

# SMBC Minutes 01/17/2017

[Printer-Friendly Version](#)

Town of North Stonington  
SCHOOL MODERNIZATION BUILDING COMMITTEE (SMBC)  
North Stonington Gymnasium Band room  
Tuesday January 17, 2017 7:00pm

Attendance: Walt Mathwich, Sam Cherenzia, Jay Peterson, Mike Urgo, Bob Carlson, Dan Spring, and Alice Zeeman. Mike Anderson arrived late.

Architect (Quisenberry) was represented by Adam Tarfano.

Construction manager, or CM (Downes) was representative was Paul Wojtowicz.

Current stage of the project: Design development.

1. Call to order. 7:04 pm.

2. Correspondence.

a. Mike Urgo E-mailed detailed construction budget estimates (by Downes) to us.

b. Eagle contract has been reviewed by Jay Peterson and Mike Anderson. We are awaiting comments from Eagle and then will be forwarded to town attorney

c. Mike Urgo attended the town meeting of the BOF, BOE, BOS on 01/11. He reported on the status of the modernization project.

d. Guy Boucher (Maintenance Supervisor, North Stonington Public Schools), will be attending meetings with the architect and construction manager on an approximate bi-weekly basis.

e. The SMBC contribution to the North Stonington annual budget report was accepted by the BOF and included in the annual report.

3. Invoices. We have one invoice from Eagle Environmental but we can't approve it until the town contract with Eagle is finalized.

4. SMBC minutes approval. Bob Carlson moved to approve the minutes from the January 3, 2017 meeting. Sam Cherenzia seconded and the committee passed the motion 7-0-0.

5. Architect and Construction manager reports.

a. The Board of Selectmen, Shawn Murphy, Mike Urgo, architect and CM will have a meeting Tuesday January 24th to discuss and clarify the construction manager contract.

b. Paul Wojtowicz reported that they submitted a revised "staffing in general requirements" for their contract with North Stonington. The overall project budget remains the same. They determined we will not proceed with the occupied renovation on the grade school in order to go with the safest approach. We are back to the schedule originally envisioned, and changes in staffing are required.

c. Floor was open to SMBC to question the CM on the cost estimates he provided to us and related issues.

1) Paul responded to technical questions about the meaning and scope of some line items.

2) The SMBC noted that the total project schematic construction budget was under by \$14,844 rather than the \$43,748 given by the CM in the cost estimate memorandum. Paul noted the math error.

3) The estimates contain contingency of 9.25% for the schools. Paul explained this reflects expected costs due to design refinement going forward, and the number will be reduced in further steps.

4) The estimates contain escalation costs. This is because the estimates are in today's prices, and final costs will likely be different.

5) Paul confirmed we are close to schedule on bids; we can expect to have the bids out by the end of April. He mentioned that he would also be requesting alternate bids that would incorporate "optional" scope and cost less in case the bids for the project as planned come in too high.

6) The SMBC wondered if it was possible for the construction costs to go over the contract amounts, creating financial problems for the town. Paul assured the final subcontractor contracts will be binding and we will have an appropriate contingency fee for change orders. He said that the construction will not cost us more than the contractual amounts.

7) Committee expressed need for budget summary sheet. Paul agreed and Mike reiterated that the committee will be holding a workgroup meeting dedicated to this task at the end of the month. We are likely to have this sheet available by mid February.

8) SMBC asked architect and CM about structural engineering process. Architect said that the plans their designs are submitted to a contracted engineering firm. The finalized plans are stamped by the firm for validation. That firm is involved in the process at this stage. Note: As per their original proposal the engineering firm would be Perrone & Zajada.

d. Downes and Quisenberry and Eagle Environmental will meet with state regulators to determine the best way to remediate PCBs. They continue to research the issue. They have allocated enough money in the budget to cover all problems that surface.

e. Construction Manager is working to schedule a design development review with the state.

f. Architect reported they are making changes to the design as needed, but so far they are small. The SMBC stated that the aesthetics of the main entrance to the Jr/High school needed improvement.

6. Discussion of solar options. Architect reported on solar energy possibilities. The Connecticut Green Bank offers the opportunity for solar installation with financial benefits to the school. The decision to use solar collectors is up to the Board of Education since it will be a lease option and outside of the scope of the project. The role of the SMBC would be to ensure that we add the necessary infrastructure during construction so that post-construction solar installation can be done with little impact on the schools. The SMBC discussed and is supportive.

7. Update on environmental plan and options.

a. Architect reported CLA septic design proposal. Is on track for submitting to DEEP on Feb. 8. Architect requested contract modification to add \$97,000 to cover the proposal. The SMBC deferred a decision and wants to study the matter.

- b. Architect reported that they asked three companies for geotechnical proposals. This is boring mostly in preparation for foundations. The the lowest bid is \$8,500 from Welti Geotechnical, P.C. Sam Cherenzia moved we accept that proposal and motion was seconded by Dan Spring. The motion passed 8-0-0.
8. Discussion of secretarial duties/position. Bob Carlson reported that incorporating the secretarial duties into an existing or pending position at the school would not be possible but that Peter Nero would like to see job description and help us. Mike Urgo will ensure the position is forwarded to Peter Nero.
9. Communications. No update.
10. Future strategies.
- a. The SMBC examined the Quisenberry contract and confirmed that design of a DEEP septic system plan is not covered by the contract which was known, however, septic issues were budgeted for. The committee will research the cost and how to proceed with the architect on this issue.
- b. The SMBC discussed whether there might be a need for us to hire an engineering firm to confirm the plans submitted by the project structural engineer. Committee members pointed out that the state signs off on the plans and stamps them if approved. Committee members did not consider it necessary to hire an independent engineer.
- c. The architect plans as they now stand have a small green roof on the front of the middle/high school above the first floor art room extension. It is on the north side of the building, and perhaps permanently shaded from the sun. The area is much smaller than originally envisioned and the architect had pointed out it would need costly access. The SMBC would like to further investigate this aspect of the project and if it is the best use of funds given the reduction in scope. Mike Urgo will discuss with the CM/Architect and will report back to the committee.
11. Adjourned at 9:30 PM. Sam Cherenzia moved and Mike Anderson seconded. Motion passed 8-0-0.