

## **Greenwich Board of Education Minutes of the GHS Front Entry Committee Meeting**

DATE: September 7, 2022

LOCATION: Virtual via Google Meet

TIME: 8:00 am

### **Committee Members Present:**

Stephen Walko - Chairman

Jake Allen- Vice Chairman

Maureen Bonanno-Secretary

Ashley Cole

Megan Galleta

Louis Contadino

Stephanie Cowie

Christina Downey (BOE)

Leslie Moriarty (BET)

### **Ex-Officio Members Present:**

Craig Amundson (RTM)

Ralph Mayo (GHS Principal)

Steven Swidler (BOE Staff)

Tom Bobkowski (BOE - Central Office)

Lauren Rabin (Board of Selectmen)

Dan Watson (BOE- Central Office)

Dennis Yeskey (P&Z)

### **Others Present:**

David Stein (Silver Petrucelli)

Chris Cykley (CSG)

### **Not Present:**

Will Schwartz (DPW)

- **Call to Order:** Meeting was called to order by Mr. Walko at 8:02 a.m.
- **Silver Petrucelli Proposal Discussion:**
  - Mr. Walko opened the meeting with a recap from the last meeting: following a BOE request for a revamped design, Silver Petrucelli was asked to submit a new proposal for architectural services.
  - Mr. Walko added that there was a discussion regarding costs, and noted that any future money spent on soft costs will be taken away from the allocated budget for hard costs (construction costs). Based on existing commitments between the architect, CSG from a state perspective and any potential for a project manager, effectively all of this money comes out of the hard cost money.

- Mr. Walko reminded the committee that at our last meeting, the committee discussed whether the design could go over the budget allocation and noted that the predominant opinion was that we should stay within budget or within a modest amount over budget, but going over budget would entail going back to the RTM and BET. He added that in an ideal scenario, we would have a design that is within budget with these additional costs.
- Mr. Walko noted that he circulated the proposal from Silver Petrucelli to the committee, which in total is \$60,000, and the committee will be voting on this item today for Silver Petrucelli to begin to develop new plans.
- Ms. Downey asked if there were any funds leftover from the A&E phase. Mr. Walko responded that there is virtually nothing remaining. Ms. Moriarty added that we have committed \$241,950 of the \$250,000 and that assumes that the \$160,250 of the original Silver Petrucelli proposal will still be spent, the majority which is left is for construction administration, and that is not duplicated in the incremental request in front of us today. She added that there is \$40,000 outstanding for CSG, and from the original proposal there was some additional time and scope that we have approved already for S&P, so we are left with \$8,000 of committed money. Ms. Moriarty noted there was also \$660 paid to the town for the permit.
- Mr. Walko added that the committed amount does not include a cost for a Clerk of Works or Owners Rep, which was a goal of the committee to have. Ms. Downey asked if we had a sense of how much that would be and Mr. Walko responded that we do not have that yet.
- Mr. Walko asked Mr. Stein about the limitations, noted in the proposal, on the number of meetings. He noted there was a limit of 6 committee meetings, 3 Land Use meetings and 1 prep meeting regarding the state reimbursement. Mr. Stein responded that with the last proposal, they needed to come back for additional time for Land Use, however, since the project has already been presented to both commissions, he believes that 3 meetings should be sufficient.
- Ms. Moriarty asked if Mr. Yeskey or Mr. Contadino would have perspective on how P&Z might address this project, and whether it would be the same in depth review as the first time.
- Mr. Contadino responded that since the scale of the project is smaller, P&Z should take that into consideration, but he is unsure about ARC
- Mr. Yeskey responded that P&Z would like to streamline the process and suggested that when we have a base design, we should go in for a pre-app and explained that a pre-app is a 20 min discussion to smoke out any major issues and, as far as ARC, we should try to streamline that process as well. He reminded the committee that ARC is only advisory and we can give direction at some point.
- Ms. Cole agreed with Mr. Yeskey regarding the pre-app process. And Mr. Yeskey added that it is a public meeting so the neighbors could have input at that time.
- Ms. Downey noted her concern with limiting the number of Land Use meetings to 3, when some meetings could be only 15 minutes but there are more of them and

she asked if the proposal could be by the number of hours vs. the number of meetings. Ms. Downey also asked about the bid phase fees in the proposal and Mr. Stein responded that they can put together an allowance for time allocated to meetings but suggested that instead of hourly proposals, he could adjust the proposal to include a swing of up or down 2 meetings and if more additional work is required they would have a conversation with the committee. Mr. Stein added that regarding the bid phase, they are not requesting any additional increase or escalation in their fee. It's a duplicate effort so they will keep the same fee of \$5,800 and since construction administration hasn't been expended yet, he did not add it.

