MAIN +1 860 395 0055 FAX +1 203 779 5661



Regional School District No. 14 Woodbury / Bethlehem

Nonnewaug High School - Renovations Project

Public Building Committee Meeting

November 15, 2016

PBC Attendees: Absent:

John Chapman JP Fernandes
Robert Piazza Don Fiftal
Brian Peterson Janet Morgan
Tom Hecht Alan Rubacha

Andie Greene Patrick DiSarro Matthew Cleary George Bauer

Also Present:

Colliers Kurt Lavaway Scott Pellman Colliers Amy Samuelson **SLAM** Glen Gollenberg **SLAM** Lorel Purcel O&G Mark Jeffko O&G Region 14 Wayne McAlester Mike Molzon Region 14 Alice Jones Region 14 Suzy Greene Region 14 Bill Nemec Region 14 Dr. Anna Cutaia-Leonard Region 14

From / Notes Prepared by: Kurt Lavaway / Scott Pellman - Project Manager

Colliers International

Attachments: VE Presentation, VE Site and Fields Test Fit Plans,

Colliers VE List

A meeting of the Public Building Committee was held on Tuesday, November 15, 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. Call to Order - John Chapman called the meeting to order at 6:38 PM.

John stated that "tonight, I would like to come to grips with what is the base project with wiggle room for unanticipated costs within the base project. We will need to review VE items that can add a buffer and look at field items to place either in the base project or as alternates."

- 2. OPM presentation on scope items Kurt Lavaway reported on the following:
 - There have been a few changes to the alternate list that was presented last week.
 - Tonight, we will look to identify a pathway to added field scope, looking at VE items with a goal of authorizing the design team to move into the Design Development Phase of the project.
 - The added scope items list were reviewed with new options dated 11-15-16, some of the items have been revised with reduced scope or locations along with the addition of a toilet room and concession building.
 - The revised list was reviewed with the district.
 - The VoAg connector was very important along with irrigation of the fields and re-furbishment of the turf fields. There were 3 add alternates that were also identified with a high priority for inclusion in the project.
- 3. SLAM Amy Samuleson presented the revisions to the added scope items as follows:
 - A new site plan was presented that represents the revised site alternates, the two-additional tennis court proposed location has been moved adjacent to the 4 courts to maintain the existing gravel parking lot.
 - The new football field layout was shown with a new practice field which is required due to the fact that the natural main field cannot hold up to daily practice. (Pricing for the practice field is in scope item \$1a-1). If a synthetic field is installed the practice field would not be required. (the practice field may be impacted by clearing and wetlands with its proximity to the river, it might also fit between the JV soccer fields, SLAM will explore). The existing track fits a standard size football field but the field will have narrower sidelines than are typically provided which will require mats to protect the track surface during games. Filed hockey also fits within the existing track with a slight overlap of the run off zone. Soccer can be played on a smaller field - the standard field of 195' wide has the overrun area that covers the track. NHFS allows a junior high school size of 165' wide that will fit. To maximize the field width you would end up with a field of 181.5' which is allowed. The 181.5 is acceptable to the athletic director, there would still be a 225' wide natural turf field available. The athletic director is planning to visit Cheshire to observe their field before deciding what size field to incorporate as they have a similar sized track.
 - The reduction in cost of S-7 scope for renovation of the fields does not include any field relocations but would include new back stops and dugouts along with



handicapped accessibility. This is acceptable to the athletic director; the previous relocations would have allowed baseball and softball to play at the same time but this situation does not happen. Renovation of the fields would involve filling the dips and leveling uneven areas with top soil, seed and a growing season.

- The new toilet building would be at the base of the hill with a concrete slab for concessions, it would house 2 men's and 2 women's toilet rooms.
- Inland wetlands are not aware of the potential practice field; it may be best to move it away from the river.
- The options to provide solar illumination in the high school concourse were reviewed, these options include skylights and solar tubes.
- The science teachers provided SLAM a response on reduced fume hood counts. They reduced the hood count in one chemistry room more than the other and also reduced the fume hood count in the general science rooms.

4. Value Engineering Review

- A. Current budget 52 million, VE would come out of the high school project. There are two options to incorporate VE items.
 - Keep building scope as is and incorporate VE items, place desired items on an add alternate list – suggest keeping the list of alternates to 5 or less, if it's too big of a list the bidders will react negatively.
 - 2. Add some of the alternates identified in option #1 into the base scope and that becomes the new base moving forward. The remaining alternates would be bid as add alternates. This option will also require some VE in order to remain on budget. This option will provide slightly less flexibility for the building committee if the total project GMP is over budget and may require re-bidding certain packages to remain on budget (if needed).
 - 3. Kurt noted that field reimbursement is only 50% of the building reimbursement on most of the site items but not all. (for example synthetic turf fields are not reimbursable)
- B. In summary, it was determined that both are good options.
 - Option #1 (Base Scope with Add Alternates) protects the base scope to allow the project to come in under budget and then allows the building committee to add in alternates with the bid savings. A safe bidding approach.
 - Option #2 (Revised Base Scope with Add Alternates) adds selected items into the base scope for some of the desired field / building program scope which would increase the baseline budget. If bids come in high you might need to do additional VE during the bid process, most likely taking it from the site package. This could potentially involve delaying start of construction. However, if bids come in favorably, this allows the building committee to add in alternates with the bid savings.



