

TOWN OF NEWINGTON
ANNA REYNOLDS SCHOOL PROJECT BUILDING COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
August 26, 2021, Zoom Event

RECEIVED FOR RECORD
IN NEWINGTON, CT
2021 AUG 30 PM 3:51
Thomas O. Krupinski
Town Clerk

- I. Call to Order – Committee Chairperson Stephen Woods called the meeting to order at 5:31 PM.
- II. Roll Call – Members present: Stephen Woods, Chairperson; Michael Camillo, Chris Miner, Steven Silvia, Cindy Stamm, Carol Duggan, and Jeremy Whetzel. Others present: Beth DelBuono, Mayor (after 5:30 PM); Paul Vessella, Newington Board of Education; Paul Dominov and Jennifer Mangiagli, Kaestle Boos Associates; Jim Giuliano and Marnie Liska, Construction Solutions Group; Tom DiMauro, Newfield Construction; John Luby, EnviroMed Services, Inc. (after 5:25 PM); Rob Ricard, RZ Design Associates, Inc.; Maureen Brummett, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools; Lou Jachimowicz, Chief Finance and Operating Officer; Jason Smith, Principal; James Krupinski, Town Clerk; and Jeff Baron, Director of Administrative Services.
- III. Public Participation – None. Mr. Silvia asked, in light of the directions not being appropriate, how are we communicating out to the public? Mr. Krupinski responded that the public can still use the meeting code and the ID pass code. Mr. Silvia stated that he wants to be sure the public has the opportunity to participate.
- IV. Take Action on Prior Meeting Minutes – Mr. Camillo made a motion that the minutes of the August 12, 2021 meeting be accepted as presented. A second to the motion was made by Mr. Whetzel. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7 YES to 0 NO.
- V. Architect’s Update – Presented by Ms. Mangiagli. The architect was looking for direction on the classroom mechanical units. They had spoken previously about an independent unit for each room. There were questions. The manufacturer can include an ionizer for each unit at a cost of \$600 per unit. Greenwich Public Schools had nine units installed. They don’t appear to have any present issues but really weren’t able to speak with Kaestle Boos Associates in any depth as they were preparing for the start of school. Madison, Maine installed 25 units in a 2012 case study. The case study touts the benefits and the low noise. Ms. Mangiagli has exchanged telephone messages with them, but has been unable to have direct contact with them beyond the case study. The controls for the units meet the noise requirements of the State. Kaestle Boos Associates is looking for direction from the Building Committee in order to meet the schedule. Dr. Brummett had concerns about the long-term noise. Newfield Construction also looked at other alternatives. These units were the lesser cost. Dr. Brummett stated that the units were within budget, Kaestle Boos Associates received more information today, if the Building Committee is amenable it can go ahead with these units. Mr. Woods added that teachers will have individual controls in the classroom. He asked for

the total count of ionizers that would be needed, as they would be a good thing to have. He asked the Committee members if there were any objections for the individual units in the classrooms? Hearing none, he gave direction to move forward with these units. Ms. Mangiagli concluded her presentation by stating that she was scheduling a meeting with the State on the Schematic Design.

- VI. Owner's Project Manager Update – presented by Ms. Liska. There is not a lot to update outside of the budget. Newfield Construction developed an estimate from the Schematic Design. Kaestle Boos Associates also had an independent estimator perform an estimate. The Kaestle Boos estimate was actually slightly higher. Newfield Construction and Kaestle Boos Associates reconciled their estimates to come up with a consensus. The estimates were very similar. What will be presented tonight by the Construction Manager is their seventh revision. They narrowed down the specifics. Construction Solutions Group spoke with Newfield about the soft costs. These numbers are based on their collective experience on similar projects. Mr. Silvia thanked Ms. Liska. He asked what her level of confidence was in the estimate. She responded that she had a very high level of confidence. Newfield Construction will walk the Committee through the estimate as part of their presentation. Mr. Silvia attempted to pin her down as to the percentage level that "very high" constituted. She noted that there was an 8% design contingency. There are several contingencies in the estimate to account for the unknowns. She also reported that she met at the school with Newfield Construction, Kaestle Boos Associates, Mr. Jachimowicz, and Mr. Luby to discuss testing. EnviroMed sent a cost proposal to Mr. Baron. EnviroMed Services has been doing testing, primarily for asbestos and lead. PCB testing of the paint and the exterior walls is necessary to be able to dispose of debris. If we don't test for PCBs we will have to assume the paint has PCBs. The estimate carries a \$900,000 premium to do that. If the test were to come back negative (no PCBs in the paint), we can dispose of that debris as regular waste at a much lower cost. A decision was made to go forward with the PCB testing in order to (hopefully) reduce the cost. There was PCB air testing at the school also. Mr. Woods stated that the test results were in and that Mr. Luby was also present to participate in the meeting. He is with EnviroMed Services, who is doing the testing. Mr. Luby informed the Committee that PCB tests were taken in all 24 classrooms in the 1950's vintage classroom section. They found some levels of PCBs in nine of the 24 classrooms. The levels were between 33 and 84 nanograms per cubic meter. The Environmental Protection Agency guidelines are under 100 nanograms per cubic meter for children under 6 years old, and under 300 nanograms per cubic meter for children between the ages of 6 years and 12 years old. There is a source somewhere in the school. There are not a lot of PCBs. He would recommend we test the painted surfaces and caulk within the building to determine where the PCBs are exactly in the school. They are not widespread but they are definitely there. Dr. Brummett asked Mr. Luby to recap his findings as there is a lot of misinformation circulating around. Mr. Luby stated that the levels are well within the EPA guidelines for Anna Reynolds School. He also stated that it would be surprising if you did not find PCBs, given the 1950's construction. Mr. Woods stated that it was great news that the school was within the limits. Mr. Whetzel asked where the high mark was? Mr. Luby replied that it was classroom 17, at 84 nanograms per cubic meter. Mr. Whetzel asked, what is there? Mr. Luby responded that the PCB level will directly correlate with the ventilation in the room. Ms. Stamm asked what the PCB limits (EPA guidelines) were for adults. Mr. Luby responded that they were 450 nanograms per cubic meter. Later in the meeting, Dr. Brummett stated that Room 17 is used by adults, mostly, and very seldom by children.

