



Regional School District No. 14 Woodbury / Bethlehem

Nonnewaug High School – Renovations Project

Public Building Committee Meeting

August 22, 2017

PBC Attendees:

Absent:

John Chapman Brian Peterson Robert Piazza Andie Greene George Bauer Janet Morgan JP Fernandes Patrick DiSarro	Don Fiftal Tom Hecht Matthew Cleary
--	---

Also Present:

Scott Pellman	Colliers
Kurt Lavaway	Colliers
Glen Gollenberg	SLAM
Lee Donaldson	O&G
Lorel Purcell	O&G
Mark Jeffko	O&G
Wayne McAllister	Region 14
Mike Molzon	Region 14

From / Notes Prepared by:

Scott Pellman - Project Manager

Colliers International

Attachments: _____

A meeting of the Public Building Committee was held on Tuesday, August 22, 2017 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 – John Chapman called the meeting to order at 6:35 PM.
2. OPM Report – Scott Pellman reported on the following:
 - **Phase 1 Construction update** – Nonnewaug High School administration moved into the Central Office space on August 15th. The asbestos abatement was completed last Friday the 18th. The school opened today for freshman orientation, it was all hands-on deck and there will be a walk-through of the project this Friday with the contractors to ensure that all areas are buttoned up prior to the first day of school on the 30th. There are a few proposal requests that are being finalized by O&G, the project is currently on budget with a phase 1 credit of approx. \$16,500 for contract allowances not used. This credit will be partially offset by proposal requests for additional work that O&G will outline at the next PBC meeting.
 - **Construction Document Budget** – The O&G 90% construction document estimate was received on August 7, 2017 and showed the project approx. \$650,000 over budget. The team reviewed the estimate and there was a day long reconciliation meeting at SLAMS office on 8-11-17 which reviewed all aspects of the project. The meeting identified alternates that were still being carried in the budget along with a number of other clarifications including pavement section reductions based on the updated geotechnical work. Revised documents and estimates were provided by SLAM and O&G on 8-16-17 and there was a lengthy conference call to finalize the 90% construction document budget. After all revisions and clarifications were incorporated into the estimate the project is on budget without incorporating any additional VE or alternates. An updated project budget was distributed to the committee.

Robert Piazza asked how the bids alternates work, is the construction contingency used for alternates and when would you look to start using contingency for alternates? Response - Kurt Lavaway explained that the owner's construction contingencies are used for unforeseen conditions and are not carried to fund alternates. The construction managers GMP contingency is carried to cover items that were not assigned to a contractor in the bidding process. The majority of the alternates can be accepted at or near the end of the project and remaining contingency money can be used to fund alternates if available. Glen Gollenberg added that all alternates except windows can be implemented late, windows will require an earlier decision.

Janet Morgan stated that the safety committee would prefer not to have the corridor to VoAg included in the base project. The students could use badges to operate the electronically controlled doors between the main building and VoAg. This will be confirmed with Maryann Aiken and discussed with the team at the next security meeting. John Chapman would like to review this request with the team and asked if there would be a cost for badges that would be provided to the students. Due to the complexity of removing all the details from the documents and the time remaining to complete the documents the connector addition may be included in the project as an alternate.

Brian Peterson asked about the VoAg connector enclosure and how control would be maintained? Response – Janet Morgan stated that the recommendation not to install the connector would allow the region to monitor the students better using badges which would identify who is late when the students passed through the electronically controlled doors. Janet also noted that the students go out to the barn and the hydroponic fields so they are outside the building already. The infill was not

design to be solid or heated so either way the students would still move through the elements.