5. The VE items were reviewed and selected for acceptance.

Each specific value engineering items listed below was reviewed with the committee, items without notations may have already been accepted, previously rejected, are second tier options of other items that were accepted, previously rejected or further pricing is pending, action was taken for the following:

C-1	Accepted savings
C-4	Potential accepted, waiting for confirmation from Janet
S-1	Accepted savings
BX-2	Accepted savings
BX-5	Rejected, if changed later this would not be a simple change and would involve cost to re-implement
BX-6	Rejected, if changed later this would not be a simple change and would involve cost to re-implement
BX-8	Pending - To be managed during design development
BN-1	Accepted Savings
BN-8	Accepted Savings
BN-12	Accepted Savings
P-1	Accepted Savings
H-1	Accepted Savings
H-3	Accepted Savings
H-4b	Pending (HOLD FOR MORE INFO) Load sharing between Cafeteria, Gym Auditorium and Media Center could not run be provided with full cooling all at once. Auditorium is the least used space during the day.
H-5	Accepted 50%
H-6	Accepted 50%
E-3	Accepted

Total accepted VE is approx. \$2.9 million

6. The building committee agreed to accept the following items to revise the base scope of the project.

Discussions centered on B3 (additional program spaces in the auditorium). It was also noted that if the second floor was added it would add square footage.

Additions to the Base Scope

•	B2 - VoAg connector	\$27,400
•	B3 - Auditorium first floor program space	\$93,000
•	S4 - Renovate 3 tennis and add 4th	\$578,600
•	S6-1 - Irrigate natural turf	\$224,362
•	S7-1 - Refurbish existing turf fields	\$568,729



Add Alternates

•	S1b-1 - multipurpose synthetic field	\$1,442,891
•	S5 - (2) additional tennis courts	\$256,000
•	S8 - New toilet and concession stand	\$397,000
•	B4 - Auditorium 2 nd floor Alternate	\$188,000

7. Public Comment

- Questions, if synthetic turf is included is there a savings on irrigation and the practice field? Response no, it's included in the number.
- The public voted for athletics and those project requirements need to be implemented. The committee has to deal with the delay.
- The constituents need to understand what they are getting for the 63 million, it
 needs to be clearly communicated on what was promised and what is being
 provided. Response from John Chapman A communication plan will be
 rolled out and the team is doing the best they can to deliver the project
 requirements.

<u>Motion made by John Chapman</u> - To authorize the design team to proceed into the Design Development Phase of the project based on the plan laid out for revision to the base scope and agreed add alternates. All will be reviewed again at the end of the Design Development Phase to keep the project on budget.

Motion Seconded by George Bauer

Discussions:

Matt Cleary – Is there a possibility of adding conduit for field lighting in the future? It was agreed within the Design Development phase additional alternates could be added.

Motion carries - Unanimous 8 positive

8. Meeting was adjourned at 9:08 PM

The next meeting is scheduled for **6:30 PM** on **Tuesday November 22, 2016** in the <u>High School Library Media Center</u>, located at 5 Minor Town Road, Woodbury, CT. Additional meetings will be determined.

REGION 14 NONNEWAUG HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECT

Building Committee Meeting

November 15, 2016



Presentation Agenda

Review of the Following:

- Revised Pricing for Added Scope Items / Alternates
- Pathway to Added Fields Scope (Strategies)
- Value Engineering (VE) Log

Next Steps

Authorization to Proceed into Design Development Phase

Schematic Design Cost Summary

Concept Design Estimate vs. Schematic Design Cost Estimate

		A			
Base Project Scope	В	cept Estimate <u>Budget</u> ase Scope 08/30/16			
Building Cost - High School	\$	34,831.19			
Building Cost - Central Office	\$	950.32			
TOTAL BUILDING CONSTRUCTION COST	\$	35,781.50			
Site Work Cost - High School	\$	2,854.54			
Site Work Cost - Central Office	\$	135.00			
Abatement	\$	2,542.07			
TOTAL RELATED CONSTRUCTION COST	\$	5,531.61			
Design Contingency and CM Mark-ups	\$	8,634.30			
Escalation	\$	2,120.74			
	\$	10,755.04			
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE	\$	52,068.16			
APPROVED VALUE ENGINEERING (VE)					
TOTAL w/APPROVED VE	\$	52,068.16			
Project Related Costs (By Owner)	\$	11,752.45			
TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$	63,820.61			
-					

В	С
SD Phase Reconciled Cost Estimate 11/7/16	Variance Over/(Under) Budget (D-A)
\$ 31,460.00	(3,371.19)
\$ 977.50	27.18
\$ 32,437.50	(3,344.00)
\$ 6,052.00	3,197.46
\$ 120.00	(15.00)
\$ 2,200.00	(342.07)
\$ 8,372.00	2,840.39
\$ 9,488.40	854.10
\$ 1,879.40	(241.34)
\$ 11,367.80	612.76
\$ 52,177.30	109.14
0	
\$ 52,177.30	109.14
\$ 11,752.45	0.00
\$ 63,929.75	\$ 109.14

Added Scope Items

Alternates P	Pricing w/ Adjustments	11/08/16	11/15/16
Alt. B1	Canopy at Central Office	\$54,800	
Alt. B2	Enclosure / Connector to VoAG	\$27,400	
Alt. B3	Teaching Spaces in Aud. – Main Level only	\$93,000	
Alt. B4	Teaching Spaces in Aud Main & Upper Level	\$188,000	
Alt. S1a	Track & Turf Field w/Irrigation	\$1,843,000	
Alt. S1a-1	Track Resurface & Turf Field w/Irrigation		\$1,127,693
Alt. S1b	Track & Synthetic Field	\$2,443,400	
Alt. S1b-1	Track Resurface & Synthetic Field		\$1,442,981
Alt. S2	Multi-Purpose Field Lighting	\$696,600	
Alt. S3	Aluminum Bleachers	\$471,700	
Alt. S4	(4) Tennis Courts	\$578,600	
Alt. S5	(2) Additional Tennis Courts	\$256,300	
Alt. S5-1	Same as Alt. S5 but in new location		\$283,995
Alt. S6	Irrigation at Existing Natural Turf Fields	\$245,200	
Alt. S6-1	Same as Alt. S6 but tied to existing wells		\$224,362
Alt. S7	Refurbish Existing Fields	\$662,400	
Alt. S7-1	Same as S7 but with reduced scope		\$568,729
Alt. S8	New Toilet and Concessions Bldg.		\$397,000

