

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
July 17, 2018

PBC Attendees:

John Chapman
Brian Peterson
JP Fernandes – on the phone
Patrick DiSarro
Robert Piazza
Andie Greene

Absent:

Don Fiftal
Tom Hecht
Matthew Cleary
Janet Morgan
George Bauer

Also Present:

Scott Pellman	Colliers
Amy Samuelson	SLAM
Nelson Reis	O&G
Mark Jeffko	O&G

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

Attachments:

A meeting of the Public Building Committee was held on Tuesday July 17, 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 6:39pm.

2. OPM Report – Scott Pellman reported on the following:

a. Project Update Phase 2 –

Coordination Meetings – The project team continues to meet bi-weekly to review scheduling and construction related issues. The move out of phase 3 went smoothly and all the furniture and equipment is currently staged in the gymnasium. The furniture identified to be donated will be removed from the site in early August. There may be an interim move of existing materials into the hall prior to the teacher's boxes moving into their temporary or permanent locations in later August. The team met with the new Athletic Director this past Friday to get him up to speed on the field phasing and issues. Unfortunately, he was not able to attend this evening's meeting to join in the field discussions. The team also met this past Wednesday with the finance subcommittee and reviewed the current project budget and application for payment that will be presented later in the meeting.

PBC information packet – All committee members should have received an electronic copy of information that will be discussed this evening. The information included Colliers field reports, the O&G monthly report, current contingency status, athletic field updates, pending PCO's and O&G's application for payment #11.

SCG-046 update - The State of CT notified all superintendents on June 22 that the process for submitting the Towns request for reimbursement (SCG-046) would be changing as of July 1, 2018 and the current system would be shut down on July 1 at 11:59 pm. This was a complete surprise. During the implementation period of September 1 to November 1 the processing of grant payments will not be available on line. The next SCG-046 for submission was prepared and we met with Ed Arum on June 28th to submit the next reimbursement request. Unfortunately, the system does not allow you to download the next payment request until the previous has been paid. Attempts were made on Friday the 29th which were not successful. We will be reaching out to the State to determine the status of the pending payment. In addition, the State will contact the superintendent's office to schedule training for the new system in the near future.

Mark Jeffko from O&G provided an update from OSCG&R dated 7/13/2018 clarifying confusion that was created with their earlier notification. The State will be able to manually enter reimbursement requests. Colliers will work with the Region14 finance office to get the next payments submission approved.

PCO-050 - This PCO was included in the information packet sent to the committee and it pertains to the walk-in coolers and freezer floors that were not specified on the contract documents for bidding. The PCO was previously reviewed by the finance subcommittee this past Wednesday but was not acted on. A request was made to see if an epoxy floor would be more cost effective than the proposed sheet vinyl floor.

Amy Samuelson provide further details; the health department does not recommend matching the existing quarry tile which will remain and be patched in the existing kitchen. The new servery has sheet vinyl and SLAM is recommending that the same sheet vinyl be installed inside the coolers and freezer. O&G did price out an epoxy coating but that effort did not result in a cost savings.

Robert Piazza asked if the durability is the same between sheet vinyl and epoxy – Response – Yes, however sometimes you need to re-coat epoxy. Nelson Reis stated that seamless floors can also be patched if damaged.

John Chapman made a motion to approve PCO 00050 dated July 13, 2018 in the amount of \$6,446 for the installation of flooring in the kitchen walk in coolers and freezer. Seconded by Andie Greene - Discussions – All in favor - Unanimous

PCO – 052 – This PCO was also included in the information that was sent to the committee and pertains to revisions in the cafeteria lighting package due to ceiling coordination in the cafeteria.

Amy Samuelson expand on the details. The lighting layout needed to be modified for the cafeteria ceiling due to the existing structural constraints and required coordination of the ductwork and ceiling heights. The revised duct locations which are exposed created shadow areas and the additional light fixtures were required to maintain even lighting levels.

John Chapman made a motion to approve PCO 00052 dated July 13, 2018 in the amount of \$5,313 for revisions to the lighting package associated with cafeteria ceiling coordination. Seconded by Andie Greene - Discussions – All in favor - Unanimous

- b. **Athletic Field Discussions** – After our last meeting O&G was instructed to solicit separate field pricing through Richards Corp from three separate subcontractor that specialize in athletic field construction. There is a colored handout that shows the previous and new budget numbers for the field renovations. The good news is that the new proposal shows cost reductions of approximately 100,000 with the work being performed by a company that specialized in field construction. Amy Samuelson and Nelson Reis provided further details of the revised proposal.

Amy – This represents a different price point because a new contractor is involved, the scope is the same for PR-17 and the specifications produced for option #2. The fields have been broken out separately so you can vote on each one independently.

Nelson Reis stated that O&G received the pricing on Friday with the backup which was reviewed by Ian, the turf specialist from Tom Irwin Associates.

