



Regional School District No. 14 Woodbury / Bethlehem

Nonnewaug High School – Renovations Project

Public Building Committee Meeting

July 19, 2016

PBC Attendees:

George Bauer
Alan Rubacha
Don Fiftal
Tom Hecht
Patrick DiSarro
JP Fernandes
Matt Cleary
Brian Peterson
Robert Piazza
Janet Morgan
Andie Greene

Absent:

John Chapman
George Bauer
Robert Halgreen

Also Present:

Dr. Anna Cutaia-Leonard	Region 14
Alice Jones	NHS
Kurt Lavaway	Colliers
Scott Pellman	Colliers
Amy Samuelson	SLAM
Dean Ober	SLAM
Lorel Purcell	O&G

From / Notes Prepared by:

Kurt Lavaway / Scott Pellman - Project Manager
Colliers International

Attachments:

None

A meeting of the Public Building Committee was held on Tuesday, July 19, 2016 in the LMC of Nonnewaug High School, 5 Minortown Road, 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 Kurt Lavaway for inclusion.



1. J.P. Fernandes called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.
2. OPM Report – Kurt Lavaway reported on the following:
 - Colliers and O&G Met with SLAM and the working group on Tuesday July 12th to review program and test fits, the result was presented at this building committee meeting. The team also discussed preparations for the meeting with the OSCG and the State process with a focus on maximizing reimbursement while maintaining the program.
 - Survey and wetland flagging has started this week and it is anticipated that topo data collection will commence next week.
 - Hazardous Material testing and inspection work in the field has been completed and the samples have been sent out for testing, a draft report should be complete by end of the month.
 - Dr. Anna and Wayne have reached out to OSCG and the team is attempting to schedule a Prep meeting for the second week in August 2016.
 - O&G’s contract business terms have been completed, the contract is being reviewed by the District’s attorney who received it this past Monday. Once that review is complete, the contract can be executed by both parties.
3. Amy Samuelson of the SLAM Collaborative presented the following through a power point presentation:
 - a. Final program review –
 - There has been no further progress on site plans, the design team is waiting until the survey and wetlands delineations have been completed and SLAM has met with the working group, O&G and Colliers to review. The primary and secondary site elements have been placed on conceptual site plans with a corresponding list. Amy Samuelson presented the concept site plans which included an entrance road reconfiguration to improve parent and bus separation, athletic field configuration and designations along with the tennis courts. All of which will need to be verified with the athletic director.
 - The updated floor plans were presented, two options, A&B. Test fits demonstrate that the program will fit in the existing building including the terrace build out. The concepts looked to utilize as many of the existing walls as possible, spaces will receive new finishes including acoustical treatment. Bathrooms will be relocated and enlarged. The Central Office remains in the current location and will receive new MEP systems including lighting and ceilings. Both options include a new connection corridor to the lower level. Access to gymnasium is difficult, SLAM will have to work with the existing configuration, design elements could be added for way finding.
 - b. Option A –
 - **Main level** - The existing main entrance remains requiring the main office suite to be re-designed to address security. The Auditorium has been reduced in size. Option A will result in approximately 425 to 475 seats. About 1200 s.f. of additional program space on each floor will be provided by the reduction of the auditorium.

- JP Frenandez commented positively on the reduced seating with additional program spaces in the captured areas.
- **Lower level** - Culinary Arts infill at lower level allows easy access for Seniors and overflow to the reconfigured cafeteria. There will be new locker facilities and training rooms. Some new storage will be provided. Student services will receive minimal renovations, the kitchen is in great shape and the design will try to maintain as much as possible, the server will be completely renovated for better flow and efficiency.
- **Second floor** – Two art rooms have been designed into the area currently occupied by three existing rooms to make appropriate spaces. The plan uses the long structural bays for science labs reducing interior windowless spaces.
- Patrick DiSarro would like the engineering lab/robotics to be located on first floor however recognizing that adjacencies may suffer to the proposed digital design lab and storage on second floor.
- Pros and Cons to option A were presented. It was noted that some of the same issues can be found on each option.

c. Option B –

- **Main level** – New entry, provides opportunities for the public to find the school entry point and resolves security issues by bringing the entry close to the admin entrance. Auditorium renovation without area reductions would result in approximately 550 to 600 seats. This plan does not provide area in auditorium for other program spaces.
- Brian Peterson asked if the new entry could also be added to option “A” – SLAM response – YES, elements within both options are interchangeable.
- **Lower level** – The lower level is substantially the same in both options.
- **Second floor** – One art room is lost in this plan as there is no infill in the auditorium to create the new second floor area.
- Pros and cons were presented that included some of the same comments as option A.

d. Exterior entrance options presented by Dean Ober from SLAM.

