



Regional School District No. 14 Woodbury / Bethlehem

Nonnewaug High School – Renovations Project

Public Building Committee Meeting

May 2, 2017

PBC Attendees:

Absent:

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

Also Present:

Kurt Lavaway	Colliers
Scott Pellman	Colliers
Amy Samuelson	SLAM
Eric Romeo	CES
Mike Walsh	CES
Lorel Purcell	O&G
Dr Ana	Region 14
Alice Jones	Region 14
Suzie Green	Region 14
Wayne McAlister	Region 14
Mike Molzon	Region 14
Maryanne Van Aken	Region 14 BOE

From / Notes Prepared by:

Kurt Lavaway / Scott Pellman - Project Manager
Colliers International

Attachments:

A meeting of the Public Building Committee was held on Tuesday, May 2, 2017 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. Call to Order – John Chapman called the meeting to order at 6:37 PM.
2. OPM Report– Kurt Lavaway reported on the following:
 - The VE log has been updated and will be reviewed this evening
 - Upcoming permitting meetings:
 - The zoning package will be submitted by the end of the week and will be reviewed concurrently with wetlands package.
 - The next wetlands public hearing is May 8, if wetlands does not approve the project there is a meeting on May 22.
 - There is a Zoning meeting on May 9. A potential public hearing for Zoning could take place on June 13th
 - Colliers is working on move management and procurement with the administration.
 - Moving services and the materials testing lab services will be selected off of the State contract. Colliers will need authorization from the committee for a lump sum appropriation to cover the initial phase. At the last meeting, it was estimated that the appropriation should be \$20,000 for movers and \$10,000 for the testing lab.
 - The third-party code reviewer Joe Versteeg has provided a proposal for professional services, his quote was \$30,350 for the required code reviews of the construction documents including both building and fire.
 - The team will test the existing concrete slabs for moisture to develop a baseline prior to construction. The tests will also determine if any topical vapor barrier installations will be needed prior to the new flooring installations.
 - The team presented the project to the teachers on Wednesday April 26, the presentation went well and a similar presentation should be scheduled for the Town in late May or early June. A notice of the meeting could be distributed as a flyer that goes home with the students

A revised Value Engineering log was reviewed, column “G” reflected the selections by the committee from the last meeting. There were clarifications noted in red on the revised document.

Tonight's building committee discussions or changes to VE decisions made at the last meeting are notes in bold italics below.

Site civil and landscape

- | | | |
|-------|-----------------------------------|---|
| C-5 | Delete blue stone caps | yes – <i>This VE item had already been removed in the SD estimate so there is no savings in the DD budget.</i> |
| C-12 | Eliminate concrete steps to field | Add Alternate |
| C-13a | Eliminate dug outs | no |

C-13b	Change to pre-fab dug outs	yes – SLAM presented images of the proposed metal dugout enclosures which were acceptable to the committee.
C-14	Eliminate 4 tennis courts	no
C-15	Reduce walking paths between BB and SB	yes

Structural - none

Building - Interior envelope

BX-9	Keep existing roof at main entry	no
BX-10	Eliminate screen wall at gym stair	yes
BX-11	Eliminate entry canopy	no
BX-12	Eliminate metal panel at auditorium wall	Alternate - The Building Committee approved this to be bid as an alternate
BX-13	Change operable windows to fixed	yes – The Building Committee would like to change this to an Add alternate

Building – Interior

BN-5	Gym floor refurbish vs replace	no
BN-16	Solid surf sills to PLAM	yes
BN-17	Change guardrail panels	yes – SLAM presented the alternative perforated metal panel materials (the railing has to meet 200 lbs. horizontal force) The material was acceptable to the committee.
BN-18a	Reduce wood paneling in corr	use less expensive material – SLAM presented metal panes with an appearance of wood and will review for the most cost effective option.
BN-18b	Eliminate all paneling in corr	no see above
	Add 18c – less expensive material – see 18a	
BN-19	Eliminate wood look paneling in Auditorium	yes
BN-20	Change Auditorium Ceilings to gyp board	yes
BN-21	Change ceiling in café	Yes – need rendering of new
BN-22	Change lobby ceilings	no
BN-23	Change locker wet walls to epoxy ptd	no
BN-24	Change locker room floors to epoxy poured floor	no – The flooring alternative would be a poured epoxy floor not paint. – Mike Molzon thought the poured epoxy flooring system would work well. A sample of the material was reviewed. The Building Committee would like to take this credit – change to a YES.
BN-25	Change food service floors to epoxy ptd	no
BN-26	Reduce bleacher quantity	no
BN-27	Change to commercial grade washer dryer	yes

Fire protection

FP-2	Change to flex heads	yes
FP-4	Remove pre-action at IDF rooms	yes - Alan also wanted MDF included – The value to remove the pre-action system from the MDF room is \$3,900 – The Building Committee requested that the VE credit include the MDF room.