Robert Piazza asked about canceling the installation of the artificial turf field. Response – Nelson Reis stated that there is an \$30,000 expenditure to date for completed shop drawings. After November 1st the site contractor will start scheduling for next year so a final decision needs to be made by that date.

Andie Greene inquired about the need for the 8-12 thousand dollars that is being carried for new top soil. Andie also expressed concern about introducing new top soil and if the new topsoil will affect the flood management certification? Response - Amy stated that PR-17 included a new grading plan. As part of the specification the soil will be amended and Ian lacey will be on site testing it. The final field elevations should match the existing – SLAM will review.

Nelson Reis stated that there is a good deal of mixing and amending of the soil prior to final grading. They will request that the design be put into a cut fill program to try and eliminate any import of soil. The overall site is balanced so the contractor is using all of the existing material still on site.

Andie Greene asked what is involved with the irrigation modifications – Response – Nelson stated that the heads need to be swung down so the grading can be performed and then turned back up and adjusted to the final grade.

Andie Greene counted about 50 heads which equates to \$250 per head for the price quoted and some of the heads are on the perimeter outside of the graded area. If you were tracking that portion of the work on T&M would it take that long per head?

John Chapman asked if the contractor can eliminate fill, questioned the additional survey cost and why do the heads need to be turned down. Response – Nelson Reis stated that they would get responses to the questions from Richards Corp. We need to proceed now and coordinate the submittals as soon as possible to get the football field work done this season.

John Chapman stated that he believes that the additional survey should be part of the base bid and the layout can be tweaked to eliminate fill and the irrigation cost seems double what it should be.

Robert Piazza inquired if taking the artificial turf out is still on the table – John Chapman noted that it may be early to have that discussion. We are working on restoring the natural fields first and this approach gives us some flexibility. Scott Pellman noted that after meeting with the new AD he did express his desire to keep the artificial turf field as it gives the school a great deal of flexibility.

Andie Greene inquired about the credit numbers provided by Richards – Response -Nelson and O&G confirmed that the Region is only paying for what the contractor has done to date. Any work that had started was stopped on the football field to address the potential revision.

John Chapman believes that \$75,000 is more than enough and we should not be paying for added survey and turning sprinkler heads.

John Chapman made a motion to approve PCO 00057 dated July 16, 2018 as amended in today's meeting not to exceed \$75,000 to renovate the football/soccer field in accordance with PR #17 dated 6/13/18. - Seconded by Andie Greene - All in Favor – Unanimous

Amy Samuelson will provide an updated proposal for Ian Lacey at TIA to provide project support and oversight of the field renovations.

3. Architects progress update – Amy Samuelson

a. **Phase 2** – Nothing further to report

4. Construction Manager Update – Nelson Reis - Project Manager

a. **Phase 2 – Work.** O&G presented some construction photos and a video of the construction progress taken from a drone. It was a quick video and O&G can provide additional drone videos which can be emailed out to the committee. Through GPS the program will produce a 3D model of the site. The video could also be uploaded to the website. Committee members are encouraged to visit the site as long as they check in with the O&G trailer however It is better to have scheduled a time in advance.

John Chapman asked if there have been any neighborhood issues – Response - NO

- b. **O&G report and application #11** – The summary sheet for the payment application was reviewed. The report reflects the period ending June 30, 2018. The invoice is 3,206,235.63. There was no second shift work. Nelson presented the executive summary reflecting the June application.

John Chapman confirmed with the finance subcommittee that they had reviewed the application and were recommending payment.

Andie Greene asked about the schedule, O&G noted that they lost a little time on an electrical conduit that needed to be spliced in the tunnel area but the demolition is proceeding well. The project is on schedule and O&G will ramp up the contractors staffing if they see the schedule slipping. There are currently 70-80 workers on site.

John Chapman made a motion to approve the O&G AIA Application No 11 dated June 30, 2018 in the amount of \$3,206,235.63 - Seconded by Andie Greene – Discussions – All in favor – Unanimous

5. Other Business

None

6. Public Comment

Jim Crocker – Woodbury – Is the project is on schedule? Response - Yes.

If there is a late payment from the State how does that effect the project? Response - The finance committee would need to borrow more money in the short term.

Did the State of Connecticut DEEP delay impact the taxpayers of Woodbury? Response – We do not have an original bid to base the question on, we did not have to put in overtime for the DEEP delay, the summer construction included overtime to accelerate the schedule and meet the revised phasing. The State approved the project in the end and the overtime was incurred to achieve the schedule not the delay with the State.

Is the artificial turf field being removed? Response – No, the artificial turf field is currently in the project. The discussions this evening are to make sure that the grass fields are being renovated properly. The discussions tonight focused on delivering the scope that was expected by the supporters of the project. If the artificial turf field was eliminated the project would be responsible for approx. \$30,000 for the shop drawings.

Is the toilet building in the project? Response – Yes.

Meeting Adjourn

Motion to adjourn by John Chapman seconded by Andie Greene.

Meeting ended at 8:15 pm,