project can go out to bid once it passes BET, but is not able to sign contract until after the RTM meets in May.*
- *BOE representative Christina Downey indicated that the BOE has identified this project as a priority, but did not have a specific timeline.*
- *Since funds will not be available until July 1, 2021, a June/July 2022 start may be more realistic.*
- *Remediation of the athletic fields may also affect the timing of the Project.*
- *Chair will get more information regarding timing.*

5. HVAC: The question about bundling projects in several schools under one project was discussed. There is an idea to separate the 3 large projects in HVAC into individual MUNIS project codes and have the remaining smaller projects stay as part of a bundled project. While this is a BET decision, does Administration have comments on the approach? Should any of the appropriation amounts change?

The benefit of bundling all of the HVAC projects is that if one project runs short on funds and another has excess funds, we are able to transfer money within the bundle. If the projects are separated and one happens to run short, the only option available is to apply for an interim appropriation which could slow the project down. We strongly prefer the bundled approach, especially given the very short windows of time GPS has to complete this type of work.

6. HVAC: There was a second point made by one member who believes the Town could qualify for a lot more State reimbursement. I think he might even be referring some of these projects. This isn't really a question that can be answered now, but if the Administration has any additional information on the rules and expectations for school reimbursement projects, that would be helpful.

School Construction grants are tightly regulated. For instance, the Cardinal Stadium project is not eligible for a school construction grant because athletic facilities not attached to the school are ineligible (per the CSDE Office of School Construction). In addition, some smaller renovations can end up costing more because applying for the school construction grant now requires additional code compliance on items the district may not be upgrading. GPS is studying this more in depth to understand the historical approach in Greenwich.

There is a great deal of information available through the [School Construction Grants](#) office. Peter Bernstein has also contacted the delegation to Hartford and one of our State Representatives is also engaged in seeking additional information and sources of funding.

7. WMS Remediation: There is support for this project. Many BET members know a lot about the DEEP/EPA approval process and timeframe. It does seem to move once a final Remedial Action Plan (RAP) is developed and submitted. That RAP proposes one specific plan (how much to be removed, at what depth, and what kind of cap on

remaining contaminants will be used). Has the RAP been finalized, written, and submitted? When would you expect a public hearing and DEEP acceptance of RAP?

The timing of the RAP is challenging to forecast considering we still have not obtained concurrence from EPA and DEEP on the remedial approach (i.e., how deep our site-wide excavation will need to be). We'll know more about the project timing when they respond to our most-recent submission addressing their concerns which was sent on February 16, 2021. We will certainly keep the BET and the community informed.

8. JC/OG/Riverside: It was stated that the maintenance plan assumes no completion of major projects, which would then indicate that the capital plan is overstated for projects in these schools. Can you share information on the estimated amounts in the 15 year forecast for this overstatement?

This is challenging to answer because what work that needs to be done is greatly dependent on when the projects gain approval and what is included in the approved Educational Specification. A good example is the process with Old Greenwich right now. The Feasibility Study had the preliminary project estimates listed below, [as shared from the October 2020 BOE Report](#), but at the last meeting the committee went through the project line by line as the BOE Representative wanted to see if the preliminary project estimate could be reduced. By only focusing on ADA, Air Quality, and safety, the cost was at \$19,900,000. However, in order to meet that lower threshold the lights, ceilings, cabinetry, and other items were suggested to be eliminated. This means, those items will need to be in the infrastructure budget because they still need to be completed. For example, areas of the flooring actually have caution tape where the floor is a tripping hazard.

Also included below is the initial estimate that was included in the Facilitates Master Plan.

	2018	2020 Feasibility Study Options		
	Master Plan	A	B	C
Site Development	\$ 3,025,309	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
New Construction	\$ 10,700,000	\$ 6,900,000	\$ 5,100,000	\$ 3,000,000
Renovation	\$ 9,060,903	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 2,000,000
Infrastructure	\$ 15,848,542	\$ 11,900,000	\$ 11,900,000	\$ 11,900,000
Subtotal	\$ 38,634,754	\$ 23,000,000	\$ 20,200,000	\$ 17,900,000
*Feasibility Study Options include estimated cost escalation to 2022				