

# **BRS Town Building Committee Meeting**

**May 26, 2009**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chair David King called the meeting to order (6:40 PM).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:** David King, Chair; David Barkin, Sheila McCreven BOE; Steve Buda, Marc Estra, Jon Gorham and Joe Hellauer (7:04 PM).

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chuck Zettergren, WSD Business Manager; Marsha DeGennaro, Clerk.

**GUEST:** Donald Harwood

**PUBLIC COMMENT** - None

## **MOTION #1 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Move that we approve the minutes of April 28, 2009 Meeting.

Mr. Estra

Second by Mr. King

Mr. Estra requested the minutes be changed to reflect his comments against issuing one RFP for Architectural design services. *“To reiterate my objections, we are at the very early stage of this project and the scope is not yet defined. We are unsure if the majority of the funding will be spent on architectural work (windows, doors, outdoor storage building, etc.) or on mechanical work (air conditioning, HVAC upgrades, boilers, IAQ issues, etc.) The work load balance between architectural and mechanical work will vary considerably depending how we define the final project scope. I do not believe it is possible for any architectural firm to present this committee a fair price until we further develop the project scope. Basing the architectural bid just on the budget of \$ 9.6 MM is a flawed concept. Thus, I believe we need to first invest into a preliminary RFP for both architectural and engineering services to develop the scope of work and once that step is accomplished then issue an RFP for final design documents.”*

## **MOTION #1A – APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Move that we approve the minutes of April 28, 2009 Meeting as amended.

Mr. Estra

Second by Mr. King

UNANIMOUS

## **MOTION #2 – APPROVAL OF SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES**

Move that we approve the minutes of May 7, 2009 Subcommittee Meeting.

Mr. Barkin

Second by Mr. Gorham

IN FAVOR: Mr. Buda, Mr. Goham and Mr. King

ABSTAIN: Mr. Barkin, Mr. Estra and Ms. McCreven

***MOTION PASSES 3-3***

Messrs. Barkin and Estra and Ms. McCreven abstained as they were not in attendance at the May 7 meeting.

Mr. Donald Harwood, a volunteer for various building projects the Wallingford Public Schools, shared his experience to help the committee avoid some of the pitfalls associated with school building projects. He provided a brief overview of his professional background. Some of the key points raised were:

- ◆ Committee members must possess a willingness to be actively engaged in all aspects of the project. Scheduling is a challenge and it may prove difficult to have the full committee together. You may want to consider authorizing subcommittee for specific actions. These actions should be outlined, in consultation with an attorney, as there may

be a need for multiple signers and/or specialty assignments. It may also be beneficial to establish a double-check process and appoint individuals who have expertise in financials. Once the project is underway, the general contractor or construction manager will be looking for direction and sign-offs on a daily basis.

- ◆ Communication with the Superintendent, building administration, facilities manager, community, CSDE and Town officials is crucial. Monthly updates should be provided to the Board of Education. .
- ◆ The committee should also work closely with the Town Finance Director. It is helpful to have financials on track for state reimbursement from the initial stages to establish a cash flow as soon as possible.

*Mr. Zettergren left the meeting (7:00 PM).*

- ◆ Legal counsel is a phenomenal resource and one of the best investments to ensure contract compliance and performance. Assistance in contract negotiations is crucial. Management of legal expenses throughout the project is important.

*Mr. Hellauer arrived (7:04 PM)*

- ◆ Accurate cost estimating is important.
- ◆ The more predesign testing done at the beginning, the more help it will be in the overall project cost.
- ◆ The Committee should be responsible for defining the project scope and the Education Specs should be inclusive of ALL steps. The potential exists for huge ramifications should a reimbursable item be inadvertently omitted from the Ed Specs. It was noted the ED-049 is the process by which Ed Specs are developed and submitted. *It is anticipated the project submission deadline would be June 30, 2010 and the Superintendent/ administration would be the primary contact for the CSDE coordination.*
- ◆ Project Management - options include construction manager or Owner Representative. Each method works, decide what works for you and which is the best option to minimize risk. Town Counsel may be able to provide guidance.
- ◆ Development of an RFQ for architectural services – recent statute changes mandate a bid process for state funding eligibility (Section 173, CGS).
- ◆ Consider incorporating bonding costs, insurance and legal fees into the project costs.
- ◆ Contingency fund should be a realistic figure.
- ◆ Clean-up is a daunting task with all work crammed into a short time span in the summer. Be sure to budget adequately.
- ◆ Change order process – 5% cap of project costs, be aware of.
- ◆ Performance observation – be careful with cost overruns and manage them carefully. Be in tune to school environment and daily activities.
- ◆ Closeout/punch lists should be disseminated to everyone.
- ◆ State submission process – identify one individual to ensure timelines are adhered to.
- ◆ CSDE code and statute requirements are in the process of change. Be aware of implementation dates, energy conservation/efficiency mandates and stimulus act guidelines.

