PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING
April 19, 2022

MINUTES

Members Present: Peter Weliti – Chairman, Gary Feldman, Sr., Dale Gerber, James Fay, Gary Magnuson – Vice Chairman, Katherine Heminway, Gary Blanchette, Jeff Olender, Thomas Adams

Members Absent: Ronald Stomberg, Sean Kelly

Others Present: Tiffany Pignataro, Finance Officer/Treasurer; Lori Spielman, First Selectman, David Stavens, Deputy First Selectman; Scott Nicol, Superintendent, Brian Greenleaf, Director of Finance and Operations, Gregory Kliman, Director of Facilities, Ellington Public Schools; Jennifer Dzen, Chairman, Miriam Underwood, Elizabeth Nord, Board of Education; Edward Widofsky, Tecton Architects; Tom Patshaw

1. Call to Order

Chairman Peter Weliti called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. The new member, James Fay, was introduced and welcomed.


3. Approval of Minutes of October 9, 2018

MOVED (FELDMAN), SECONDED (HEMINWAY) AND PASSED [AYE: WELTI/FELDMAN/GERBER/MAGNUSON/HEMINWAY/BLANCHETTE/OLENDER/ADAMS; ABSTAIN: FAY] TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 9, 2018 AS DISTRIBUTED.

4. Building Projects Policy – Referral from Board of Finance/Board of Selectmen

Mr. Weliti shared that this item was originally referred to the Board of Selectmen (BOS) from the Board of Finance (BOF); the BOS has since referred this to the PBC.

Mr. Feldman stated that the PBC has already been following a checklist and creating all required reports on prior projects, but concluded that it seemed like the BOF and BOS want an official policy created.

Mr. Weliti agreed that there is a checklist and processes already in place. Mr. Fay stated that this item arose from the issue with the Crystal Lake School gymnasium floor, and creating this policy would ensure that there are no checklist items still outstanding before final payment is issued for future projects.

Mr. Olender asked if the PBC would still be passing final approval of building projects or if the PBC would be recommending final approval to the BOF and/or BOS. Mr. Weliti stated that he believes the BOS is asking for the input of the PBC on this motion, whatever that may be. Mr. Feldman shared his opinion that this is a request to formalize the processes that are already in place. Mr. Magnuson reiterated that multiple
reports are created throughout the current process of reviewing building projects. He also asked what, if any, action item is expected from the PBC from this meeting.

Mr. Greenleaf clarified that this discussion is related to the release of final retainage, not the regular construction funds that are released throughout the process. He also spoke to the Windermere Building Project, which is years from completion. Ms. Pignataro shared that in her research, all of the procedures that were in place during the Crystal Lake gym project seemed to function properly; this request is to simply formalize the process as an official Town Policy. She also stated that since the PBC members are the most knowledgeable about the process and the various steps that are taken throughout, it would make sense that they be involved in the formulation of any related policy.

Mr. Stavens said that his understanding from the BOF is that they were looking for a checklist for use when determining when and if to release final payment. Mr. Adams agreed that having a task list for future members of the PBC to follow would be helpful; however, he does not believe that there was an item within the existing procedures that would have prevented the issue with the Crystal Lake gym floor. Mr. Olender stated that if there had been professional input and recommendations from an outside advisor, he feels that the Crystal Lake gym floor issue could have possibly been prevented.

Mr. Magnuson commented that the formalization of the checklist would positively increase accountability and oversight and will verify that the processes were followed appropriately. He shared that once drafted, the checklist could be reviewed by the Town Attorney to ensure that it is sufficient prior to it being finalized. Mr. Gerber echoed the support for finalizing the checklist. Further discussion was held on the current checklist that is used and what changes would be helpful for future projects.

5. Background of the Windermere School Project

Mr. Weliti provided some brief background information on this project. Mr. Greenleaf shared a presentation [ATTACHED] that provided an overview of the driving needs of the project, the timeline of past steps that have been taken, the chosen project concept, an analysis of existing conditions, the development of the proposed project, some key dates in the process, and items for consideration by the PBC. He shared his belief that, with a project this size, going with a Construction Manager at Risk compared to a General Contractor for the Construction Delivery Method may be beneficial. Mr. Widofsky shared that the thorough understanding of the phasing, timing and sequencing of a project like this is a real strength that a construction manager could bring to the table. Mr. Greenleaf also commented on the importance of having finalized bid documents prepared prior to going out to bid so that there is no misunderstanding of what is being asked. He shared the proposed timing of the onboarding of the chosen parties, including the project manager, architect, and construction manager.