Added Scope Items – District Preferred

NOTE: Eligible Site Related Items Reimbursed at 50% of District Rate

Added to	o Base Scope of the Project	\$820,491
B2	- Enclose Connector to Vo Ag Building	\$27,400
S6-1	- Irrigate Natural Turf Fields (use existing well)	\$224,362
S7-1	- Refurbish Existing Turf Field (reduced scope)	\$568,729
Add Alte	\$2,418,581	
S1b-1	 Multi-purpose Field (Synthetic Turf) w/ Re-surfaced Track 	\$1,442,981
S4	- Renovate (3) Tennis Courts & (1) New = (4) Total	\$578,600
S8	- New Toilet and Concessions Building	\$397,000

Total VE Savings Required = Approx. \$3,239,072

Potential Savings

Value Engineering Summary

	Value	w/mark-ups
Total All VE Items	\$4,703,760	\$6,031,730
Total Baseline VE Savings	\$1,964,950	\$2,519,700
Total Pending VE Minor	\$766,140	\$982,430
Total Pending VE Major	\$1,618,630	\$2,075,600
Total Rejected	\$354,050	\$454,000
Base Scope Construction Bu	dget	\$52,068,500
High School Project		\$50,708,000
Central Office Project		\$1,360,500

Pathway to Adding Fields Scope - OPTION 1

- Identify Desired Fields Scope as Add Alternates
 - Based on District and BC Direction
- Selected Scope Items to be Add Alternates
 - Limit to (5) Add Alternates or less
- Accept the VE Savings List (Based on BC and District Direction)
 - Hold on Accepting Remaining Pending VE Items Until End of DD Phase
- Add the "Connector to Vo AG Building" to the Base Scope
- Reduce the Base Scope Construction Budget by the BC Approved Accepted VE Amount
- Proceed into the DD Phase with Revised Base Scope and New Add Alternates List.

Pathway to Adding Fields Scope - OPTION 2

- Identify Desired Fields Scope as Add Alternates
 - Based on District and BC Direction
- Add Selected Scope Items into <u>Base Scope</u> of the Project
- Remaining Selected Scope Items to be Add Alternates
 - Limit to (5) Add Alternates
- Accept the VE Savings List (Based on BC and District Direction)
 - Hold on Accepting Remaining Pending VE Items Until End of DD Phase
- Add the "Connector to VoAG Building" to the Base Scope
- Reduce the Base Scope Construction Budget by the BC Approved Accepted VE Amount
- Proceed into the DD Phase with Revised Base Scope and New Add Alternates List.

Pathway to Adding Fields Scope - OPTION 1

	Value	w/mark-ups	
Total All VE Items	\$4,703,760	\$6,031,730	
Total Baseline VE Savings	\$1,964,950	\$2,519,700	Approve \$ (??) *
Total Pending VE Minor	\$766,140	\$982,430	Hold thru DD
Total Pending VE Major	\$1,618,630	\$2,075,600	
Total Rejected	\$354,050	\$454,000	
Base Scope Construction Bu	ıdget	\$49,548,800	New Budget (??) *
High School Project		\$48,188,300	Reduce by \$ (??) *
Central Office Project		\$1,360,500	No Change

* Assumption

Approve <u>Baseline Savings</u> Identified Above to Add Fields Scope Back into Base Project and Afford Some Alternates, Assumes Some Risk of Not

Getting all Alternates

Pathway to Adding Fields Scope - OPTION 2

	Value	w/mark-ups	
Total All VE Items	\$4,703,760	\$6,031,730	
Total Baseline VE Savings	\$1,964,950	\$2,519,700	Adjust *
Total Pending VE Minor	\$766,140	\$982,43 0	Adjust *
Total Pending VE Major	\$1,618,630	\$2,075,600	
Total Rejected	\$354,050	\$454,000	
Base Scope Construction Bu	dget	\$48,798,500	New Budget (??) *
High School Project		\$47,438,000	Reduce by \$ (??) *
Central Office Project		\$1,360,500	No Change

^{*} Assumption

Approve Approx. \$850,000 to Add Fields Scope Back into Base Project Select Another \$2,420,000 in VE for Alternates Now

DRAFT

State Reimbursement Considerations

Assumes Renovation Status – Decision from OSCG Still Pending

RENOVATION STATUS

Total Approved Budget (2013) \$63,820,605

Estimated Ineligible Costs \$8,823,667 (assumed 12% @ HS/ 50% @ Central Office)

Projected Eligible Costs \$54,996,938

Full Reimbursement Rate 47.86% (reduction Ratio = 99.58%)

Reduced Reimbursement Rate 47.66%

Estimated State Reimbursement \$26,101,266

Estimated District Share \$28,895,672

Total District Portion \$37,719,339

(including ineligible costs)

Referendum Region 14
Taxpayer Cost (2013) \$38,765,310

(per referendum)

Variance (over) / under \$1,045,971

Site scope could affect the reimbursement rate and District Share of the Project cost.

Value Engineering to achieve added site scope could impact ineligible costs.

Audit will look to the ED Spec in reviewing final reimbursements.