Mr. Harwood departed the meeting (7:35 PM).

Discussion ensued as to what the next steps should be. A decision to select either the QBS (Qualifications Based Selection) design/bid/build process, or ESPC (Energy Savings Performance Contracting) is necessary. There was consensus among all members that regardless of the process selected energy conservation aspects should be incorporated into the project scope.

An overview of the ESPC process was presented. All buildings have energy waste and the ESPC process presents an opportunity to save money and energy. There are no upfront or out-of-pocket expenses incurred by the Town nor may bonding be necessary. A third party is selected through RFQ to finance, retrofit and select companies who specialize and are experts in energy systems to guarantee savings through energy efficiencies. While similar to the QBS process, this process guarantees energy saving cost measures, improved air quality, state-of-the-art equipment and financing of the entire project. The basic premise is you get experts who do this for a living. The companies only make money if they deliver energy savings. Therefore, the Town is guaranteed the building will become energy efficient and have the latest technology and energy systems available. As the bulk of the project is related to HVAC, air conditioning, and energy conservation areas, this may be a more cost-effective option. It was suggested that a formal presentation on this process be given at the next meeting. It was noted that CABE/CAPSS had a presentation on this process at their annual convention.

Concerns were raised relative to third party utility companies serving the best interest of the town and community. Further, it is not clear how savings in energy costs will be monitored nor who will be responsible for tracking that data. There is a conventional delivery method in place with clearly identified reimburseable costs. The design/bid/build process typically provides more project control and more savings are garnished when design aspects are controlled. Not all aspects of this project are related to energy. Contractors are not educators and it is imperative that we create an exceptional learning environment and maintain classroom aesthetics. This Committee does not have several months to spend deliberating process selection.

*Mr. Zettergren returned (7:40 PM).*

The Town will incur costs either through bonding or paying for energy. Taxpayers might be interested in the ways towns are working to save monies every day. It is also not yet known what the impact of the recent land acquisition will have on our debt profile. Taxpayers need to know that we have thoroughly researched options to save money, especially since this project will go to referendum. Money will be saved through either process provided we attain a cost effective and energy efficient building. It is important that energy options remain flexible for the future and that the Town maintains control of the building.

**MOTION #3 – ESPC PRESENTATION**

Move that we receive a presentation on the ESPC (Energy Savings Performance Contracting) process at the next meeting (June 23, 2009).

Ms. McCreven

Second by Mr. Buda

IN FAVOR: Mr. Buda, Mr. Goham, Mr. King and Ms. McCreven

AGAINST: Mr. Barkin and Mr. Estra

***MOTION PASSES 4-2***

Concern was raised for the applicability of this untested process. BRS should not be an “experiment in process” for the Town or state. It was requested that the presentation include at least one case study that was not successful.

It was requested that Mr. Zettergren present an overview of the timeline of the Connecticut State Department filing process for project funding at the next meeting. Administration was requested to provide an outline that defines the scope of the project and what is required educationally to run the school.

It was agreed the attribute list, outlined by Mr. Barkin, would be expanded and the project schedule timeline updated. This information will be shared with the committee prior to the June 23 meeting.

Mr. Estra requested clarification on what constitutes a quorum.

**ADJOURN:** (8:40 PM):       Ms. McCreven  
                                      Mr. Barkin  
                                      UNANIMOUS

Recorded By Marsha DeGennaro

*All documents and meeting information are available on the town web site, [www.woodbridgect.org](http://www.woodbridgect.org)*