

TOWN OF EAST HAMPTON

20 East High Street
East Hampton, CT 06424



ofc: 860-267-7300
fax: 860-267-7800
www.easthamptonct.gov
facman@easthamptonct.org

HIGH SCHOOL--ADDITION & RENOVATE-AS-NEW
HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING

High School (Library)
15 North Maple Street, East Hampton, CT 06424

MINUTES

Thursday, April 26, 2012, 5:30 p.m.

Highlighted areas contain ACTION ITEMS

PRESENT AT MEETING

Committee Members: Michele Barber, Sharon Smith, Cynthia Abraham, Thomas Cooke, David Ninesling, Roy Gauthier, Stephen Karney, Michael Zimmerman, Tom Seydewitz.

Town Employees: Sue Weintraub, Town Council Chairperson; Kevin Reich, Assistant Superintendent of Schools; John Fidler, Principal; Frank Grzyb, Facilities Manager

AGENDA ITEM #1: Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Sharon Smith at 5:38 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM #2: Review and approve Minutes from 4/11/12 Building Committee meeting

Sharon Smith inquired about one of the entries on the 4/11/12 Minutes; explanation was provided by Recording Secretary; Sharon made a motion to accept the Minutes; Roy Gauthier seconded the motion; all voted in favor.

AGENDA ITEM #3: Review of timeline discussed at 4/11/12 Building Committee meeting

Discussions of this item are interspersed throughout the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM #4: Discuss package that Board of Education supplied to Committee Members on 4/17/12

This item was discussed later in the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM #5: Discuss RFQ's received on 4/23/12 for Architectural/Engineering Design Services

Discussion occurred regarding the rating methods to use for RFQ evaluations (Sharon Smith distributed a rating sheet that could be useful), how many firms to narrow the RFP invitation list to, and when the interviews are conducted (pre- or post- RFP?).

Sharon Smith shared the RFP process used in Glastonbury: respondents submit their proposals with a second sealed envelope detailing pricing, RFP's are then reviewed and rated, sealed pricing is then revealed once top firms are selected, and then pricing negotiations may occur.

Roy Gauthier inquired as to whether this Committee is picking up where the previous Committee (Facilities Study) left off; Sharon Smith indicated we can use the previous material as a resource, but that "no," we are starting from scratch; Roy further explored the accuracy of the \$40,000,000 project estimate discussed at the last meeting; Frank Grzyb responded that this estimate was based upon the option that was accepted by the BOE and the cost could increase based on final options that are selected.

Criteria to consider for the rating the firms was discussed by Stephen Karney: firm sizes, past experience, quantity of work done in-house or subcontracted on various disciplines, how much staff they have, etc. Stephen shared his matrix of his evaluation.

More detailed discussions transpired regarding firms' strengths and weaknesses.

Cynthia Abraham questioned how many architects are typical for a shortlist; Frank Grzyb responded that at least four is required by the State.

Discussion ensued regarding two-phase pricing: (1) amount for up to referendum, (2) then pricing to take us through the end of the project.

Roy Gauthier questioned as to whether negotiating price is legal. Frank Grzyb indicated that in East Hampton it is not legal; East Hampton's process requires us to take the lowest qualified bidder, then we may negotiate the scope of work after we have a contract. Sharon Smith felt that if we did not open the pricing envelopes until after the interviews, that it would be legal. Frank Grzyb recommended that Town Attorney be consulted. Sue Weintraub recommended that Jeff Jylkka (the Town's Finance Director) be consulted first. Sharon Smith's goal is to not allow the price to impact the Committee's judgment of the firms' qualifications.

Sharon Smith recommended the possibility of looking at some of the firms' completed projects as an additional evaluation tool.

Frank Grzyb informed the Committee that the State Bureau of Education has a maximum funding on change orders and not all firms reported on their change orders in their RFQ's.

Further discussion occurred regarding the topic of sealed pricing; Frank Grzyb shared some experiences with Town projects to emphasize the importance of *knowing* the pricing during the RFP evaluation process.

Questions arose regarding the procedures and timing of checking references, etc.; Frank Grzyb indicated that this would take place after the interview process.

timeline

Concerns arose regarding the staffing of some firms running lean; Frank Grzyb confirmed that the whole economy is running lean right now and it is affecting many.

The Committee wrapped up discussions/evaluations, and a final shortlist was composed by the Committee; Cynthia Abraham made a motion to invite the following five firms for the RFP process; Tom Cooke seconded the motion; all voted in favor:

- Fletcher Thompson
- Moser Pilon Nelson Architects
- JCJ Architecture
- The SLAM Collaborative
- Kaestle Boos Associates

The RFP process was discussed; Sue Weintraub expressed the legal format/requirements that the Committee can communicate outside of meetings (i.e. Members cannot communicate with one another outside of formal meetings and must meet quorum requirements); Sue confirmed that Frank Grzyb can provide information to Members for their review and request their comments in return.

Sharon Smith, Frank Grzyb, and the Committee worked through the timing of the RFP posting as follows: Frank Grzyb will work on the RFP draft next week and will provide to Committee Members by e-mail; Members will e-mail their comments back to Frank; Frank will make adjustments to the RFP and submit a final draft prior to the next meeting on 5/10/12; per Frank, the total timeframe of the RFP posting through to the proposal due date is approximately 2-3 weeks.

timeline

Committee members further inquired what would be included in the RFP; Frank Grzyb answered—price, scope of work, architect's approach, construction management, etc.