Next Steps

Special Building Committee Meeting – November 22, 2016

- Incorporate Approved Added Scope, Alternates and VE Savings into the Project
- Report on Renovation Status from OSCG (When Received)
- Future BC Meetings
 - Phase II ESA Results
 - Update on CxA Process (OPR Development)
 - Update on Geotechnical Report
 - Public Presentation of Project Status
 - BC Meetings 12/6, 12/20



Accelerating success.





Schematic Design Phase Estimate - 11/08/16, Updated 11,15/16

Design Development Estimate -

75% Construction Documents Estimate -

## PRIORING / SAMPLE / SPC SAMPLE PRIORING /				Α	В	C	D	E	F	G	
Simple S	ITEM #	<u> </u>		SAVINGS ITEMS		POSSIBLE DEFERRED Minor	POSSIBLE DEFERRED/ Significant	REJECTED	REDUCTIONS 11/15/2016		COMMENTS
Additional participation of the company of the comp	C-1		SLAM Sketch	\$ 38.54			\$ 38.54		\$ (38.54)		Single Loaded Drive, keep the existing dirt parking lot.
Revised in laste Reduce causacity of underground storage tanks for fire suppression CES Namarive S (305.45) Revise note) S (305.45) S	C-2	Eliminate staff/event parking lot (see note)	SLAM Sketch?	\$ -	х		\$ -		(66.6.1)		
C5. Change all blue stone caps on rotaining and seat walls to procest C-6 Eliminate results first to atthick fields and re-design handcarp ramp to the provide access to side of state where data walls and re-design handcarp ramp to the provide access to side of state where data walls and re-design handcarp ramp to the provide access to side of state where data walls and re-design handcarp ramp to the provide access to side of state where data walls and re-design handcarp ramp to the provide access to side of state where data walls and re-design handcarp ramp to the provide access to side of state where data walls and re-design handcarp ramp to the provide access to side of state where data walls and re-design handcarp ramp to the provide access to side of state where data walls are to the provide access to side of state where provide access to side of state where data walls are to the provide access to side of state where provide access to side of state where the provide access to side of state where the provide access to side of state where the provide access to side of state can be eliminated at the provide access to side of state where the provide access to side of state where the eliminated at the provide access to side of state where the provide access to side of state where the eliminated access to side of state access to side of state where the eliminated access to side of state where the provide access to side of state where the provide access to side of state a	C-3	Take reduction in landscaping and seeding – allowance \$150,000		\$ -	Х			Revised in Base			In Base Scope
C-6 Climinato-small-stair to-athletic fields and re-design-handicap-ramp. SLAM Sketch 5 (67.32) X Singlify-bus-loop-piaza, delete pavers, change raised-area-to-conscrete. C-7 Simplify-bus-loop-piaza, delete pavers, change raised-area-to-conscrete. C-8 Change all bituminous walks at fields to stone dust SLAM Sketch 5 (39.84) \$ (39.84	C-4		CES Narrative	\$ (305.45)	\$ (305.45)				\$ (305.45)		CES Comment: Reduced fire pump size due to manual standpipes will allow for one 70,000 water storage tank (Oldcastle precast model LWT) and one Oldcastle precast
to provide access to side of site-where stails-were climinated X Simpliffy but loop plaza, delete pavers, change raised area to centerete: X Revised in Base Scope C8 Change all bituminous walks at fields to stone dust SLAM Sketch SLAM Sketch SLAM Sketch SLAM Sketch SLAM Sketch Revise in DD where possible C-10 Reduce stee lighting fixture count assumption to minimum required SLAM sketch SLAM sketch Revise in DD where possible C-11 Reduce site drainage scope (see note) Civil / Landscape - Sub-total Size / Civil / Landscape - Sub-total Siz	C-5	Change all blue stone caps on retaining and seat walls to precast		\$ (24.74)		\$ (24.74)				
C-8 Change all bituminous walks at fields to stone dust SLAM Sketch \$ (39.84) \$ (39.84) \$ \$ (39.84) \$ Revise in DD where possible C-10 Reduce scope of existing staff/student parking for the possible SLAM Narrative \$ Revise in DD where possible Where possible SLAM Narrative \$ Revise in DD where possible SLAM to reduce if possible in DD Phase SIGUAL SLAM Narrative \$ (39.82) \$ (39.84) \$	C-6	o i i	SLAM Sketch	\$ (67.32)				\$ (67.32)			in this option.
Reduce scope of existing staff/student parking lot SLAM sketch S Revise in DD where possible C-10 Reduce site lighting fixture count assumption to minimum required SLAM Narrative S Revise in DD where possible Where possible C-11 Reduce site drainage scope (see note) Site / Civil / Landscape - Sub-total Site / Civil / Landscape - Sub-total SIRUCTURAL S-1 Eliminate ramp outside of gymnasium Maintenance Issue Pending Gootech Report Need to meet current P&Z Requirements SLAM to provide reduction in fixture quantity SLAM to provide reduction in fixture quantity SLAM to reduce if possible in DD Phase Reductions will be taken where possible in DD Phase STRUCTURAL S-1 Eliminate ramp outside of gymnasium S (141.00) S (141.00) S (141.00) S (141.00) S (141.00) See item No. BN-1	C-7		SLAM Sketch		Х						Add additional savings for no pavers, mimimal changes to
Need to meet current P&Z Requirements	C-8	Change all bituminous walks at fields to stone dust	SLAM Sketch	\$ (39.84)			\$ (39.84))			
Where possible C-11 Reduce site drainage scope (see note) Civil Narrative \$ - Revise in DD where possible where possible Stand to reduce if possible in DD Phase Scope existing pipes to inspect condition Reductions will be taken where possible in DD Phase STRUCTURAL STRUCTURAL S-1 Eliminate ramp outside of gymnasium \$ (141.00) \$ (141.00) \$ (141.00) \$ (141.00) \$ See item No. BN-1	C-9	Reduce scope of existing staff/student parking lot	SLAM sketch	\$ -							
where possible Site / Civil / Landscape - Sub-total \$ (398.82) \$ (305.45) \$ (24.74) \$ (1.30) \$ (67.32) \$ (343.99)	C-10	Reduce site lighting fixture count assumption to minimum required	SLAM Narrative	\$ -							
STRUCTURAL S-1 Eliminate ramp outside of gymnasium \$ (141.00) \$ (141.00) \$ (141.00) \$ See item No. BN-1	C-11	Reduce site drainage scope (see note)	Civil Narrative	\$ -							
STRUCTURAL S-1 Eliminate ramp outside of gymnasium \$ (141.00) \$ (141.00) \$ (141.00) \$ See item No. BN-1		City / Civil / Landa and Civil Adde		¢ (200.02)	¢ (205.45)	A (24.74)	A A (4.20))	± (2.42.22)		
S-1 Eliminate ramp outside of gymnasium \$ (141.00) \$ (141.00) \$ (141.00) \$ (141.00) \$ See item No. BN-1		Sile / Civil / Landscape - Sub-total		\$ (398.82)	\$ (305.45)	\$ (24.74)	(1.30)	(67.32)	\$ (343.99)		
\$ (141.00) See item No. BN-1											
Structural - Sub-total \$ (141.00) \$ (141.00) \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ (141.00)	S-1	Eliminate ramp outside of gymnasium		\$ (141.00)	\$ (141.00)				\$ (141.00)		
		Structural - Sub-total	ı	\$ (141.00)	\$ (141.00)	\$	- \$	- \$ -	\$ (141.00)		





