



## Regional School District No. 14 Woodbury / Bethlehem

### Nonnewaug High School – Renovations Project

#### Public Building Committee Meeting

**August 30, 2016**

**PBC Attendees:**

John Chapman  
JP Fernandes  
George Bauer  
Alan Rubacha  
Brian Peterson  
Robert Piazza  
Patrick DiSarro  
Andie Greene  
Matt Cleary

**Absent:**

Don Fital  
Tom Hecht  
Janet Morgan (arrived later / did not vote)

**Also Present:**

Dr. Anna Cutaia-Leonard	Region 14
Alice Jones	Nonnewaug High School
Kurt Lavaway	Colliers
Scott Pellman	Colliers
Charles Warrington	Colliers
Amy Samuelson	SLAM
Mark Jeffco	O&G
Lorel Purcell	O&G
Matthew Meyers	Langan Engineering
Pete Chiarizio	Langan Engineering

**From / Notes Prepared by:**

Kurt Lavaway / Scott Pellman - Project Manager  
Colliers International

**Attachments:** \_\_\_\_\_

A meeting of the Public Building Committee was held on Tuesday, August 30, 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 or Scott Pellman for inclusion.



1. John Chapman called the meeting to order at 6:34 PM.
2. Colliers presented an update on the Commissioning agent proposals. - Scott Pellman summarized the detailed scope reviews that were performed with the two low bidders. Colliers recommended awarding the Commissioning services to the lowest qualified bidder - SES

John Chapman motioned to approve SES as the selected Commissioning Agent

Motion second by JP Fernandes

Vote – 9-0 unanimous

3. OPM Report – Kurt Lavaway reported on the following:

8-9-16

State PREP meeting – review of State procedures and requirements with specific discussions:

- Verified 800 students
- Verified existing bldg. GSF (per OSCG) to be 144,202 for the high School, 5,378 for the Central Office area. VoAg is separate building and not included with this project.
- The allowable area should work for “renovation status”, once the eligibility documents are completed they will need to be submitted to OSCG for decision on eligibility.
- The total project budget will be broken out as requested to show funding for the High School project and Central Office area separately and will need to be tracked separately. Both projects will need to total the approved funding amount.
- The District will need to re-submit the Grant applications with revised ED049’s, including updated budgets, letter addressing population, space standards and final building areas for the High School and Central Office area.
- Included will be the additional year time extension request.

8-10-16

Programming meetings occurred with staff – Room by Room with SLAM

- Media Center
- Administration
- General classrooms

8-12-16

Design Team, Colliers and O&G met to review scope and costs at O&G’s office, included review of initial Haz Mat findings and recommendations moving forward.

8-17-16

Design Team, Colliers and O&G met to review scope and costs at O&G’s office

8-19-16

Hazardous Materials follow up meeting occurred with working group and Langan engineers



#### 8-23-16

Design team, Colliers and O&G met with working group to discuss potential spaces available to be used for classroom swing space so that O&G can start developing construction phasing.

#### 8-24-16

Design team, Colliers and O&G met with working group to discuss community outreach and communication as project moves forward.

- Draft letter to State sent to team
- Began updating ED049's top separate projects

#### 8-26-16

Coordination meeting occurred at Colliers office with Design Team and O&G to review presentation of current budget challenges.

#### 8-30-16

Follow up conversation with OSCG to determine documented age of Student Services building along with Roof replacement impact on the project and how this will impact State reimbursement.

- Student Services building - State date on file is from 2003
- District is looking for the warranty documentation to determine if it has an earlier date which can be used to increase State reimbursement with the revised ED049 Grant applications.

#### 4. Langan engineering presented the initial results from the building environmental testing and the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

Matthew Meyers discussed the environmental building assessment

- The student services building does not contain asbestos or PCB's.
- No lead base paint was detected
- Asbestos - The 1970s building contains a number of different glues, pipe insulation, lab hoods and black science counter tops are all positive for asbestos. Older brown windows, glazing compound has asbestos along with the older membrane roof and demolition for new mechanical penetrations will have to be abated.
- PCB's - caulking materials were tested in accordance with OSCG requirements for doors and windows. In the 1970's original building the window glazing compound contained some low levels of PCB's with levels below 50 ppm.

50 ppm is the threshold for EPA involvement so this was positive news that the levels are below federal requirements. CT regulates PCB's above 1 ppm and below 50 ppm, some samples were just over 1 ppm but all were below 50 ppm so CT DEEP sets the regulation. PCB contaminated materials will have to go to an approved landfill. Windows will need to be disposed of as regulated waste.