- Option A – Consolidates the entrance points and embraces the VOAG theme with plantings, softens the building façade. Similar gesture for regional offices.
- Option B – Introduces a living wall, subtle entrance, more barn like with timber frame. Both options embrace natural light and day lighting.

4. Questions and Comments from the committee:

- a. Don Fiftal – liked the openness of the connector, in the original estimate was there a line item for a new entry? Where will the money come from?

- Response – The original plan had 19,000 s.f. of additions so something was included. The new area is about 2,000 s.f. offset somewhat by the existing entrance demolition. Costs will be evaluated by O&G to determine what can be afforded.
 - b. Don Fiftal – Observation – The screen in entrance option B without vegetation looked institutional – he was concerned about the look with vegetation however that might attract insects, liked idea of softening the masonry wall.
 - c. Lorel Purcel from O&G commented that the reduced Auditorium provides extra swing space for construction phasing.
 - d. Patrick DiSarro – Commented that the new entry provides natural light for admin.
 - e. Andie Green – What are the advantages with a new entry that requires limited revisions to administration verses maintaining the existing entry which would require more extensive renovations to administration for security.
 - SLAM Response – There are advantages to guidance as it is currently undersized, this area includes special education and the school psychologist which can be included with admin.
 - f. Brian Peterson – Commented that not doing a major addition saves money for smaller additions.
 - g. Janet Morgan – Liked the new entrance but thought the rear corridor design might be to elaborate and concerned it would be taking away from program elements.
 - SLAM Response – The design is attempting to eliminate dark hallways, need openness for communication and the new corridor solves bottleneck problems. Openness also improves internal security.
 - h. Mike Molzon -Director of grounds – have you looked at the connector to Vo-Ag?
 - SLAM Response – It is currently being reviewed and needs to be done in a way that will not require the Vo-Ag building to be sprinklered.
 - i. Suggestion by Colliers, SLAM should look at the potential of isolating the new connector to use as pass through on off hours and for athletic field access from the front parking lots. Doors could be introduced on hold opens to isolate the space from the rest of the school.
5. Colliers presented the Commissioning agent proposals.
- After reviewing the proposals and Colliers cost comparison spreadsheets, the committee requested a further review of the two low bidders, specifically to determine what the fee for the two low proposals would look like to include unlimited meetings as opposed to a set number?
6. A proposal was presented to perform a septic system existing conditions investigation requested by SLAM and their Civil Engineer. Colliers received an independent informal quote with unit costs that further validated the requested fee for the Septic system review. It was also noted that this approach would provide sole ownership of the septic system investigation and design to the Design team.



- The committee noted that two years ago the school submitted for permit and a wastewater management plan which to date still needs to be completed. The committee also questioned why this service was not part of the Civil Engineers base contract work. The proposal was tabled until the next meeting, pending further review of their scope.
 - The Design team will need to certify that the project is in compliance with DEEP and local requirements, SLAM to review requirements with their Civil Engineer and report back to the committee at the next meeting including a clarification of scope.
7. A proposal was presented for additional survey information requested by the Design Team to survey 500 feet of roadway profile at the entrance to the school for use in design and OSTA permitting.
- The committee noted that an OSTA certificate was issued in 1999 with the last building project and the Design team should research that as the entrance configuration and curb cut location will remain in the same general area. The Committee also questioned the cost of the additional survey as it related to the overall fee and if that work should have been included by the Surveyor in their original bid. The proposal was tabled until the next building committee meeting pending further review with the Civil Engineer.
 - The Design Team will provide more research to confirm the need for the requested additional survey.
 - Colliers will request a detailed breakdown of the additional Survey Fee and scope.
8. Alan Rubacha asked where the project was in terms of schedule.
- Colliers responded that the design team has started the Schematic Design phase following the last building committee meeting that presented the final program on June 20, 2016. The project schedule has slipped slightly due to the need to verify corrections in the grant application and to get clarification from OSCG on renovation status. Since this has a major impact on how much the State will reimburse on the project.
 - Kurt Lavaway mentioned that the overall project schedule will be presented at the next building committee meeting.
 - Alan stressed the need to review the schedule often to avoid further schedule extensions. Colliers agreed and reiterated that the working group has been informed of the process ongoing with OSCG and will be scheduling a prep meeting as soon as possible to get better clarity on the State disposition on the grant. This will allow further development of the budget options to be presented to the building committee following the prep meeting.



9. Public Comment - None

The next meeting will be held at **6:30 PM** on **Tuesday August 2, 2016** in the High School Library Media Center, located at 5 Minor Town Road, Woodbury, CT. Additional meetings will be determined.

Motion to adjourn made by JP Fernandes, seconded by Robert Piazza.
Meeting Adjourned at 9:10 PM.