

BRS Town Building Committee Meeting

August 6, 2009

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: David King, Chair; Steve Buda (6:39 PM), Tim Cohen, Marc Estra (6:39 PM), Sheila McCreven, and Sandy Stein.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Guy Stella, Superintendent; Charles Zettergren, WSD Business Manager; Marsha DeGennaro, Clerk.

CALL TO ORDER: Chair David King called the meeting to order (6:37 PM).

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

MOTION #1 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Move that we approve the minutes of July 23, 2009 Meeting.

Ms. Stein

Second by Ms. McCreven

Ms. Stein requested confirmation of the change on Page 3, under Scope of Work, that the “3,000 to 1,000” sq. ft. notation was removed entirely from the July 9 meeting minutes. This change had been made in the July 9 minutes as requested at the July 23, 2009 meeting.

IN FAVOR: Mr. Buda, Mr. Cohen, Ms. McCreven and Ms. Stein

ABSTAIN: Mr. Estra

MOTION PASSES 4 - 1

Draft Request for Qualifications (RFQ)

The RFQ document prepared by Mr. Zettergren was reviewed. The Committee agreed that two documents should be developed which specify qualifications separate from pricing. Once qualification proposals are received, they will be reviewed, a list of firms identified for interview and then detailed cost information will be solicited from the finalists. Language changes and/or modifications in the draft RFQ were suggested as follows:

- There did not appear to be enough emphasis on green technology and alternatives. It is important that firms have a clear understanding that innovative solutions and the ability to address green energy options are a key component of the qualification and selection process.
- The Overview on Page 3 be modified to include a broader description for innovative solutions to our infrastructure issues and not just include replacement of windows, roof, etc.
- Page 3 – the second bullet – expand the details.
- Remove bullet on “design of storage building”.
- New systems shall be designed ...strengthen that statement and add “utilize green energy and explore all options available to us”.
- Separate the “vision of the committee” from the “Scope of Work”.
- Highlight “available funding sources” and include “working with possible independent cost estimator”.
- Page 4 include “integration of design with potentially available funding sources as may be identified by a consultant.”

The timeline was discussed as publishing of the Legal Notice should occur as soon as possible. It was agreed that September 11 would be the date for RFP submissions with interviews commencing on or around September 28. It was also stated that September 20 should be the target vote date.

Changes in the Legal Notice:

- ◇ Under licensed architect and licensed engineer; 2nd paragraph “firm” should be changed to firm(s); professional background – clarify assigned to project.
- ◇ Consistency on either “Woodbridge School District” or “Woodbridge Board of Education”.
- ◇ Change date of submissions from September 4 to September 11.
- ◇ Consistency in capitalization.

MOTION #2 – APPROVAL OF LEGAL NOTICE

Move that we approve the Legal Notice as amended.

Ms. Stein

Second by Mr. Buda

UNANIMOUS

Further changes in the Draft RFQ included:

- Exhibit A (the Committee Charge) was not attached and should be included.
- Spellout DX Cooling “Direct Expansion” and “through”.
- Change heating/ventilating to ventilation.
- On Page 2 under more detailed study; the SBS Study is mentioned and the AZTech Study should also be; “Develop conditioning systems” should be changed to “environmental systems”; change “conditioning” to “mechanical systems”.
- Specify the overall project budget.
- Under Scope of Work - integrate long-term solutions and delete last sentence.
- Second bullet change “last units” to “with thermally broken frames”.
- Fourth bullet – address “existing accessibility” if these are ADA issues clarify them as accessibility references, i.e., ADA survey of facility. It was noted that code compliance is dependent upon the work involved. It will be helpful if deficient areas are identified and then guidance could be sought for remediation.
- Comma between furniture and sinks.
- Drop “the” in front of BRS wherever it appears.
- Remove “investigate” and change “fire code” to “Connecticut Fire Life/Safety Code.
- On Page 3 the 2nd bullet - Energy Star Ratings – mention firms should use the Ashrae K-12 Guideline Case Studies on School Districts.

Ms. Stein left the meeting (7:30 PM).

- Remove associated fees; changes “Phases” to “Steps”

- Remove all reference to fees throughout the document as this document will seek qualifications.
- Interviews will be based on the RFQ and a shortlist of firms will submit proposals as outlined in an RFP.
- Successful professional report to Board of Selectmen - strike entire paragraph.
- Under Selection Process – 1st paragraph replace the entire “Overview” paragraph.
- Scope of Work, Page 2 – Strike everything from Overview to Phase 1. Then proceed with description of phases 1,2,3,4. Reference the AZTech and SBS Studies under the Introduction and before the Scope of Work.
- Change Selection Process Date to September 11.
- Change August 26 date in last paragraph.
- Under Prepared Detailed Cost Estimator, let the architects/engineers perform the cost estimating. There is a vast amount of work involved in cost estimating and we do not need to pay for it twice. Also, this information should be included in the RFP not the RFQ.
- Does 9.4 include Construction Manager? Has the Committee decided on a Construction Manager, and if so, when will this individual be brought into the project? Pre-construction services are just as important as construction services. When that individual comes in will have an impact on what the design professionals submit. At what point do we have an independent third party commence cost estimating verification? While soft costs are incorporated, identification of those costs has not occurred. It was noted that generally a Construction Manger is hired within a month after the design professional. Action by the Board of Selectmen will determine when the Construction Manger should be hired.
- Timeline is meant to be part of this document and these dates should be reflected in Scope of Work document prepared by David Barkin as well.
- “Electronic collaboration software” entails that all documents should be hosted by the design professionals, electronically on site. During the Amity process, this proved very helpful as all documents were available for public. It was agreed this would read as “electronic collaboration capacity”. It was also pointed out that the Town should retain ownership of the electronic documents upon completion of the project.
- It was questioned who would be responsible for schedule development? Generally, the Construction Manager, and architect are relieved of that responsibility. Perhaps consideration of hiring a Commissioning agent, who could act as the lead for the project, could be brought in during the early stages as well due to the complexity of the systems involved. Preventative maintenance should also be part of the commissioning process descriptions.
- When does staff involvement occur relative to accessibility for equipment, training, approvals submittals, etc.? Do we have the capability to perform the necessary efficiency functions? Who guides the training process if internal staff should be responsible for maintenance?
- How much of the language under “Phase” should be included in the RFQ versus the RFP. It was agreed under “Overview” everything except the last sentence would be deleted.
- Change the RFQ and Legal Notice submittal requirements to “four hard copies plus pdf version” for each proposal submission.

MOTION #3 – AMEND LEGAL NOTICE

Move that we amend the Legal Notice.

Ms. McCreven

Second by Mr. Buda

UNANIMOUS

The committee will meet on August 20 to review the RFQ and on September 10 to review the RFP at 6:30 PM. It is anticipated interviews will be conducted on September 24th at 6:30 PM.

ADJOURN: (8:32 PM)

Ms. McCreven

Second Mr. Estra

UNANIMOUS