

Greenwich Board of Education
Minutes of the New Lebanon Building Committee Meeting

DATE: Friday July 31, 2015
LOCATION: Havemeyer Board Room
TIME: 8:00-9:00 a.m.

Committee Members Present:

Stephen Walko - Chair
Peter Bernstein (BOE)
Dean Goss
Brian Harris
Patricia Baiardi Kantorski – Clerk
Clare Kilgallen

Ex-Officio Members Preset:

Jake Allen (RTM)
Nick Macri (P&Z Commission)
Drew Marzullo (Selectman)
Barbara O’Neil- Chairman (BOE)
Will Schwartz (DPW)
Tony Turner (RTM)

Others Present:

Ronald Matten (BOE Director of Facilities)

This meeting was called to order by Mr. Walko at 8:00 a.m.

Proposed RFP for Architectural Services

- Subcommittee (consisting of Brian Harris, Patricia Kantorski, Claire Kilgallen and Nick Macri) met on July 22nd to begin the process of reviewing the RFP
- Mr. Macri provided an overview of the subcommittee meeting explaining that the main goal of the committee is to reorganize the RFP in order to provide the architect with a clear vision of committee expectations, specifically what the architect should provide and the timeline for the project. Technical information should also be included.
- The subcommittee suggested looking at prior works of the architects rather than solely their conceptual designs. They proposed to ask the architect to describe which one of their previous projects best represents them. This will give the committee the opportunity to correspond with the owners of those prior works and receive feedback about the architect.

- After a brief discussion, the committee concluded that the best way to approach the architect selection process would be to not make limiting statements in the RFP, thus giving all architects the opportunity to present the best possible design.
- Mr. Turner asked if there is any leeway in the current project timeline.
 - Ms. Kilgallen suggested adding another column on the RFP for duration. This will provide the architect with an idea of which dates are firm
 - The timeline according to State and further approval deadlines to be confirmed by Mr. Matten
 - Discussion followed regarding the timeline of the RFP and when it is going to be posted to the BOE website
 - Mr. Matten confirmed that the RFP needs to be posted on the website for twelve business days
 - Mr. Walko suggests a vote on September 9, 2015 and presentation to the BOE on September 10th. During this time it needs to go through the purchasing and legal department.
 - After this step, the subcommittee can begin going through the contract and submit to legal department for review
 - October 2015 - semi-accurate numbers for the project are due and changes can be submitted up until the December BOE Work Session
- Analysis of page four of the RFP- special instructions
 - Hard Costs, construction and escalation and the sentence referring to the design of pricing were considered too ambiguous and will need further clarification
 - Mr. Harris read aloud from the document that the current target for hard costs of construction is 21.2 million includes 10% design and pricing contingencies. The number for the hard costs of construction needs to be confirmed as well as if this relates back to the 40 million dollars.
 - Mr. Walko asked what did the BET put in their capital plan budget for this project and if it included the hard costs? The number \$40.75 million, which does not include environmental testing/remediation, modulars and bussing for students, needs to be confirmed. This confirmed number should be included in the RFP in order to provide the architect with parameters/limitations regarding this project.
 - Ben Branyan was phoned during the meeting and will confirm that the \$21.2 million does not include contingencies. Copy of the CIP initial form is needed.
 - Ms. Kilgallen asked does the construction manager impact these numbers?
 - Mr. Walko tasked the subcommittee with identifying what is the difference between project manager and construction manager and the role each plays. This is important to understand how the project is managed and structured.

Additional RFP Questions/concerns

- Mr. Walko brings up the state standards certification for having a “green school”. LEED is a green building certification program that creates the standards of which a building is considered energy efficient. The levels of certification include certified, silver, gold and platinum. Should this be included in the RFP? Is there a difference between the State Certification vs. LEED silver?
 - Mr. Harris explained that incorporating in the RFP committee desires regarding potential certifications could be beneficial for the architect
- Ms. Kantorski suggested to further clarify the project description. Specifically, what should the architect be responsible for? She proposed to add that the site design include the field, wooded area and existing public library.
- Mr. Allen asked if a confidentiality agreement be included in the RFP (to be discussed)
- Ms. Kantorski also questioned if the committee should request audited financial statements from the architectural firm.
 - Another future question for legal
- Ms. Kilgallen to work on further modifying the requirements section

A2-T2 Testing Update

- Mr. Matten confirmed that the A2-T2 testing is underway and should be completed by September

Final Thoughts

- Mr. Walko suggests the committee look at potential additional subcommittees such as one to specifically evaluate the timeline.
- The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Walko at 9:22 a.m.