Mr. Magnuson asked what would happen if the project didn’t make the State priority list of December 2022. Mr. Greenleaf answered that the budget would likely become tighter at that point, but the local representatives could be approached to put special legislation through to adjust the timeline to keep the project on schedule; however, he stated that the risk of this is minor. Mr. Olender asked for clarification that existing areas must be maintained for 55% of the project. Mr. Greenleaf confirmed this, and stated that there is a 7% contingency in place. The impacts of the proposed project on various school security and safety concerns were briefly discussed. Mr. Weliti commented that while there is a project concept and some details tentatively in place, most if not all of the specifics of the project will be revisited prior to final contracts being signed.

Ms. Pignataro stated that the project funds have been appropriated, as the project successfully passed at the Town referendum, but the State side of the funding has not yet been secured.

Mr. Weliti commented that some re-education on the pros and cons between a general contractor and a construction manager at risk, as well as any other feasible option, would be highly valuable for the PBC.
6. Review of the Town Charter and Role of the PBC

Mr. Magnuson reviewed the relevant sections of the Town Charter that discuss the PBC. Highlighted duties and functions of the PBC include investigating sites for future public buildings, making recommendations for acquisition and construction for building projects, surveying sites, engaging architects and engineers, approving plans, entering into contracts for construction, and supervising constructions, among others as outlined in Town Charter Section 913.b. In summary, the job of the PBC is to oversee the assigned projects and accept the work as authorized, not to act as stakeholders of the project. The importance of working together to meet that challenge was noted.

Mr. Magnuson also read a few sections of the Resolution that was passed at the March 1 referendum, highlighting that “The PBC is authorized to determine the scope and particulars of the project” [Item 1] and “That the PBC is designated to act as the school building committee for the project and is vested with the following powers and duties: (i) to approve design and construction expenditures for the project... (i) to contract with architects, engineers, contractors and others in the name and on behalf of the Town to complete the project; and (ii) to exercise such other powers as are necessary or appropriate to complete the project” [Item 7].

Mr. Greenleaf stated that the designation of a school building committee is required by State Statute, and historically that task has fallen to the PBC, which has final control and decision-making authority. However, the BOE will be offering input throughout the process so that the end users are represented. Superintendent Nicol echoed that a collaborative effort is how these projects should be handled.

7. Discussion – Timelines and Next Steps

Mr. Welts stated that putting together a monthly schedule would be prudent at this time, acknowledging that additional special meetings may be necessary as certain deadlines approach. Mr. Welts commented that the timeline highlights that were provided by Mr. Greenleaf were very helpful.

Mr. Magnuson asked if, in regards to expenditures for consultants and architects being released prior to final project approval, the PBC should ask for approval from the BOF and/or BOS prior to releasing funds. Mr. Olender commented that allowing these groups to have a seat at the table and making the process transparent is a good idea.

Mr. Greenleaf suggested releasing the Request for Proposal/Quotes for the Owner’s Project Manager in early fall, theoretically bringing them on board in early November to review the architect’s contract documents that will go out next. Ms. Pignataro commented that these documents would need to be pulled together early enough to give the Town Attorney time to review. She also shared that project funds are earmarked separately outside of the general government fund so related expenditures are easy to track.

MOVED (MAGNUSON), SECONDED (FELDMAN) AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY TO FORWARD A REQUEST TO THE BOARD OF FINANCE/BOARD OF SELECTMEN TO AUTHORIZE THE PBC TO BEGIN SPENDING MONEY ON RELATED PROJECT PROFESSIONALS, INCLUDING ARCHITECTS AND ATTORNEYS, PRIOR TO THE APPROVAL OF STATE FUNDING.

8. Adjournment

MOVED (GERBER), SECONDED (HEMINWAY) AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY TO ADJOURN THE PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING AT 7:26 P.M.

Submitted by: Julia Connor
Substitute Recording Secretary
Windermere Building Project

Permanent Building Committee
April 19, 2022

Thank you!
Why Windermere?

- Immediate capital needs
- Long-term capital needs
- Inefficient layout
- Safety and security
- District enrollment
Chosen Concept

- Initial concept can be adjusted
- Meets requirements for square footage
- Shorter schedule reduces impact on students during construction
- Meets what State wants for a project concept

## ANALYSIS OF EXISTING CONDITIONS / CAPACITY ANALYSIS

### Capacity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Projected Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>PK 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Pop.</td>
<td>75 97 103 99 96 92 89 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Space Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF/Student (Max)</td>
<td>120 120 120 120 120 152 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF/Grade Level (Max)</td>
<td>9,000 11,880 12,340 11,880 11,520 11,040 13,528 13,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Standard Space Specifications Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Enrollment</th>
<th>Pre-K</th>
<th>PK 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 350</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124 124 124 124 156 156 156 180 180 180 194 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 - 750</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120 120 120 120 152 152 152 176 176 176 190 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1500</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112 112 112 112 142 142 142 164 164 164 178 178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sec. 10-287c-15. Standards (Reference: Section 10-283a)

