

Old Greenwich School Building Committee - Responses to Board of Education Questions

June 20, 2023

Submitted by Christina Downey, BOE Vice Chair

1. The estimates provided to us this week have pricing for Options A, B and C. I know we briefly spoke about this at the Board meeting, but could we get some clarity on what Options B and C include (or do not)? It was not clear if these match the good/better/best analysis of the June 1 documents provided to us. E.g. given that Option B is only \$1.26M more than A, I think it would be helpful for the Board to understand what "bang for the buck" we get for that.

Option A includes the requirements of the Ed Specs, compliance with recent MEP code updates, and compliance with the ADA related requirements of the agreement between the US Dept. of Education, Office of Civil Rights and GPS dated 4/9/2021.

Option B originally represented the Ed Specs plus code updates and required ADA compliance. These necessary elements have now been included as part of Option A. The \$1.26 million additional cost in Option B just covers MEP upgrades that are outside the scope of the Ed Specs and not required and some additional scope to ensure that more spaces within the building are accessible.

Option C includes everything in Options A & B, plus SP+A's suggestions for a more comprehensive renovation which would result in a more consistent appearance both inside and outside the building and a more environmentally favorable mechanical system. It also includes replacing all windows in the building and all roof sections of the building. The OGSBC realizes that the OGS Feasibility Committee thoughtfully reduced the scope in the Ed Specs to be a realizable approved budget. Note that Option C will NOT result in a "renovate-as-new" project as much of the existing building and building envelope would remain as is.

2. Is there a relatively concise explanation (again, sorry that this may have been answered on Weds night but there was so much information) for the \$2,783,807 of increased scope costs? And similarly for the \$2,734,935 of increased Haz Mat abatement and demo (although I think that simply related to asbestos in various locations in the building.

Building committee members conducted a value engineering session on Friday June 16, which brought the total increased scope number down to \$6,548,752, which includes added scope related to the EdSpecs, HazMat abatement, demolition and reconstruction, and Phasing Costs. The breakdown of these costs is as follows:

- Increased scope related to HazMat abatement, demolition and reconstruction: \$2,910,547. This number is an estimate based on thorough investigations and testing by Langan Engineers (report provided). The Ed Spec budget anticipated a small amount of remediation in the boiler room only. Buildings of this age with multiple renovations

typically require a considerable amount of remediation and we have focused abatement around the areas that must be conducted to facilitate installation of HVAC and sprinkler systems and to ensure ADA compliance.

- Increased scope related to Phasing Costs: \$1,673,110. No costs for phasing the project were identified in the Ed Spec. Since the school will remain occupied during construction, there will be phasing costs for; additional security and material to separate the children from the construction area, and multiple cleaning and moving expenses as the contractor mobilizes different areas of the building for construction and completion. There will also be costs associated with maintaining the existing MEP systems while the school is occupied and under construction until the new systems can be completed. In general, a phased project requires a longer period to complete.
- Increased scope related to core objectives of the Ed Specs, specifically ADA compliance, HVAC compliance, and the new addition: \$1,965,095.
 - The building committee conducted extensive value engineering work to pay for additional ADA improvements REQUIRED to properly address the OCR complaint and subsequent agreement between GPS and the OCR. This work includes new toilets and sinks, door widening, casework, ramps, and a secure universal main entry. The EdSpec was created before the complaint was received and resolved and only included some ADA upgrades. The building committee has included all required ADA upgrades.
 - In the EdSpecs, a building-wide HVAC system was emphasized, but the EdSpecs left approximately 23,095 square feet in the building (>25% of the building) without HVAC. Our project team has recommended that the full building receive HVAC to be compliant with recent code guidance and with the maximum state reimbursement in mind. At the end of the day, this is the largest component in terms of added scope.
 - Additional Geotechnical scope not budgeted. KG+D were not aware of the geotechnical soil conditions, which will require mass excavation and structural fill for the addition.

3. On the "Project Update" sheet, in the final column the Downes estimate for an infrastructure difference of \$8,711,168 from the March 2023 estimate. Do we have a general breakdown of that figure (can keep big picture and it may result from the answer to question 2 above)?

Based on the value engineering session on Friday June 16, the infrastructure difference from the March 2023 estimate is \$7,824,331. The key components of that figure include:

- Renovation of the HVAC system in the existing building which was not captured in the original conceptual estimate. Approximately 23,095 sf of the existing building's HVAC system was not addressed in the conceptual estimate and upon further investigation by the design team they were able to design a more complete system based on the current needs of the school. The incremental HVAC cost is \$2,058,457.
- The Hazmat abatement costs have been divided between the infrastructure and renovations. Infrastructure carried \$2,538,795 which includes all indirect costs.

- As a team we felt it would be responsible to include a \$62,200 allowance for contaminated soils which was not included in the original estimate.
- A small value was carried in the original budget for Communications and PA System, however the Ed Spec identified the need for a complete system which aligns with the design documents. We have included a budget of \$279,121 for this purpose.
- A security system consisting of intrusion detection, access control and cctv cameras were included in the Ed Spec and the current Design documents, however it was not in the original estimate. The estimated value of the system is \$449,343.
- Escalation is included in the original estimate at 3% for (4) years which totals approximately \$1M included with infrastructure. Subtracting the estimated escalation from the total value and reapplying actual escalation that occurred from the date of the estimate to today and applying an estimated 7% escalation, the total increase to the original \$13M budget would be approximately \$3.3M. Actual escalation was calculated utilizing the ENR building cost index.

4. In terms of ADA compliance, for Option A, what is the level of compliance we will be achieving? And would there be additional compliance with B or C? (sort of ties to question 1)

Option A is in full compliance with the 2010 ADA Standards and meets the requirements of the signed agreement between the US Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights and the Board of Education.

5. Is a generator for some/all of the building included? It was mentioned in the June 1 documents so would be helpful to know if it is.

Yes a generator is included in option A. The generator is not for the whole building, it is defined as an "emergency generator" for the operation of sump pumps, selective lighting, and HVAC. Options B and C include upgrades to the generator, which would be above and beyond the requirement listed in the Ed Specs.

6. I assume that the new K rooms will also be usable for a Pre K class if there were any rejiggering at some point if you could please confirm that (with the reduced size just checking).

Yes, at this time our enrollment in Kindergarten and 1st grade fluctuates between 3-4 sections yearly. In the event enrollment of Kindergarten dropped to 3 sections and Pre-K grew to 3 sections, the new classrooms could be used for either grade. The classroom size was purposely designed to meet the needs of a Kindergarten classroom with a minimum of 1,000 sq ft required to become adequate flex space. Current classrooms used as 'flex space' for increased Kindergarten enrollment do not meet this square foot minimum.

7. For the 2 classrooms that have had the sewage/below the floodplain (and sort of down a level) in the schematic design presented this week it keeps those both as classrooms

(and I cannot determine the elevation). How is that doable? I apologize as it's probably in the documents somewhere but I did not see it quickly and wanted to get this email out to you today.

Yes, these rooms will remain as classrooms. One will be used for 1st grade and the other has challenging sightlines as a traditional classroom, so it will be used to house 2 speech pathologists to deliver individual and small group direct instruction. The bathrooms would be removed. The floors and ceilings in these rooms will be raised to allow for adequate instructional space.

Both Lateral sewer lines between the school and Sound Beach Avenue are recommended to be replaced. GPS Facilities is planning on replacing the south line. The OGSBC's design team will work with facilities to fast track this project.