

A meeting of the Building Committee was held on Tuesday, December 1, 2015 at 6:30 pm in the LMC of Nonnewaug High School, 5 Minortown Road, Woodbury, Connecticut.

Present: Committee Chair John Chapman, committee members JP Fernandes, Don Fital, Janet Morgan, George Bauer, Andie Greene, Alan Rubacha, Kurt Lavaway, Robert Piazza, Brian Peterson, Tom Hecht, Matt Cleary and Robert Halgreen.

Unavailable to attend: Gary Michell

Also present: Superintendent Anna Cutaia-Leonard, Wayne McAllister, Alice Jones, Maryanne Van Aken, Mike Molzon, Ken Biega from O&G Industries, Paul Antinozzi, Mike Ayles and Paul Lisi of Antinozzi and Associates, along with their attorney Don Doeg, one additional community member, one member of the press, and clerk Deb Carlton

Mr. Chapman called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm.

A calendar of meetings has been presented to the committee with the request that members indicate approval or not with the proposed schedule.

Mr. Chapman reviewed the plan for securing the project's architect, construction manager (CM) and owner's project manager services (OPM). The RFPs will be formalized and the committee will move quickly to choose an architect. The due date for RFP is 12/15/15; Mr. McAllister has already heard from four firms. He has advertised in the Republican-American, on the district's website, and has solicited the AIA for architects with school project experience. Extensions would only be considered if the pool of candidates was insufficient. Walk-throughs could be accommodated by request. It was discussed that this project has been in the works for years and is likely well known to architectural firms. The scope of the project has changed, however, from work on all four schools to a renovate-to-new for NHS only.

The committee will receive bids for review on 12/15/15, and will then meet on 12/17/15 to set an interview schedule for 12/22/15. If less than four qualified firms are identified, the committee will go back out to bid again.

Mr. Chapman invited his vice-chair, Mr. Fernandes, as well as Mr. Bauer to provide brief introductions and background information on themselves, as neither was present at the last meeting introductions were made.

The committee reviewed most recent enrollment figures as compared with the Prowda projections. In the projections, 1732 students were expected; however, enrollment for Oct-Dec. has been 1775, 1778, and 1790. Enrollment is important for reimbursement once the project is completed, as the state compares numbers of students to square footage allotments. Mr. McAllister will have updated enrollment projections by mid-January.

The committee continued to discuss topics including: enrollment, scope of the work to be done, state reimbursement, inflation as it affects the project, programming and safety considerations. Mr. Fernandes commented that state science requirements drove the design for the science labs. Mr. Chapman commented that abatement can be a wild card in a project like this one.

Enrollment was discussed further, with concern about going over if the enrollment came in lower than projected. It was seen as a moving target. Ms. Morgan asked if the design can be changed, and was told it can. There is currently a schematic design that can be revised every step of the way. Mr. Chapman stressed that the committee's responsibility is to meet the needs of the school, and to stay within the amount of money approved at referendum.

It was agreed the OPM would control the project schedule, though the committee will also oversee every aspect of it. There was discussion about the benefits of having the OPM on board before the CM, further discussion about how decisions would be made to reallocate funds if it was determined they could be better spent elsewhere, and how changes would be approved and by whom. Mr. Chapman stressed that the high school administration will be consulted and that their input will be essential to maximizing the use of funds throughout the project.

Mr. Chapman opened the floor for privilege of the floor.

Joe Corey, Woodbury, asked for clarification on the impact on reimbursement if enrollment changed prior to the completion of the project.

Mr. McAllister reiterated that reimbursement is based on the population expected; if the occupancy is higher than expected, more square footage is reimbursable. If lower, the opposite is true. Mr. Chapman added that the reimbursement rates differ for different types of spaces within the project.

Dr. Cutaia-Leonard thanked the committee members for agreeing to serve. She sees a marriage of form and function in this project, and is happy to know that the educators' voices will be heard. There will be 750 students in the building while the renovation takes place, and she will welcome the chance for input on timelines and other aspects that affect students. She stressed that enrollment is not the only factor to consider in what is built. Mandates, and best practice, cannot currently be implemented due to the limitations of our building.

Mr. Ayles told the committee that his firm believes there is an existing contract in place from 2007 that needs to be considered and that included two phases – pre and post referendum. He referenced a June 9, 2013 letter from the state that he feels indicated reimbursement would not be an issue with the existing contract. He feels experience is also not an issue, as his firm has been involved in a number of school projects in the interim. His firm's attorney is present tonight, he said, just for issues related to the contract. Mr. Ayles believes the contract should be honored.

There was brief discussion among the committee members and questions about whether the town attorney has looked at the contract with Antinozzi.

Mr. Chapman said that he had, adding that reimbursement is a legitimate concern; that the project has been and will continue to be scrutinized, and that the state and District 14 counsel agree it is the right of the District to openly solicit the post-referendum phase architect services. The district wants to be above reproach on this project.

Ms. Morgan asked if Antinozzi and Associates will submit a bid, or did they think what they submitted in 2007 is still valid?

Mr. Chapman replied that the 2007 solicitation was significantly different; therefore, it would need to be updated to reflect the new scope of work, and that it was his hope that Antinozzi would submit a proposal.

The meeting concluded at 7:28 pm

Respectfully submitted,

John Chapman, Chair
Building Committee