Pete Chiarizio - discussed the Phase I ESA results

- There were 10 recognized conditions found
- Conditions #1 through #3 are centered around (3) underground storage tanks removed and replaced. The required tank closure reports have not been found, however the tank testing data is good. The new tanks are double wall, concerns are with previous tanks.
- Condition #4 concerns the well with excess nitrates used for irrigation.



- Condition #5 #6 #7 #8 #9 are interior conditions.
  - #5 floor drains connected to septic, It needs to be determined if anything hazardous was poured down the drains and has made it to the septic fields
  - #6 #7, #8, #9 are areas of visible oil staining within the building
  - #10 site wide residual Herbicides and pesticides, coordinated by Pomperaug Health District. Need to take 16 additional samples to meet 20 sample requirement and average the results.
  
- Mr. Chiarizio explained that due to the (10) recognized conditions noted above a Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment will be required. The scope of the Phase 2 study as presented will determine the extent of the concerns with any of the areas mentioned in the Phase 1 report.

Andi Green asked the following question:

"What was the results of the land across from the river that has been a different use for the past 50 years?"

Response:

Langan - DDT and pesticides from early 70s, it is recommended that the scope should stay where anticipated site work will happen.

Robert Piazza asked the following question:

"Are the numbers for the Phase 2 ESA in line?"

Response

Colliers - The numbers have been reduced, Langan sharpened their pencil and scope was carefully reviewed. Costs are for first level of sampling, if additional sampling is required cost will go up. It is typical to test in steps. When tanks are pulled they will have to make sure tank closure reports are filed.

John Chapman posed a question/ statement:

"No samples to date have shown high quantities of concern, correct? "

Response

Langan - correct. The additional testing will have a 6 week turn around after notice to proceed.

John Chapman motioned to move forward with the Phase II ESA

Motion second by JP Fernandes

Vote – 9-0 (unanimous)

Andie Greene Asked the following question

"Did the surveyor utilize ground penetrating radar to detect underground utilities?"

Response

Below is the scope from the Survey RFP:

*Underground Utility Survey: Surveyor shall survey all underground utilities such as storm, sewer, gas, etc. when physically available. Surveyor is not required to enter spaces considered "Confined Space" as defined by OSHA. Survey is required to remove manhole covers to provide accurate inverts of all culverts leading into and out of all storm and sewer structures.*



## 5. Project Budget Status / OSCG Process Presentation – Colliers

Before the presentation John Chapman noted how the renovation project contains lots of moving parts and that it is critical to get renovation status approved. He also mentioned that there have been numerous meetings with the State of Connecticut and a great deal of time has been taken to develop a strategy that will help maximize State reimbursement.

Kurt Lavaway provided a detailed power point presentation to review the project budget history from referendum to the present, Project Finances, Project Schedule which included the projects 2-year delay to defend the referendum lawsuit and its impact on the budget and scope. The presentation reviewed a systematic approach looking at eligible and ineligible scope items with a focus on renovation status that will maximize the state reimbursement and address the academic needs of the school.

John Chapman noted after the presentation that the design team needs to try and pull in as many of the pieces of the original project scope that are currently outside of the current budget projections. He stated that he realizes there are a lot of steps to go through, there will be sacrifice around the entire program but wants to make it a good project. He also stated that the project team push hard not to have a (5) month extension to the construction schedule.

The building committee might like to see more soil samples taken in the playing fields in case this work can be included in the project. The design team will review with Langan.

## 6. Public Comment

- Jim Uberti expressed his support for the project and appreciation for the presentation on the status of the budget and affects of the time delay. He stated that the fields were a big driver of the original project. He also noted that the athletic program scope seems to have taken the biggest cuts due to the project delay and cost escalations which is disappointing to those that voted for the project.
- Leeza Desjardins stated her concerns with the location of the art rooms being located on the second floor and that the art program adjacencies and program needs to be reviewed in more detail by the Architects and change the location to the first floor to accommodate the program needs. She would like the renovations to reflect the success that the art program has attained.

Amy Samuelson from the S/L/A/M Collaborative said that the building plans are still being developed and they are continuing to work with the teachers, staff and administration to provide the best function and cost effective solutions that also respond to their programmatic needs.

7. The next meeting will be held at **6:30 PM on Tuesday September 13, 2016** in the High School Library Media Center, located at 5 Minor Town Road, Woodbury, CT. Additional meetings will be determined.

John Chapman motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:44 PM  
Motion second by JP Fernandes.