- **Additional VE list** - The list of potential value engineering (VE) items previously not accepted along with additional suggestions created during the contract document estimate reconciliation meeting were reviewed with the committee. It was noted that value engineering decisions are not needed to meet the budget estimate and the design team did not recommend acceptance of any of the VE suggestions.
 - Kurt Lavaway asked SLAM if the metal panels in the auditorium were removed would it effect acoustics? Glen Gollenberg stated that he needed to check with the acoustical engineer.
 - Each of the classrooms will receive infrastructure to install 3 additional monitors for group project use. This will allow monitors to be purchased later and installed that are in addition to the one interactive monitor that is currently included in the project.
 - The water heater change was not recommended
 - The gymnasium floor has water damage and replacement is still recommended.
 - Glen Gollenberg will have the security consultant explore the potential reduction of the number of cameras. Any potential reduction will be reviewed with the security committee. One thought would be a reduction of cameras in the stairwells. O&G industries feels that the number of cameras are excessive compared to other schools they have constructed. This value engineering suggestion targeted 10 camera locations. The estimated cost of the credit included the camera, mounting brackets, installation and infrastructure.
 - The chiller warranty reduction was not recommended.
- **Alternates List** – The list of accepted alternates was reviewed, there was one additional alternate added to the list since the DD phase for the replacement of the existing exterior security cameras. There was a concern raised in a coordination meeting with the security consultant and Wayne McAllister that the existing camera resolution was not adequate.

Patrick DiSarro question if the resolution of the cameras would be admissible in court. Kurt Lavaway noted that the comment on the camera resolution needs to be confirmed and that the security consultant deals with the top of the line equipment. When entering the building you need to be able to get face recognition. Glen Gollenberg added that the security requirements imposed by the State are not governing this project due to the project funding approval that pre-dated the requirements however, the design team is doing their best to incorporate the standards where applicable.

Patrick DiSarro would like to attend the safety committee meeting.

- **Document Reviews** – There will be a phasing constructability meeting at SLAMS office tomorrow afternoon. Document comments from the code reviewer have been provided to the design team and they are addressing the comments.

- **Pavement testing** – The report is being finalized and the geotechnical engineer has spent additional time coordinating other aspects of the project with the design team. Those efforts translated into final pavement and walkway base material recommendations and thicknesses that resulted in significant pavement cost reductions. There will be a minor additional cost for the added VE and base clarification services. Approx. \$3,500.
- **Slab Moisture testing** – Moisture testing protocol information was sent to the building committee on Monday 8-7-17 describing the testing methodology. The initial tests showed high relative humidity levels in the slabs on grade as well as elevated slab areas. SLAM is currently reviewing the flooring materials for all areas and will comment on any requirements for the application of topical vapor barriers if needed to meet the manufacturers installation tolerances. These tests provided a basis for the design team to quantify areas that may require mitigation so the budget can carry money for the potential installation of a topical vapor barrier. The project specifications require the flooring contractor to perform their own tests prior to installing the flooring. The flooring contractor has to accept the existing conditions as part of their installation. The project budget has encumbered the cost of a topical vapor barrier if required for flooring installation in areas identified as having moisture issues.
- **Schedule** - The project is on schedule, the State has moved the PCR date to September 22, 2017.
 - Target for ED042 approval by building committee and BOE on September 5th. (building committee special meeting) Janet Morgan will confirm the BOE meeting date.
 - The current date for the state PCR review is September 22nd at 9:00am
- **Finance Sub Committee** – The need for a finance subcommittee was discussed further. John Chapman noted that it would be good to get 3 people on the committee, Brian, Andy and 1 more person, Robert Piazza volunteered. John would like to check with Wayne McAllister to set the committee up properly so they can have the ability to approve change orders up to a certain amount. The committee will also review all requisitions and report to the PBC at the regular meetings. There is also a need to establish a limit of change order approval for Wayne and Dr. Anna to authorize funds that require immediate approval to keep the project on schedule. Kurt Lavaway will provide an outline.
- **Agronomist proposal** – The proposal has been revised not to exceed \$2,050 – The agronomist will generate the turf management plan and provide scope and specifications so the design team can get a complete bid on what needs to be done at the field.