Schematic Design Phase Estimate - 11/08/16, Updated 11,15/16

Design Development Estimate -

75% Construction Documents Estimate -

		T		Α	В	С	;	D	E	F	G	
ITEM #	ITEM DESCRIPTION	DRAWING / SPEC REFERENECE	CSAVING	/E COST GS ITEMS CT)/ADD	VE SAVINGS BASELINE	PENDIN POSSI DEFERI Mino Impa	IBLE PRED or	PENDING / POSSIBLE DEFERRED/ Significant Impact	rejected	RSD 14 SELECTED REDUCTIONS 11/15/2016 (SD Phase)	ALT. "√"	COMMENTS
	BUILDING - EXTERIOR / ENVELOPE											
3X-1	Change to backlit skylights ILO opening up 9 skylights to daylight	SLAM Sketch	\$	-	Х				Χ			SLAM - would prefer to pursue BX-2
BX-2	Change skylights to Sola tubes and infill glazing with gyp bd	SLAM Sketch	\$	(109.00)					X	\$ (109.00)		CES: UTILIZE (8) SOLATUBE SOLAMASTER 330 DS SERIES UNITS IN LEIU OF ALL (7) SKYLIGHTS AND ALL (20) REPLACED CLERESTORY GLAZING PANELS. INFILL EXISTING INTERIOR SIDE OF GLAZING PANELS WITH TYPE F4 FURRED PARTITION CONSTRUCTION.
3X-3	Use Storefront ILO Curtainwall		\$	(42.36)		\$	(42.36)					SLAM to review new connector for height limitation Cannot take this if BX-5 or BX-6 is accepted
3X-4	Change all metal panel to CMU		\$	(41.47)		\$	(41.47)					
BX-5	Eliminate new entrance and canopy - (keep connector corridor)	SLAM Sketch	\$	(350.24)					\$ (350.24)			Cannot take this if BX-6 is accepted
3X-6	Eliminate new entrance and canopy and connector corridor	SLAM Sketch	\$	(875.59)					\$ (875.59)			Cannot take this if BX-5 is accepted
3X-7	Clean exterior building face ILO re-painting		\$	(51.23)	X				\$ (51.23)			SLAM - Not recommended for this wall material
Вх-8	Reduce extent and finishes of proposed entry canopy	SLAM Sketch	\$	-								Revisit in DD Phase if needed
	Building Exterior / Envelope - Sub-tota	ı	\$ ((1,469.88)	\$ (109.00)	\$	(83.83)	\$ -	\$ (1,277.05)	\$ (109.00)		
										,		
BN-1	BUILDING - INTERIOR Change to drop down curtain ILO folding partiiton in Gymnasium		¢	(100.00)	¢ (100.00)					* (400.00)	1	CLANA to regularly a green varying manufactor improperty library No. C. 1
			D		\$ (100.00)					\$ (100.00)		SLAM to review egress requirements for impact to Item No. S-1 SLAM Reviewed, accpetable
BN-2	Reduce wood paneling in auditorium by 30%		\$	(51.60)			(51.60)				ļ <u> </u>	
BN-3	Reduce wood paneling in corridors by 30%		\$	(35.13)		\$	(35.13)					
3N-4	Revise carpet selection to be below \$45/yd	SLAM	\$	- (1= 1=)								O&G base is at \$45/SY
3N-5	Patch and refinishg Gym floor ILO full replacement		\$	(65.10)				\$ (65.10)				Assume 20% patching, also reduces abatement costs AD does not preferr this option
BN-6a	Eliminate Terrace infill, Keep video production in VoAG Build new culinary arts on second floor where video production lab is proposed.	SLAM Sketch	\$	-	Х				Х			Still construct new corridor connector Current design - 1,820 sf nd adjacent to café for overflow- seating. This change = 1,150 sf
BN-6b	Eliminate Terrace infill, Keep video production in VoAG Renovate Culinary Arts Classroom in Place. Move second floor Faculty Workroom and Dining to Proposed Video Production Classroom		\$	-				\$ -				
BN-7	Same as BN-6, except do not build corrdior connector		\$	-	Х				Х			
BN-8	Change all HVT to VCT floor tile	SLAM Spec	\$	(242.65)		\$ (2	(242.65)			\$ (242.65)		REVIEW MAINTENANCE IMPACT: ANNUAL WAXING ON VCT REQUIRED. NO WAX ON HVT. UTILIZE MANNIGTON TOUCHSTONE OR EQUIVALENT.
BN-9	Eliminate all VCT, patch and seal concrete floors		\$	(170.00)		\$ ((170.00)					District to test floor moisture content Cannot be taken with BN-8
BN-10	Reduce renovations to locker rooms	SLAM Sketch	\$	-	Х				Х			Design needs to be reviewed with District Not preferred by District
BN-11	Reduce central office scope to code required changes only		\$	-	X				Х			Sprinklers and ADA changes only SLAM not recommended





