

A meeting of the Building Committee was held on Tuesday, January 28, 2014 at 6:30 pm in the LMC of Nonnewaug High School, 5 Minortown Road, Woodbury, Connecticut.

Present: Superintendent Jody Ian Goeler; Committee Chair George Bauer, committee members JP Fernandes, Wayne McAllister, Pat DiSarro, Mike Molzon, Andrew O'Brien, Bill Nemec  
Also present, Maryanne Van Aken, Carol Ann Brown, Ken Biega, Paul Lisi, Vince McDermott, Andy Green, Mike Preato from *Voices*, and Board clerk Deb Carlton

Mr. Bauer called the meeting to order at 6:34 pm and reviewed the status of court proceedings and reason for a delay since the last meeting. Motions had been filed in Waterbury court to hold us in contempt for continuing with building committee meetings. Our attorney and bond counsel agree that the committee can meet and plan with confidence. There will be a hearing on 1/31/14.

Mr. Bauer invited Mr. McDermott and Mr. Green to join the group's discussion of topographical design maps of the field areas. They spoke issues related to constructing a turf field and the existing soccer field, including the need for a flood plain management certificate and a hydraulic model of the river. We will need to show how we will compensate for fill, and consideration for where storage space for floodwaters would be if all but the soccer field is lowered by 1 ft. They felt the turf field might need to go elsewhere.

Mr. Fernandes confirmed that we can lower the fields across the river if we raise the fields on this side.

Mr. McDermott suggested a more economical solution by putting the turf field inside the existing track. With the existing size of the track, this would accommodate football and field hockey, but not soccer. He also asked the committee to weigh the relative cost of field work and elevation versus the life expectancy of the track, which is much less than when the building project first was planned. Scholastic soccer calls for a 70 yard field and this would involve reworking the dimensions of the track. Another benefit to locating the turf field inside the track would be the option to satisfy ADA compliant access to the top of the viewing stands as opposed to way over by the proposed turf field. He also recommended removing the dry wells under the current track if work was done there.

Mr. Fernandes commented that the committee looked at this many times and it was not seen as cost beneficial to put turf inside the track.

Mr. McDermott noted it will cost the district \$300,000 to resurface the track in 6 years. A track such as ours has a 20 year life, and is currently 14 yrs. old. He sees pushing the back edge of the track to accommodate a soccer sized turf field preferable to raising the field currently planned for turf.

Mr. Molzon felt pushing the track would work, there's room before you get to the river (Clark Brook).

Mr. Fernandes noted this is an approximately \$600,000 add.

Looking at the FEMA flood plain map, showing part of the track to be in the flood plain, Mr. Green and Mr. McDermott explained that we would simply need to demonstrate that that track is not truly in the flood plain due to its elevation.

Mr. McDermott also offered suggestions about field lighting, to place them as close to the fence line as possible without interference, and to use 85' lights which would be easier with the lower bleachers.

Mr. Fernandes was interested to know who would be doing what at this point, to move forward,

Mr. Bauer would like to see historical data on what we would be considering with each option.

Mr. Fernandes sees the wisdom of putting turf inside the track, now. Previously, the cost benefit was not there, but that was in 2006 when we were not considering replacing the track in 6 years. He considers it unlikely the district would have \$300,000 to resurface the track in capital reserve.

Mr. McAllister asked if the FEMA flood line could be "pre-track" and so this would have changed when the track was constructed.

Regarding RFQ for architectural services, and then construction management services, Mr. Bauer indicated samples had been provided by Mr. McAllister, who said our attorney has advised us to pursue RFQs; his opinion has not changed. It was the architect who contacted the Bureau of School Facilities about this, and we await their decision.

January 28, 2014

Considerable discussion followed. Mr. Fernandes felt the scope of the project was based on educational specifications and asked what prompted a repeat of the RFQ process.

Mr. McAllister explained that the scope is significantly different than what went to referendum; it is typical, since new requirements beginning in 2008, to do RFQ/RFP post referendum.

Mr. Fernandes felt this was done in 2007, and there was plenty of scope, but the decision was to only go with what was in the ed specs that we felt would pass a referendum. It was only the programmatic needs at the high school that changed because of changes to graduation requirements.

Mr. McAllister reviewed changes to the prices on original draft contracts for architectural services and also noted that the original contract called for work at MES, BES and NHS.

Mr. Fernandes believed the architects sent an amendment for new services, were compensated based on a fixed fee and on a percentage on construction fees. He was puzzled about why we are re-doing this now.

Mr. McAllister replied we are doing it to follow statutes as they are currently written, because we are adding scope, and because we want to determine qualifications for a project of this size.

Mr. Fernandes felt dollar amounts would have been added once the construction manager was secured.

Mr. DiSarro felt we should be doing whatever the state says we should.

Mr. Fernandes asked whether the RFQ is a state document

Mr. McAllister told him it is not, it's local and is ready to go, is specific to the scope, requests examples of renovate to new experience based on square footage, with percentage of change orders to overall scope. He also noted that, for the most part, the firm that does the pre-referendum work is generally awarded the post referendum contract, too.

Mr. Lisi noted the process has changed, but not in the way it is being discussed. For instance, in Old Lyme, there was a feasibility study, then the project. Here, he doesn't think the scope/budget change argument makes any sense.

Mr. Biega added that O&G submitted no costs for pre-referendum work.

Mr. Bauer said that a next meeting will be scheduled following a decision from the state about the RFQ process.

The meeting concluded at 8:21 pm

Respectfully submitted,

George Bauer, Chair