- Mr. Walko noted the new proposal includes 3 concept floor plans and he asked Mr. Stein if at least one of those plans could include a design with all costs and is within budget including, the owners rep and contingency. Mr. Stein agreed it makes sense with the understanding that there will need to be a solution that there can be enough of a contingency built in. Mr. Walko believes that it is our obligation to provide a security vestibule design that is within budget, whether or not that design is well received by the committee. Ms. Moriarty agreed but the responsibility would be ours to determine the contingency and owners rep amount. The committee agreed that a 10% contingency would be acceptable.
- Mr. Stein suggested that it may be beneficial for CSG to do a side by side estimate for more due diligence, and that would help to get a better sense of the soft cost component and would help them not under-design to stay within budget. Mr. Cykley stated that their estimator will work with real time costs and can provide a 3rd party estimate. Mr. Allen asked Mr. Cykley what the fee would be and Mr. Walko suggested the timing would be before P&Z, after pre-app but before we fully go for final approval. Mr. Stein noted that there is still some unpredictability in the market. Mr. Cykley noted that the biggest challenge is that it is a small, stand-alone project and we will feel the effect all the way through. Mr. Allen asked if this was an added service and Mr. Walko responded that he will clarify that with BOE purchasing.
- Ms. Cowie clarified that the \$30K PTA landscape money is for hardscape only and she asked if she should go back to the PTA to see if it should be added as a fundraising arm and Mr. Walko responded that we don't have enough information yet.
- Mr. Contadino noted that even though the project is smaller, it is still a relatively complicated project regarding the logistics of moving students around and there is an inherent complexity to the location of the vestibule which he believes is reflected in some of the costs.
- Ms. Moriarty asked if there would be a conversation of what we want to see in the revised design and what elements are critical and which are more flexible and Mr. Walko responded that is why he raised the point that at least one revised version stayed within budget. He added, at the last meeting there was a discussion regarding including ballistic glass for the glass corridor that the goal is to still get visitors to the admin wing as opposed to into the building. Mr. Walko stated that

we will be voting on the proposal today so any comments such as these should be discussed now as to give direction to the architects as to what the plans should look like. Ms. Moriarty clarified that the key elements are a secure entrance, the connection to the administration wing and the landscape plan required by P&Z.

- Ms. Cole confirmed that the neighborhood wants to see an attractive entryway.
- Ms. Downey asked how the allowance for the meetings in the proposal should be addressed and Mr. Walko agreed that the vote will be on the proposal as amended, plus or minus 2 meetings and Mr. Stein confirmed that he will send a revised letter for execution.

- **Approval of Proposal:**

**Motion was made by Jake Allen and seconded by Leslie Moriarty to approve the Silver Petrucelli proposal, as amended, in the amount of \$60,280. The motion was approved.**

*The Motion Passed 9-0-0*

- **Approval of Minutes:**

**Motion was made by Jake Allen and seconded by Leslie Moriarty to approve the minutes of the August 22nd, 2022 meeting. The motion was approved.**

*The Motion Passed 9-0-0*

- **Going Forward/Next Meeting:**

- Mr. Stein stated that he will assemble a team to get started on a schematic design, working through October with the expectation to have P&Z approval (assuming there are 3 meetings) by Nov/Dec.
- Mr. Walko suggested the committee meet again on Wednesday September 28th however Ms. Downey noted a scheduling conflict so the committee decided on meeting on Thursday, Oct 6th at 8am to review the 3 concepts.
- Mr. Walko will circle back with Eugene from Purchasing on the 3rd party estimator as well as a budget for the owners rep. Regarding the timeline noted in the proposal, construction would now take place next summer.

- **Adjourn:**

- The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Walko at 8:40am.

Submitted by Maureen Bonanno on October 4th, 2022