Schematic Design Phase Estimate - 11/08/16, Updated 11,15/16

Design Development Estimate -

75% Construction Documents Estimate -

			Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	,
ITEM # BN-12	ITEM DESCRIPTION Delete ceilings in all storage rooms, jan. closets, IDF rooms, etc.	DRAWING / SPEC REFERENECE	ALL VE COST SAVINGS ITEMS (DEDUCT)/ADD \$ (43.77)	VE SAVINGS BASELINE	PENDING / POSSIBLE DEFERRED Minor Impact	PENDING / POSSIBLE DEFERRED/ Significant Impact	REJECTED	RSD 14 SELECTED REDUCTIONS 11/15/2016 (SD Phase)	ALT.	COMMENTS
			(10177)	\$ (43.77)				\$ (43.77)		
BN-13	Change to 2x4 ceiling tile ILO 4x4 ceiling tile in Media Center		\$ (16.83)		\$ (16.83)					
BN-14	Change interior storefront to aluminum door frames		\$	X			Revised in Base			
BN-15	Keep existing doors where possible	SLAM	\$	Х			Revised in Base			
BN-16	Change to PLAM sills ILO solid surface sills		\$ (20.80)		\$ (20.80)					Not recommended by design team
	Building Interior - Sub-total		\$ (664.47)	\$ (100.00)	\$ (499.37)	\$ (65.10)) \$ -	\$ (342.65)		
								+ (0:12/00)		
ED 4	FIRE PROTECTION									
FP-1	Change to manual standpipe system (Reductions Inside Building)		\$	See C-4 Above						Review with FM, reduces size of fire pump and storage tanks CES comment: Manual standpipes will allow for diesel fire pump house package manufactured by Armstrong Pumps to be sized for 500 GPM @ 100fthd approximately. See note C-4 above for additional information.
FP-2	Change to flex heads ILO black iron pipe		\$ (15.00)		\$ (15.00)					Review with District Facilities Director
FP-3	Change to exposed heads ILO concealed type	SLAM sketch	\$							Combined with BN12
	Fire Protection - Sub-total		\$ (15.00)	\$ -	\$ (15.00)	¢	- \$ -	¢		
			\$ (15.00 ₎	-	\$ (15.00)	D		-		
P-1	PLUMBING Provide manual faucets and flush valves ILO automati sensing type		\$ (12.20)		\$ (12.20)					Review witjh District Facilities Director
1 - 1	Trovide manual radects and mash valves it of automati sensing type		ψ (12.20)		ψ (12.20)			\$ (12.20)		neview with bisiner racings birector
P-2	Provide insta-hot water heaters ILO storage type		\$	х			х			CES Comment: Not recommended because hot water-recirculation throughout the building. In addition the power-consumption is extremely high for a building this size. As a result the electrical feeders and service can be effected. We typically do not recommend these units unless it is an office-space or tenant fit-out. We do mention in our SD Narrative to provide tankless water heaters at janitor closets to supply hot water during the summer months when the building water-heaters are shut down, if the owner so chooses.
P-3	Change water heaters to (2) PVI Conquest 80 L 130A-GCML. "		\$							CES Suggested VE - Take this in Design Development
	Plumbing - Sub-total		\$ (12.20)	-	\$ (12.20)	\$	- \$ -	\$ (12.20)		





