

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

DATE: Wednesday, February 24, 2016
LOCATION: BOE, Havemeyer Board Room
TIME: 8:00 - 9:40 a.m.

Committee Members Present:

Stephen Walko - Chairman
Patricia Baiardi Kantorski - Clerk
Bill Drake - Vice Chairman (BET)
Clare Kilgallen
Peter Bernstein (BOE)
Dean L. Goss
Jake Allen
Brian Harris via phone

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Laura Erickson (BOE Chair)
Tony Turner (RTM)
Will Schwartz (DPW)
Nick Macri (P&Z)
Drew Marzullo (Selectman)

Others Present:

Ryszard Szczypek (Tai Soo Kim)
Ronald Matten (DOF-BOE)
Barbara O'Neill (BOE)
Debbie Applebaum (BOE)
Eugene Watts (BOE Chief Buyer)
John Frangione (BOE Facilities)
James Hricay (MDO_BOE)
Peter Manning (Gilbane)

1. Meeting was called to order by Mr. Walko at 8:00 am
2. Mr. Walko discussed the following items with the committee:
 - a. The status of the Construction Manager's (CM) contract. He said it should be signed today. He also said it was important the CM, Gilbane, begin working on the budget estimate immediately.

- b. Mr. Walko informed the committee that the NLBC is scheduled to go before the BET this Friday, February 26, 2016, at 9:00 am. He said he is optimistic the BET will approve the project budget.
- c. The committee discussed whether they were going to vote on the budget as presented by Gilbane today or postpone it until a later date.
- d. Mr. Walko said the committee would discuss the results of the meetings TSK had with the Town agencies and school personnel at a future meeting.

3. Update by Tai Soo Kim.

- a. The committee discussed the status of the remediation work of the playing fields. It was noted that the Town will do the field remediation.
- b. Ryszard Szczypek (TSK) recommended the remediation work be included in the Project Budget, because it maybe eligible for State Reimbursement. He also said all expenses including the cost of the modulars and remediation should be in the budget, which could be as high as 80%.
- c. Ryszard Szczypek said TSK was impressed by the estimating work Gilbane had done. He further said that the extent they prepared the estimate goes to the level and accuracy of the numbers.
- d. Peter Manning (Gilbane) passed out copies to the committee members of the 32 page detailed estimate they prepared. He then made a power point presentation of the estimate. He said Gilbane had reviewed the estimate with TSK yesterday and invited the committee to go through it with him.
- e. Mr. Manning said it was typical to be over budget at the Schematic Design Phase of the project. He explained that the Team will now do a process called 'Value Engineering'. Gilbane will propose options to bring the budget down and review them with the committee. The savings will bring the budget inline with a typical project at the Schematic Design Phase.

4. Discussion by the Committee of the Budget

- a. Mr. Manning said it is common for the estimate to be "over" budget in Schematic Design Phase. Anything between 10% and under is in the strike zone which we can work with. He said the New Lebanon Project estimate was at 8% over budget.
- b. The committee decided the estimate for the project needs to be presented as 3 different numbers. One number for constructing the building, one for the field work and another for the cost of the modulars.
- c. Laura Erickson asked Gilbane if they could provide the committee with comparable examples. Mr. Manning said they will.

- d. Mr. Manning explained that the original rough estimate (not prepared by Gilbane) was at a very early stage and it was not based on the reality of the most current project details they have now.
- e. Tony Turner said the Town is sensitive to overruns and the numbers need to be defensible. Mr. Manning responded that Gilbane's track record of keeping the project in budget is good. He also said the possible unknowns which could lead to overruns are the abatement of the existing building and the site work.
- f. Mr. Manning said the architectural schematic design drawings were very comprehensive and detailed, so he felt Gilbane's estimate was accurate.
- g. The committee questioned Mr. Manning about cost controls. He said some of the items they had identified are the structural steel and glass.
- h. Laura Erickson was asked if the Ed. Specs. were final. Ryszard Szczypek said the Ed. Specs. are extremely thorough and are reflected in the estimate. The one area TSK deviated from the Ed. Specs. is the material of the corridor walls. He said TSK determined that concrete block walls were not necessary and as a cost saving measure they designed them using gypsum board.
- i. Patricia Kantorski asked Mr. Manning if they had tracked the budget for past projects from Schematic Design thru Construction. He said Gilbane had.
- j. Clare Kilgallen said the estimate was a real number and we should rely on the professionals expertise. She also stated that it is typical for the estimate to be higher in Schematic Design then in Construction Documents.
- k. Drew Marzullo recommended the committee discuss the reductions at this meeting.
- l. Ron Matten reminded the committee that the original building was estimated at 58,000 square feet and is now estimated to be 62,000 sq. ft. The discrepancy in the size of the building is due to the fact that the original building calculations did not include the exterior walls.
- m. Peter Bernstein asked what the bottom line was with respect to the building size and cost.
- n. Will Schwartz said the original estimate of June 2015 should be adjusted for inflation.
- o. Ryszard Szczypek said the estimate was a 'Not-to-Exceed' number. He also said TSK has never gone back to a Town for more money.

5. Discussions of Next Steps:

- a. The committee discussed if they would vote on the budget estimate today or at the next meeting. Several committee members expressed the need for further time to review the budget.
- b. Steve Walko said it was highly problematic to go to the BET with an estimate of \$40,343,368. and suggested holding another meeting before Friday's Meeting.

- c. Mr. Walko said he would present the BET with three separate numbers. The cost of constructing the building, including demolition of the existing school, the cost of the renovating the fields and the cost of the modulars.
 - d. Dean Goss stated that this was only an appropriation.
 - e. Bill Drake informed the committee that the BET wants to see typical standards for new school construction in the state of CT, in Fairfield County and in Greenwich.
 - f. Ryszard Szczypek discussed the Value Engineering process and the specifics of this project.
6. A motion was made by Peter Bernstein and seconded by Bill Drake to accept a budget of \$37,550,390. for the school building including demolition of the existing school, \$2,412,399. for the portable classrooms and \$380,739. for the ball field improvements with a total cost of \$40,343,528. to be moved forward to the BET. The vote was 4 in favor - 2 against - 2 absent. The motion was passed.
7. Bill Drake made a motion, but then withdrew the motion, to ask the architect and construction manager to do the Value Engineering now and for the committee to vote on the budget next week.
8. Approval of Meeting Minutes.
 - a. Approval of the meeting minutes was tabled until the next meeting.
9. The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Walko at 9:40 am.