I. Call to Order – Committee Chairperson Stephen Woods called the meeting to order at 5:16 PM.

II. Roll Call – Members present: Stephen Woods, Chairperson; Michael Camillo; Kim Radda (joined at 5:20 PM); Danielle Drzod; Amy Perotti; Carol Duggan; and Jeremy Whetzel. Others Present: Paul Dominov and Jennifer Mangiagli, Kaestle Boos Associates; Marnie Liska and Brian Giuliano, Construction Solutions Group; Tom DiMauro, Newfield Construction; Maureen Brummett, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools, Lou Jachimowicz, Chief Finance and Operating Officer, and Jason Smith, Principal; James Krupienski, Town Clerk; and Jeff Baron, Director of Administrative Services.

III. Public Participation – None.

IV. Take Action on Prior Meeting Minutes - Mr. Camillo made a motion that the minutes of the December 16, 2021 meeting be accepted as presented. A second to the motion was made by Ms. Perotti. The motion passed by a vote of 6 YES to 0 NO.

V. Take Action on Invoices – Ms. Liska noted that the invoices presented this evening had been reviewed by her and were in accordance with the program budget. Ms. Radda made a motion that the invoices be approved as presented. A second to the motion was provided by Ms. Duggan (editor's note, there were three invoices – EnviroMed for $10,795.00; Innovative Engineering Systems for $1,446.50; and Kaestle Boos Associates for $72,240.79) The motion passed by a vote of 7 YES to 0 NO.

VI. Architect’s Update – presented by Ms. Mangiagli. Kaestle Boos Associates is finishing up the Contract Documents phase of the project. There is an upcoming presentation to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (TPZ), scheduled for January 12th. Written responses to the comments made by the Town Planner and the Town Engineer were provided to those officials. The Town Planner is fine with their responses. The Fire Marshal is reviewing information as well. Mr. DiMauro put the pre-construction schedule on the screen for all Committee members to see, at the request of Ms. Liska. Ms. Liska stated that the project team has gotten approvals and completed documents. Line 23 on the pre-construction schedule is the TPZ Site Plan Approval. A lot of work is going on behind the scenes and there is a lot that goes into these items on the schedule. Ms. Mangiagli stated that the DEEP (the State Department of Energy and Environmental Protection) Discharge Permit Application (line 16 on the schedule) was filed by Newfield Construction along with the Civil Engineer for the project. Stormwater activity is to be monitored during construction. Ms. Liska pointed
out that there is a wetlands area at the corner by Reservoir Road and Fenn Road, that has to be addressed. During construction, authorities don’t want runoff going into this area. Ms. Mangiagli added that the official name is the Stormwater Pollution Control Plan. She anticipates that the 90% Construction Documents estimate will be reconciled with Newfield Construction in time to present it to the Building Committee on January 20th. Kaestle Boos Associates also anticipates a meeting with the Town’s 3rd Party Code Reviewer, Versteeg Associates. Ms. Mangiagli hasn’t received any comments from Versteeg Associates, but they generally have them, and those comments will be addressed. After that, local officials will be asked to sign off. The project can’t go to bid until the State gives their approval. The State needs to know that the Building Committee has approved the plans and specifications to go to the State. The Board of Education will need to do so also. The Town Council will approve as well, although that is not needed for the State. She concluded her remarks by stating that Kaestle Boos Associates was trying to get to the State PCR meeting date. Mr. DiMauro thanked her.

VII. Owner’s Project Manager Update – presented by Ms. Liska. She wanted to put what was presented today in context. The schedule items in red are for Town approvals. The items in black are the team’s approach. The project is now in the Construction Document phase. She then presented a letter with a cost proposal for Kaestle Boos Associates for additional services, regarding the furniture in the school. The proposal is for $8,000 and the services in the letter are outside the Kaestle Boos Associates’ contract. She recommends approval of it. It would be to conduct an inventory of furniture to determine what is in like-new condition. Ms. Liska will help Kaestle Boos Associates. She felt it might save the project $100,000. If bids are favorable, the Town may not need to re-use any furniture. She anticipates that some furniture will receive a designation that it could be re-used. Approval of this is not a formal commitment to re-use furniture. It is a safety measure in case bids go over budget. This is not within the current scope of Kaestle Boos Associates’ contract. The budget can handle it. Mr. Whetzel asked if there was a standard rate? Ms. Liska replied that it was based on labor at the Kaestle Boos Associates hourly rate. They will compare the furniture to that on an existing document to see if this furniture can translate to the new program. She feels it is a good exercise to do to make sure they don’t go over budget. Mr. Whetzel asked if they test for hazardous materials in the furniture? Ms. Liska replied no, the furniture made today does not have any hazardous materials, so there is no need to test. When the time comes to decide on the furniture, this would allow the opportunity to make a recommendation to the Town, the school and the Board of Education. This is just an inventory but it is quite time consuming. Ms. Perotti asked if this was the only way we can re-use furniture? Ms. Liska felt that was a difficult question to answer. The Architect is tasked to comply with the Education Specifications. Any evaluation beyond that is not in their scope of work. Some furniture might work in another school in Newington. Ms. Mangiagli added that, based on the Education Specifications and meetings with the staff they know what is needed for each room. They have done a cost estimate for all new furniture and it exceeds the budget. This analysis would look at the existing furniture. Otherwise someone would need to go through the building and tell Kaestle Boos Associates to save furniture. Is there anything in the school that would work for the program? The next step would be to re-use furniture in other schools. Ms. Liska noted that on other projects they have scheduled furniture for the entire district. Mr. Whetzel stated that it sounds like a good idea and that this is part of the normal process. He recognizes that this is outside their scope of work and that it was not thought of before. He asked if it was in the project timeline? Ms.
Liska replied that it can be done within the project timeline. Mr. Whetzel then asked if other items will pop up as needed? Mr. Woods responded that there would most likely be other items. That is what the Owner’s Contingency is for. Mr. Camillo then made a motion that the Committee approve having Kaestle Boos Associates do an inventory of the furniture at Anna Reynolds School in accordance with their proposal, for an amount not to exceed $8,000. A second to the motion was provided by Ms. Duggan. There was no discussion. The motion passed by a vote of 7 YES to 0 NO.

VIII. Construction Manager’s Update – provided by Mr. DiMauro. He stated that he had nothing major to add. He expected Newfield Construction would have an estimate to publish next week of the 90% Construction Documents, and to present an estimate to the Building Committee at their next meeting on January 20th.

IX. Any Other Business Pertinent to the Committee – None.

X. Public Participation – None.

XI. Comments by Members – Ms. Perotti asked what the end date of the project was? Mr. DiMauro responded that it was the summer of 2024. He is refining a preliminary schedule and will have it for the next meeting. Ms. Liska noted that is a worst-case scenario. We will try to finish earlier.

XII. Adjournment – the meeting adjourned at 6:01 PM.