Andie Greene stated that the timing is not great as the fields are being used and questioned what impacts the testing might have to the fields. Response – Glen Gollenberg noted that the landscape architect reviewed the testing procedures with the consultant who would be required to put the field back into a playable condition. It is believed that the testing will only involve hand tools and will confirm what he is doing. John Chapman wants to make sure there is adequate sampling and verification. The proposal requires further clarification of the scope, Andie to provide feedback.

- **Application for payment #1 for phase 1 work** – John Chapman presented the application.

O&G provides a pencil copy which is reviewed by the design team and Colliers, the application is marked up and goes back to the CM for revisions, the architect will sign it and Colliers will also stamp.

George Bauer asked if Wayne reviewed the application? Response - Yes Wayne signed it. There is a 5% retainage on the invoice.

Motion to approve August 8th Phase 1 O&G application for payment #1 for period ending 7-31-17 for a total of \$459,032. by John Chapman, Seconded by George Bauer – All in favor - unanimous

3. Architects progress update – Glen Gollenberg

- **Design progress** – There is not much to add, SLAM is working to meet the deadlines and respond to comments for the State as well as QA/QC. The final document coordination will not add more than the design contingency to keep us on budget.

JP Fernandes– has O&G done a constructability review? Response - Yes

Glen noted that the State is picky on the approval of the SCG-042. Janet Morgan requested that the team provide information on what they are approving for the SCG-042 in a written form. George Bauer stated that many of the BOE members have seen the community presentation. Janet requested a 1-page description of the project.

Andie Green inquired if the design team has all the State permits? Response – SLAM and their consultants are following up, the State permits are still in process and is something that needs to be done as part of the PCR process for bidding approval.

4. Construction Manager update– Lee Donaldson / Lorel Purcell

- **Phase 1** – The Abatement has been completed and O&G is awaiting close out documents. There are 3 sub phases to the first phase of work. Phase 1.1 admin move to the central Office – the phase has been completed. Phase 1.2 temp classrooms on the second floor – the painter is finishing tomorrow and the cleaning company will be in Wednesday and Thursday to perform the final cleaning. Once the furniture is in its final location the power poles will be installed. The freshman orientation went well, there was a hiccup with the fire alarm but they have found the cause of the problem and the system is functioning properly. A fire alarm consultant will be on site tomorrow to further review the system. Phase 1.3 modifying the existing admin into 5 temp classrooms - The area has been segregated, the demolition is substantially complete and they will be removing debris and framing will commence. The project is on schedule.

John Chapman questioned when the students return will O&G be on campus? Response – Yes, O&G and the contractors will access the old administration area from the back stair to construct the temporary classrooms. On Sept 5th Kurt will be presenting the projects to each of the grades and will discuss what they will see for the next year. The students will know what to do and what to avoid, there should be no interaction between students and construction workers.

Kurt Lavaway stated that the plan is to walk the school with the principal on Friday to make sure that everything is set for next week's opening.

- **Phase 2 update** – Lorel Purcell provided the following: O&G is assuming that the project will be out to bid in early October – because we are moving towards the January timeline we will need to approve critical contractors quickly to be able to order long lead items. When bids come in O&G will look for early approval before GMP is finalized on certain packages. Potentially Nov 16 MEP, Casework and Windows. O&G will be meeting with SLAM tomorrow to go over their constructability review.

JP Fernandes questioned when will bids be due? Response – The bidding is scheduled to begin on OCT 3rd through Nov 6th, however O&G will most likely shorten the time frame. There has been significant interest in the project from contractors.

John Chapman questioned the ownership of the BIM model. Response - There is one model with the design team – O&G has done a clash detection, MEP is the most important aspect of the project and that cash detection will be provided to the design team. The model will be provided to the contractors for coordination.

John Chapman – So were on schedule? Response - YES

5. Other Business

None

6. Public Comment

- None:

Meeting Adjourn

Motion to adjourn – John Chapman, seconded by George Bauer – unanimous.

- Meeting Adjourned 8:05 pm,
- The next meeting is scheduled for September 12, 2017 @ 6:30pm