Schematic Design Phase Estimate - 11/08/16, Updated 11,15/16

Design Development Estimate -

75% Construction Documents Estimate -

				Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	·
ITEM #	ITEM DESCRIPTION	DRAWING / SPEC REFERENECE	SAVIN	VE COST IGS ITEMS ICT)/ADD	VE SAVINGS BASELINE	PENDING / POSSIBLE DEFERRED Minor Impact	PENDING / POSSIBLE DEFERRED/ Significant Impact	REJECTED	RSD 14 SELECTED REDUCTIONS 11/15/2016 (SD Phase)	ALT.	COMMENTS
H-1	HVAC Move chiller sound enclosures 30 to 40 feet away from bldg with	SLAM Sketch	\$	(402.00)	\$ (402.00)				\$ (402.00)		SLAM to verify with acoustic engineer
H-2	sound blankets Move chiller sound enclosures away from bldg to eliminate sound-	SLAM Sketch							(132133)		SLAM to verify with acoustic engineer and proximity to
	control requirements				X			X			neighbors Similar to H-1
H-3	Change to Cassette units for VFR system	SLAM Sketch?	\$	(400.00)	\$ (400.00)				\$ (400.00)		
H-4 a	Eliminate AC from school except in specific areas (see notes)		\$	(214.50)	X			\$ (214.50)			Keep AC in Auditorium, Central offices, Admin offices, Media-Center, Fitness Room CES Suggested VE:- Option #1 - Full cooling of air handlers listed above: Chillers-will be reduced to (2) 120 ton chillers Trane model CGAM-120 Pumps P1A&B will be 25 HP Armstrong dual arm model 4302-pumpsAHU-1, 7, 8, 9, & 10 no cooling coil -VRF to be reduced where no VRF indoor or outdoor units serve-classrooms.
H-4b	Eliminate AC from school except in specific areas (see notes) Load Sharing		\$	(258.40)			\$ (258.40)				CES Suggested VE: Cooling for only for class ventilation and offices only air handlers with swing space of auditorium: Chillers will be reduced to (2) 90 ton chillers Trane model CGAM-90. Pumps P1A&B will be 20 HP Armstrong dual arm model 4302 pumpsAHU-1, 7, 8, 9, & 10 no cooling coil -VRF to be reduced where no VRF indoor or outdoor units serve classrooms. SLAM and District do not prefer to reduce AC
H-5	Reduce number of fume hoods in science classrooms (Chemistry)		\$	(33.00)		\$ (33.00)			\$ (16.50)		Reduce from 4 to 2 - (4) total) District to advise. Cannot be taken if H-7 is accepted
H-6	Reduce number of fume hoods in science classrooms (Biology)		\$	(58.00)		\$ (58.00)			\$ (29.00)	1	Reduce from 2 to 1 - (3) total District to advise Cannot be taken if H-7 is accepted
H-7	Eliminate Stainless Steel ductwork in chemistry labs		\$	(40.00)		\$ (40.00)					SLAM to verify list of chemical used in chemistry labs with District. Use fume hoods with filters? Cannot be taken with H-5 or H-6
H-8	Reuse HVAC unit serving Central offices,		\$	-	Х			Х			CES does not recommend this due to lost efficency
H-9	Reduce amount of roof cut and patch for new AHU replacement	SLAM Sketch?	\$	-	Revise in DD where possible						SLAM to coordinate with CES and Structural Engineer SLAM to review potential in DD
H-10	Open specification for HVAC controls		\$	(75.00)	\$ (75.00)				\$ (75.00)		
	HVAC - Sub-tota	1	\$	(1,480.90)	\$ (877.00)	\$ (131.00)	\$ (258.40)	\$ (214.50)	\$ (922.50)		





Schematic Design Phase Estimate - 11/08/16, Updated 11,15/16

Design Development Estimate -

75% Construction Documents Estimate -

			Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	
ITEM #	ITEM DESCRIPTION	DRAWING / SPEC REFERENECE	ALL VE COST SAVINGS ITEMS (DEDUCT)/ADD	VE SAVINGS BASELINE	PENDING / POSSIBLE DEFERRED Minor Impact	PENDING / POSSIBLE DEFERRED/ Significant Impact	REJECTED	RSD 14 SELECTED REDUCTIONS 11/15/2016 (SD Phase)	ALT.	COMMENTS
	ELECTRICAL (includes Fire Alarm and Low Voltage Items)									
E-1	Reduce number of fire pull stations through buildings		\$ -	TBD						\$500 savings / each - To be reviewed with FM CES Comment: This will need to be formally reviewed and approved by the AHJ prior to implementing into the design. We should keep this as a possible savings but not count on it at this stage.
E-2a	Change service entrance feeders to aluminum ILO copper		\$ (10.00)			\$ (10.00)				CES Comment: Change aluminum feeders for the service entrance conductors from the utility transformer to the main service entrance switch.
E-2b	Change feeders to aluminum ILO copper		\$ (58.00)			\$ (58.00)				CES Comment: Provide Aluminum feeders for panelboards 100A and larger. HVAC equipment shall remain copper.
E-3	Change to MC cable ILO EMT for branch circuit wiring	CES Narrative?	\$ (380.00)	\$ (380.00)				\$ (380.00)		Entire building (where allowed) CES Comment: Estimator to confirm if included in base
E-4	Change to fluorescent light fixtures in locker rooms, storage/mech/elec/data rooms		\$ (21.00)	Х			\$ (21.00)			SLAM/CES - Not Preferred
E-5	Use (12) recessed 2x4 LED fixtures in lieu of 3 rows of 6 Pinnacle linear recessed fixtures in all classroom spaces (35)		\$ (52.50)	\$ (52.50)				\$ (52.50)		\$1,500 savings per classroom (expected)
	Electrical - Sub-tota	1	\$ (521.50)	\$ (432.50)	\$	\$ (68.00)	\$ (21.00)	\$ (432.50)		