VII. Construction Manager's Update – provided by Mr. DiMauro. As mentioned earlier, there was a budget review. His firm and Kaestle Boos Associates did estimates and then reconciled them. The Kaestle Boos Associates estimate was initially 2% higher. He then went over the highlights of the estimate. The estimate began with a summary, which included an 8% design contingency. They also include 4.18% for escalation. The Owner's Contingency is 5% of the grant value. The overall estimate is about \$65,000 under the grant value. Mr. Silvia asked what his level of confidence in the estimate was. Mr. DiMauro responded that it was very high. Mr. Silvia asked what translated to in terms of a percentage. Mr. DiMauro responded that he had 100% confidence in this estimate, but the design is not complete. He continued with his presentation. The mechanicals are found at the bottom of page 21 (the next to last page, NOT INCLUDED/INCLUDED, Mechanical Option #3). The pages in between are all the details. Mr. Woods noted that this is a fluid document. The two estimates were close. That means that both were looking at the same thing. It is a good start. He asked if the courtyard design and the canopy were both included in this estimate? Mr. DiMauro said that they were.

Ms. Stamm said that she was pleased with the estimate. Mr. Silvia made a comment about the Assumptions (on page 21), specifically the roof structure. He asked about the line item for reinforcing, did this money go into contingency? Mr. DiMauro said yes, any extra would come out of contingency. Mr. Silvia asked if the same was true of the kitchen equipment? Mr. DiMauro said it would. Mr. Silvia then inquired if there was any equipment that could be salvaged? Mr. Woods stated that depends on the age of the equipment. Whatever is present has to be good for 20 years. Mr. Silvia noted that there were 26 projectors in the technology line item. They were installed in 2014 under Dr. Collins. Is the plan to replace them, they are only seven years old? Ms. Mangiagli stated that they are proposing new. They can revisit this if there are cost savings. Ms. Liska pointed out that the goal was to mirror the Education Specifications as closely as possible. Mr. Silvia asked about the specialty acoustic panels for the gymnasium and the auditorium. Ms. Liska responded that these were an effort to meet State guidelines and requirements. They suit the space and cut down on echoes. Mr. Silvia asked if this was a State driven requirement? Ms. Liska responded that it was, for acoustics. Mr. Whetzel stated that for the projectors, technology goes on five-year plans. He will look closely at technology. He noted that he sees a lot of "by Owner" listed. On the last page, what are the gaps between the two estimates that make up the delta? Mr. DiMauro responded that a lot of the differences were from the estimators putting things in different categories. Newfield used different projects. For instance, in the fire protection systems, you need to look into the specifics in each category.

Mr. Whetzel stated that he wanted to see what the differences are. Mr. DiMauro stated that, for the Design Allowance, Newfield was at 8%, Kaestle Boos Associates was at 10%. Escalation was a negotiated number. Kaestle Boos Associates takes it to the start of construction, Newfield Construction takes it to the mid-point of construction. Newfield's contingency is 3%, that is contractual. That is the Town's money. If you don't use it you get it back. Mr. Woods noted that the next budget will be important. Ms. Liska also pointed out that it would be helpful for the Building Committee to know that the Schematic Design drawings are 43 pages long. There could be 200 pages of drawings at the end of the day. There are so many details that are not developed. The design allowance can be reduced to nothing at the end of the day. Ms. Mangiagli stated that the design is about 30% complete. Mr. Woods asked if that was typical? She responded that it was. Mr. Dominov added that for the next budget the design would be about 60% or 65% complete. Mr. Miner encouraged all parties to stay on budget. It is fluid. The numbers will fluctuate. They will be fluid all the

way through. He suggested that we reach out to Madison, Maine directly about the HVAC units. He would like to have a life history for these units, rather than just a case study. Mr. Woods thanked Mr. DiMauro, and stated that he felt it was good that we are under where we need to be. The Building Committee will do what it has to in order to help the project.

- VIII. Any Other Business Pertinent to the Committee – Dr. Brummett stated that Governor Lamont wants to visit the school next week. She got a call from Representative Gary Turco who is organizing this.
- IX. Public Participation – None.
- X. Comments by Members – Mr. Woods felt it was a good meeting. There was a lot of work by a lot of people to keep the project on track. He thanked those people for their efforts.
- XI. Adjournment – the meeting adjourned at 6:17 PM.