

BRS Town Building Committee Meeting

June 23, 2009

CALL TO ORDER: Chair David King called the meeting to order (6:34 PM).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: David King, Chair; David Barkin, Vice Chair; Sheila McCreven BOE; Steve Buda, Tim Cohen, Marc Estra, Jon Gorham and Sandy Stein.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION #1 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Move that we approve the minutes of May 26, 2009 Meeting.

Mr. Barkin

Second by Ms. McCreven

Mr. Estra requested the minutes be changed to reflect the removal of Mr. King's vote on Motion #3.

MOTION #1A – APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Move that we approve the minutes of May 26, 2009 Meeting as amended.

Mr. Barkin

Second by Ms. McCreven

IN FAVOR: Mr. Barkin, Mr. Buda, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Estra, Mr. Gorham and Ms. McCreven

ABSTAIN: Ms. Stein

MOTION PASSES 6-1

The removal of the vote was questioned. In accordance with Roberts Rules, the Chair will cast a vote only if it is necessary to break a tie.

Energy Savings Performance Contracting

Mr. Gorham presented an overview and background on energy savings performance contracting. The recent construction project with the New Haven Public Schools was highlighted. It was noted that 100% financing was achieved for the Magnet School with 80% for the other schools. The savings on the buildings was then utilized for purchase of capital equipment. A local architectural firm was hired for construction and project management. It was further clarified that in the New Haven project, the firm hired served in the capacity of an Owner/ Representative not as an ESCO agent. Projects also referenced included Windham and Naugatuck.

In Windham, there were insufficient dollars available to finance the capital improvements. An RFP was developed incorporating energy service companies, who managed the project, and which focused on savings and energy systems. Enough savings were garnered to obtain financing to complete the project. ConEdison Solutions provided assistance with financing and grant opportunities, energy baseline studies, monitoring savings and functions/verification of data and consumption to assess energy performance. In the Naugatuck project it was clear the premise of the project was one-for-one-replacement to attain more energy efficiency.

Energy savings performance contracting can work if done well. The ESCO works for client and it can be advantageous to have an energy service company perform system integrations and monitor savings to ensure proper functionality. This is how they obtain a return on their investment. With an ESCO, expenses are absorbed by the energy performing contractor who has a vested interest in the grade and scope of work attained. The companies make money only if they deliver energy

savings. Further, as bonding may not be necessary, the Town incurs limited, if any, costs. ESCO guarantees energy performance. They will have the responsibility to model the building, monitor savings and functions, verification of data and consumption. A primary advantage of ESCO is that monitoring is critical to attaining cost savings. ESCO is a quicker process, provides a creative financing solution for the Town and savings garnered quickly and effectively.

Concerns were raised again relative to third party utility companies serving the best interest of the town and community. Some committee members believed that it is crucial the owner maintain control of the project, and have responsibility for defining the scope of work, not energy service companies. Not all aspects of this project are related to energy. It was also noted that energy service companies may have a preferred vendor lists, which is incorporated into their design, when bidding on projects. We would also be compromising our state reimbursement. It is not clear legally how the ESCO guarantees the contract, who ultimately owns the equipment, how future costs are determined nor how disputes are resolved w/o adding to costs. Further, it is not clear how savings in energy costs will be monitored nor who will be responsible for tracking that data.

Our systems are different, there is a direct impact on student learning, and all systems and/or treatments must be designed properly for a learning environment. Design is extremely important, architect/engineering firms may be more sensitive to our concerns and what best fits our district. We should select the architectural/engineering team that will best serve our interests in designing an energy efficient school. This project will be completed with a fully occupied school at all times. It is important that the firm selected possess a high sensitivity to mission of school with fairly complex design phasing for execution. The Town will be able to attain bonding at very competitive rates. The Town will incur costs either through bonding or paying for energy.

It was not clear whether monitoring does or does not occur at Beecher currently. Even if a current baseline does not exist, one can be developed through calculations and building usage formulas. Offsite monitoring programs are available that provide data based on how well the building is used compared to the way it was designed. Further, as we function differently each year, dependent upon occupancy - summer programs, extra days, etc. corrections should be built into the analysis. It was suggested that regardless of the model selected (QBS or ESCO), we specify what monitoring should occur. It was also suggested that regardless of who is charged with monitoring, independent monitoring should occur by Beecher staff to ensure the numbers are in concert.

It was pointed out that similar designs could be achieved regardless of which process is selected. The two distinct approaches represent different areas of expertise. Whether it is QBS or ESCO, it is necessary to hire an engineer and architect either through RFQ or RFP, and it is possible that an energy company could be the lead architect and/or engineer. We should be respectful of all perspectives and investigate each one thoroughly. Once a decision is rendered on who the Owner/Representative will be, the project could be bid with separate architectural, mechanical and "green" components. There was consensus that regardless of the process selected, energy conservation aspects could be incorporated into the project scope.