(a) State standard space specifications. The standard space specifications identified in this section shall apply to all school building project grants except code and health violations, roof replacements, site acquisitions, site improvements, leasing projects, plant purchases, vocational agriculture equipment, and administrative facilities. For any building constructed prior to 1950, the standard space specifications identified in this section shall be increased by twenty-five per cent.
ANALYSIS OF EXISTING CONDITIONS / RENOVATE AS NEW

Consideration ~ Keep existing areas for 55% of the project
Construct 45%, and obtain 10% higher reimbursement rate = "Like New"

94,280 X 55% = 51,854 sf
DEVELOPMENT OF PROPOSED PROJECT

PROPOSED PROJECT / RENOVATE 55% OF EXISTING, LARGE ADDITION
PROPOSED PROJECT / RENOVATE 55% OF EXISTING, LARGE ADDITION

BENEFITS

- Lower initial construction cost and highest reimbursement rate
- Addition can be built without disruption to students, creating swing space for future phases
- Good flexibility in terms of 21st century learning, with many new spaces
- Lower operating costs, with consolidated footprint

CHALLENGES

- Longer overall construction duration, with the most quantity of partial phases
- Additional work to renovate or replace existing building materials and systems

PROPOSED PROJECT / SITE SECTION
PROPOSED PROJECT / RENOVATE 55% OF EXISTING, LARGE ADDITION

3A BUILD NEW ADDITION: MARCH 2024 TO JANUARY 2025

3B RENOVATE EXISTING CENTER CLASSROOM WING: JANUARY 2025 TO JUNE 2025
PROPOSED PROJECT / RENOVATE 55% OF EXISTING, LARGE ADDITION

3A BUILD NEW ADDITION: MARCH 2024 TO JANUARY 2025

3B RENOVATE EXISTING CENTER CLASSROOM WING: JANUARY 2025 TO JUNE 2025

3C RENOVATE EXISTING ASSEMBLY SPACES: JUNE 2025 TO AUGUST 2025

PROPOSED PROJECT / RENOVATE 55% OF EXISTING, LARGE ADDITION

3A BUILD NEW ADDITION: MARCH 2024 TO JANUARY 2025

3B RENOVATE EXISTING CENTER CLASSROOM WING: JANUARY 2025 TO JUNE 2025

3C RENOVATE EXISTING ASSEMBLY SPACES: JUNE 2025 TO AUGUST 2025

3D RENOVATE/DEMOLISH NORTH CLASSROOM WING: JUNE 2025 TO DECEMBER 2025
PROPOSED PROJECT / RENOVATE 55% OF EXISTING, LARGE ADDITION

3A BUILD NEW ADDITION: MARCH 2024 TO JANUARY 2025

3B RENOVATE EXISTING CENTER CLASSROOM WING: JANUARY 2025 TO JUNE 2025

3C RENOVATE EXISTING ASSEMBLY SPACES: JUNE 2025 TO AUGUST 2025

3D RENOVATE/DEMOLISH NORTH CLASSROOM WING: JUNE 2025 TO DECEMBER 2025

3E DEMOLISH EXISTING SOUTH CLASSROOM WING: SEPTEMBER 2025 TO MARCH 2026

PROPOSED PROJECT / RENOVATE 55% OF EXISTING, LARGE ADDITION

3A BUILD NEW ADDITION: MARCH 2024 TO JANUARY 2025

3B RENOVATE EXISTING CENTER CLASSROOM WING: JANUARY 2025 TO JUNE 2025

3C RENOVATE EXISTING ASSEMBLY SPACES: JUNE 2025 TO AUGUST 2025

3D RENOVATE/DEMOLISH NORTH CLASSROOM WING: JUNE 2025 TO DECEMBER 2025

3E DEMOLISH EXISTING SOUTH CLASSROOM WING: SEPTEMBER 2025 TO MARCH 2026

3F NEW FIELDS: MARCH 2026 TO AUGUST 2026
Key Dates in State Process

- June 30, 2022  Submission Deadline
- December 15, 2022  Priority List
- June 2023  Funding Commitment

Key Dates (tentative)

2022 - Application
2023 - Funding & Design
2024 - Construction Starts
2026 - Construction Ends
Philosophy

- Generational investment
- Plan for Windermere at 100
- Easy to see $$ now, hard to see $$$ later

Items for Consideration by PBC

- Consultants
  - Owner’s Project Manager vs Rep vs Clerk
  - Architect
- Construction Delivery Method
  - General Contractor vs Construction Manager at Risk
- Bid Process
- Timing
Proposed Timing of Onboard

OPM - Late Fall 2022

Architect - Early 2023

CMR - Spring 2023