Schematic Design Phase Estimate - 11/08/16, Updated 11,15/16

Design Development Estimate -

75% Construction Documents Estimate

Constructic	on Documents Estimate -											Additions / Renovations Project
			Α		В	С	D	E		F	G	
ITEM #	ITEM DESCRIPTION	Drawing / Spec Referenece	ALL VE CO SAVINGS IT (DEDUCT)//	TEMS	VE SAVINGS BASELINE	PENDING / POSSIBLE DEFERRED Minor Impact	PENDING / POSSIBLE DEFERRED/ Significant Impact	REJECTED	11.	14 SELECTED DUCTIONS /15/2016 ED Phase)	ALT.	COMMENTS
	VE Sub-total		\$ (4,70	3.76) \$	(1,964.95)	\$ (766.14)	\$ (392.80)	\$ (1,579.87)	\$	(2,303.84)	-	
	Markup on Above	23.30%	\$ (1,09	5.98) \$	(457.83)				\$	(536.80)	-	
	Total VE with Mark-ups		\$ (5,79	9.74) \$	(2,422.79)				\$	(2,840.64)	-	
	Escalation on Above	4%	\$ (23	1.99) \$	(96.91)				\$	(113.63)	_	
	VE TOTAL		\$ (6,03	1.73) \$	(2,519.70)				\$	(2,954.26)	-	
	1	Reconciled Estir		dget \$					\$	52,068.20 52,177.30	- -	
	-	ering Required to							\$	109.10	-	
	Total VE Savings Remaining After Meetin	g Budget (befo	ore mark-u	ips) \$	(1,855.85)				\$	(2,845.16)	-	
	Site / Civil / Landscape VE Savings Sub-total		\$ (39	98.82) \$	(305.45)	\$ (24.74)	\$ (1.30)) \$ (67.32)	\$	(343.99)	-	
	Structural VE Savings Sub-total		\$ (14	11.00) \$	(141.00)	\$ -	\$.	- \$ -	\$	(141.00)	=	
	Building Exterior/Envelop VE Suggestions Sub-total		4							(109.00)		
	Building Exterior/Envelop ve Suggestions Sub-total		\$ (1,46	59.88) \$	(109.00)	\$ (83.83)	\$ -	- \$ (1,277.05)	\$	(103.00)	=	
	Building Interior VE Savings Sub-total			54.47) \$		\$ (83.83) \$ (499.37)			\$ \$	(342.65)	-	
				54.47) \$							- - -	
	Building Interior VE Savings Sub-total		\$ (66	54.47) \$	(100.00)	\$ (499.37)	\$ (65.10)) \$ -		(342.65)	- - -	
	Building Interior VE Savings Sub-total Building General VE Savings Sub-total		\$ (66 \$ \$ (1	54.47) \$ - :	(100.00)	\$ (499.37)	\$ (65.10)) \$ -	\$	(342.65)	- - - -	
	Building Interior VE Savings Sub-total Building General VE Savings Sub-total Fire Protection VE Savings Sub-total		\$ (66 \$ \$ (1 \$ (1	54.47) \$ - :	\$ - \$ - \$ -	\$ (499.37) \$ - \$ (15.00)	\$ (65.10) \$ \$) \$ - - \$ - - \$ -	\$ \$ \$	(342.65)	- - - -	





Schematic Design Phase Estimate - 11/08/16, Updated 11,15/16

Design Development Estimate -

75% Construction Documents Estimate -

Regional School District 14 Nonnewaug High School Additions / Renovations Project

			Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	
ITEM #	ITEM DESCRIPTION	DRAWING / SPEC REFERENECE	ALL VE COST SAVINGS ITEMS (DEDUCT)/ADD	VE SAVINGS BASELINE	PENDING / POSSIBLE DEFERRED Minor Impact	PENDING / POSSIBLE DEFERRED/ Significant Impact	REJECTED	RSD 14 SELECTED REDUCTIONS 11/15/2016 (SD Phase)	ALT.	COMMENTS
	ALTERNATES									
Alt. No. B1	Canopy at Central Office		\$ 54.80							
Alt. No. B2	Enclosure at Corridor to VoAG Building		\$ 27.80					\$ 27.80		ADD TO BASE SCOPE - District Priority
Alt. No. B3	Teaching Spaces in Auditorium - Main Level Only		\$ 93.00					\$ 93.00		ADD TO BASE SCOPE
Alt. No. B4	Teaching Spaces in Auditorium - Main and Upper Level		\$ 188.00					\$ 188.00	✓	ALTERNATE
Alt. No. S1a	Track and Natural Turf Field w/Irrigation		\$ 1,843.00							Includes new track
Alt. No. S1a-1	Re-surfaced Track and Natural Turf Field w/Irrigation		\$ 1,127.69							
Alt. No. S1b	Track and Synthetic Turf Field		\$ 2,443.40							Includes new track
Alt. No. S1b-1	Re-surfaced Track and Synthetic Turf Field		\$ 1,442.98					\$ 1,442.98	✓	ALTERNATE
Alt. No. S2	Multipurpose Field Lighting		\$ 696.60							
Alt. No. S3	Aluminum Bleachers		\$ 471.70							
Alt. No. S4	(4) Tennis Courts		\$ 578.60					\$ 578.60		ADD TO BASE SCOPE Renovate (3) existing, add (1) new cout
Alt. No. S5	(2) Additional Tenniss Courts		\$ 256.30					\$ 256.30	✓	ALTERNATE Will not allow Event Parking Lot to be eliminated
Alt. No. \$5-1	(2) Additional Tenniss Courts in new location		\$ 284.00							
Alt. No. S6	Irrigation at Natural Turf Fields		\$ 245.20							
Alt. No. S6-1	Irrigation at Natural Turf Fields using existing well		\$ 224.36					\$ 224.36		ADD TO BASE SCOPE
Alt. No. S7	Refurbish Existing Fields, Athletic Amenities		\$ 662.40							
Alt. No. S7-1	Refurbish Existing Fields, Athletic Amenities w/ reduced scope	<u> </u>	\$ 568.73					\$ 568.73		ADD TO BASE SCOPE
Alt. No S8	New Toilet and Concessions Building		\$ 397.00					\$ 397.00	✓	ALTERNATE

Total Add to Base Scope \$ 1,492.49

Total Alternates \$ 2,284.28

Construction Budget \$ 52,068.20 Reconciled SD Estimate \$ 52,177.30

Accepted VE \$ (2,954.26)
Value Engineering Required to Meet Budget 109.10

Total Revised Construction Budget \$ 1,492.49

\$ 50,824.63

Variance to Budget - Over/(Under) \$ (1,243.57)

SD Phase - Building Committee Approved 11/15/16

SD Phase - Building Committee Approved 11/15/16