Money will be saved through either process provided we attain a cost effective and energy efficient building. Further, the "green" elements could be incorporated into student learning initiatives. It is also possible that the "green" components could be funded through stimulus monies or Clean Air Energy incentives. There was consensus among all members that regardless of the process selected energy conservation aspects should be incorporated into the project scope. As this is not a large project, it may not be a viable project for ESCO. The building uses approximately 60,000 gallons of oil annually. It was suggested that modeling occur now, to provide the committee with important data before final decisions are made. State reimbursement data is also not known and will not be identified until later in the project. It important that the Town's best interest be served long-term. It was agreed the project schedule and timeline, along with the SBS and AzTech studies, could be provided to several ESCO firms to ascertain viability.

Concern was raised regarding the delay in process selection. Several members felt this Committee does not have several months to spend deliberating and that precious time was being lost. Other members believed that another 2-3 weeks deliberating the process selection would not be detrimental. During this time, contact could also be made with the Town Finance Director to obtain bonding ratings and the Town's preference for how the debt should be incurred. The Committee would then be able to compile a complete list of pros and cons to determine the most cost-effective process. The Committee compiled a brief short list of pros and cons:

- ❖ Cons - Risk of loss on CSDE reimbursement - 5-10% on the overall project cost.
 - Pros – not paying financial cost up-front, not borrowing at the same rate as banks.
 - Pros – guaranteed savings, BTU kilowatt monitoring built in.
 - ❖ Cons – we would still hire someone on our side to verify data.
 - Pros – no capital outlay required as the town’s appetite for incurring debt is not known (how this debt would be incurred short-term and what is current outlook for long-term debt for town).
 - Pros-start savings quicker using this process as it is in interest of an ESCO to start saving money immediately.
- Either way, project has to be completed before there are savings.

PROJECT SCHEDULE AND TIMELINE

The Committee updated the project schedule and timeline developed by Mr. Barkin. Suggestions were made as follows:

- ❖ A plan of the physical layout of the school and a copy of the AZTech report be attached as appendences.
- ❖ Language modification on “deferred” maintenance was suggested. This line item would be changed to “Building Repair Options”.
- ❖ Central Clock System be designated separately from the Public Address system.
- ❖ State code compliance and mandated upgrades be added as a separate item.
- ❖ ADA issues, accessibility, Connecticut Fire Safety Code audit for compliance would be included.
- ❖ Building systems would be defined to include air conditioning and air cooling.
- ❖ Incorporation of air quality and humidification under scope of work.
- ❖ Geo Thermal should be a separate item.
- ❖ Language modification on “rate reasonable of return” to “return on investment”.
- ❖ Language modification “windows in entire building” to “replace single glaze windows wherever present with insulated glass units”.
- ❖ Language modification on “Integrate Day Lighting, using different glazing, energy load reduction” (not just window replacement) changed to Integrate Day Lighting, etc.
- ❖ Identify specifically which grade levels or classrooms require upgrades, A, B and C wings as well as casework improvements. Exclude which classrooms we do not want included.
- ❖ IT Infrastructure or telecommunications bullet - add wireless phone coverage. Consideration be given to broaden scope beyond what ACES technology systems currently provide.
- ❖ Roof replacement(s) – obtain verification from Joe Hellauer on the current age of North and South roofs before we define Roof Replacement over A, B and C wings only.
- ❖ Entry Canopy at North Entrance – perhaps include as option. Suggestion was made to have solar reflectives on top of it, to serve as double function.
- ❖ Present findings to Building Committee, add presentation to Board of Education.
- ❖ Change “Building Committee will hire” to “Building Committee will select and recommend for hire”.
- ❖ Specify list of attachments to be included.

Timeline Schedule

Important the Boards of Education, Selectmen and Finance approve the Scope of Work sooner rather than later. This will allow the Committee to request funding for schematic designs and cost modeling while pursuing additional options. This information is required prior to going to referendum. It is crucial that the referendum occurs prior to May 30, 2010. If we do not file our ED-049 prior to June 30, 2010 we could potentially lose an additional year. It was suggested the Scope of Work be presented to the Board of Selectmen at their next meeting on either July 14 or 15.

SUMMER MEETING SCHEDULE

It was strong suggested that the Committee meet more than once a month as momentum continues to be lost. The Committee agreed to meet twice a week for the summer. The meeting day was changed from Tuesday to Thursday. Meetings will be held on:

July 9	7:00 PM
July 23	6:30 PM
August 6	6:30 PM

ADJOURN: (8:51 PM): Ms. McCreven
Ms. Stein
UNANIMOUS

Recorded By Marsha DeGennaro

All documents and meeting information are available on the town web site, www.woodbridgect.org