Plumbing

P-3	Change water heaters to PVI	NA
P-3a	Change type, quantity and warranty water heaters	no
P-4	Eliminate 19 floor drains	no
P-5	Change underground san from CI to PVC	yes
P-6	Change storm from CI to PVC	yes
P-7	Change all vent piping from CI to PVC	yes

Additional plumbing clarification not listed above– The documents called for pro press fittings but the project was not priced that way – there is a savings of \$42,800 which will be included in the final DD budget estimate

HVAC

H-11	Reduce quantity of HRV units	yes
H-12	Reduce SS ductwork	yes – The district may use chemicals that would eliminate this credit. Mr York head of the science department stated that the program in AP chemistry uses chemicals that require SS ductwork. The architect's recommendation is to keep SS in all ducts worrying what may happen down the road and not limiting flexibility for the department in the future. A phoenix control devise is being incorporated for energy savings so a change to galvanized ductwork would not be possible. Building committee – do not take the credit – Change to No. Also keep ductwork fully welded.
H-13	Eliminate VAV boxes	need more info. Defer to 5-2 mtg.– CES presented VAV options and differences from motorized dampers. A question was asked about radiant heat in the ceiling verses fin tube mounted low on the wall. Due to the smaller size of the classrooms the ceiling system was selected. Both systems are similar in price. Eliminating the ductwork run out into the spaces is what is driving the VE savings. The SD design originally had the dampers down low in the angled walls however the angled walls were eliminated. The system design moved towards ceiling mounted diffusers with VAV boxes when it was determined that the components would fit within the ceiling space. When the building is occupied the spaces will be ventilated at .6cfm minimum and the CO2 detector will ramp up to 450cfm with the VAV. The motorized damper system just goes from min to max there is no in-between however fan speeds can be modulated. It would take under 10 minutes typically when the room is occupied to ramp up. The savings in energy comes with the VAV system that can modulate more effectively for each space. The project savings would be the reduction in ductwork by using the system with motorized dampers at the perimeter of the room. The VAV system would pay for itself in approximately 6 years.

A vote was raised by John chapman to take the savings – vote 5 in favor 3 rejected. Janet Morgan was not present

The system accepted by the committee included motorized dampers with no ductwork. Mike Walsh from CES commented that the committee has eliminated the VAV and with no ductwork for the motorized dampers it may make sense to eliminate the dampers all together and control the fans by looking at the CO2 levels with a constant volume to the most critical room. The additional savings could be another \$70,000.

A vote was raised by John Chapman to eliminate the dampers – vote 7 in favor Janet Morgan and Alan Rubacha were not present for the vote.

H-14	Relocate VRF from attic to grade	yes
------	----------------------------------	-----

Electrical

E-6	Reduce theatrical lighting	no
E-7	Change to aluminum feeders - secondary's	yes
E-8	Change to alum feeders to 110A and above	yes

3. Architects progress update

- No further updates.

4. Construction Manager Phase 1 Progress update

- Bids due May 10th, the bid date may be extended.

5. Other Business

- Alternates: The current list of alternates can be located at the bottom of the VE list. The list of alternates is the same from the last meeting but include some additional suggestions as follows.
 - There were past discussions for adding the snow melt system at the main entrance sidewalk below the canopy. This alternate has not been recommended by the committee.
 - There was a proposal to change the VoAg corridor enclosure using perforated metal. With the interior metal change this may not be required.
 - Adding the concrete steps to the athletic fields back into the project as an alternate was discussed. The steps were value engineered out of the project. Putting the steps back into the project as an Alternate was accepted.
 - Adding the exterior metal panels at the auditorium as an alternate. The design team stated that this was a simple alternate. The Alternate was accepted.
 - Colliers also suggested adding a separate cost to re-surface the track as it will be close to the end of its useful life at the end of the project along with the replacement of the perimeter fence. The alternate was accepted.
 - The windows were also added as a new alternate to be operable. Fixed windows will be the base bid.

6. Public Comment

Lynn Forte – Faculty member expressed concerns raised by the staff and students:

- Would paints being used contain formaldehyde – There was a statement at the teacher presentation that the paints would be LOW VOC's but the request is to move from low to none due to the extent of students with breathing issues.
- Windows being operable - the staff prefers operable windows.
- Everyone is in a panic on the reduction of faculty bathrooms from 4 to 2.

Can any of the issues be addressed?

- The architect is reviewing all specifications for VOC's. The construction areas will be ventilated separately from the building during each construction phase and will not communicate with occupied areas.
- Operable windows will be bid as an alternate. As part of the base building project outside air will be provided to all spaces and the system is designed to add fresh air where you don't receive it now. Windows will not be sized for egress if the alternate for operable windows is accepted. The potential size of openings is a safety consideration so people cannot use them to enter the building from the exterior.
- Bathrooms have been optimized for location and the design team is reviewing the quantity. Although only two toilets are labeled as faculty on each floor there are additional unisex toilets and toilets in the administration suite. There are additional single bathrooms not necessarily labeled for staff located in the media, nurse.

Meeting Adjourn

- Meeting Adjourned 9:11 pm

The next meeting was scheduled for May 16, 2017 however there is a BOE meeting that night so it will be rescheduled to May 23, 2017.