Frank Grzyb reiterated that hazmat issues must be bid separately; as a result of further discussion of hazmat materials with Committee Members, Frank Grzyb will work up a draft RFQ package for the hazmat consultant and will e-mail to Members for their review/comments.

AGENDA ITEM #4: Discuss package that Board of Education supplied to Committee Members on 4/17/12

Sharon Smith did not see the Executive Summary in BOE package; Sharon indicated that the Facilities Study will be interesting for the selected architect to refer to, however, the architect will need to start from scratch and will really need the Executive Summary; John Fidler responded that the school staff is putting together Wish Lists.

Tom Seydewitz commented on the High School's designation as an emergency shelter and the need to keep that in mind; Tom also inquired as to the current generator system; Frank Grzyb specified that the High School currently has a generator; due to costs, this generator was designed only to support 20% of building vitals; further discussion with Frank revealed that an upgrade to the current generator system would need to be 6 times larger to run the whole school and even larger to accommodate the new addition; other Committee Members expressed that this would be expensive.

An array of information was discussed that is necessary to come up with a project price and for the State application process: enrollment numbers, square footage, hazmat issues, etc. Concerns were expressed that the architect will need a more defined scope to estimate a reasonable project price rather than carte blanche and that hazmat issues are costly and could dramatically increase the budget.

The Committee inquired who informs the firms that are not selected; Frank Grzyb will send the letters out to these firms.

The next Building Committee meeting scheduled for 5/3/12 is cancelled to permit Frank Grzyb time to draft the architectural RFP and hazmat RFQ as well as permit time for the Committee Members to review these documents (as submitted to them via e-mail over the next 2 weeks); once comments are received from the Committee Members for the hazmat RFQ, Frank will post the RFQ; the architectural RFP will be finalized at the next Committee meeting scheduled for 5/10/12.

timeline

Sue Weintraub urged the Committee (by next meeting) to address the line items that need to be requested to set in place appropriate funding; Sharon Smith and Kevin Reich interchanged that we are not at that point yet and that we need to get school staff to finish wish list first.

Sue Weintraub, Committee Members, and Frank Grzyb continued to communicate the need for more details as to the matrix of enrollment, quantity of space needed, etc.; some of the plans were outlined in the BOE package according to Kevin Reich (i.e. number of classrooms); Kevin will work with John Fidler on a plan and will send to Frank to share with the Committee.

Sharon Smith and Cynthia Abraham conveyed to Kevin Reich that we need a realistic baseline for the RFP to get the architects going (magnitude of space needed, programmatic changes, enrollment, etc.) to be able to estimate the project and thus their fees; Frank Grzyb expressed concern that if project costs end up too high, the Town may never approve it; Cynthia also wants to keep in mind that we desire full reimbursement from the State noting that the auditorium space throws the square footage off.

Summary of timeline prior to next meeting of 5/10/12 was reviewed by Sharon Smith as follows:

- Frank Grzyb will work on RFQ (hazmat) and submit to Members by e-mail
- Frank Grzyb will work on RFP (arch. svcs.) and submit to Members by e-mail
- Kevin Reich to work on providing information on baseline scope for Frank to include in the RFP
- Frank Grzyb to incorporate BOE information and send completed draft of RFP to Members by e-mail
- Members will come to the meeting with their individual notes regarding their review of the RFP

timeline

Frank Grzyb confirmed with the Committee Members that he will need to use the preliminary design that was "accepted by the BOE" as the baseline for the RFP without needing to go back to the BOE for approval.

Frank Grzyb expressed concern over clear indication over who “owns” the drawings; the RFP will include language that the Town owns the drawings; Cynthia Abraham inquired as to whether we own the current drawings (the baseline) by Kaestle Boos; Sue Weintraub indicated that the Kaestle Boos contract is available (maybe through Jeff Jylkka or BOE) to verify ownership of drawings.

AGENDA ITEM #6: Public Remarks

Mark Lorah, independent energy auditor, suggested the Town consider efficiencies, sustainability, solar options, geothermal heating and cooling, solar hot water, etc.; he recommended bringing this to attention of the architect; he expressed that there are many programs available (possible grants, CL&P services and rebates for upgrades) which could reduce the costs to the Town.

Bill Marshall, member of BOE, also suggested energy efficiencies and to research architects’ knowledge in this area; he shared information regarding CL&P’s (Richard Asselin) commercial energy and load management and their energy incentives; he recommended that we consider investing more upfront in exchange for long-term cost savings.

OTHER BUSINESS

Sue Weintraub located a copy of the Kaestle Boos contract; Recording Secretary will distribute to Committee Members.

Discussion took place regarding 3-week RFP timeframe and follow-up interviews of 45 min. each; Sharon Smith reiterated that this is a very aggressive timeline and that the Committee will work very hard to meet it; Kevin Reich inquired of approval process relative to Town Council meetings; Kevin reminded Committee that Town Council meetings can be sparse during the summer and the urgency/timeliness in getting Council approval; Michele Barber stressed the need to get this in for the referendum due to a more favorable turnout for voting during a presidential election; Committee discussed making architects aware of short timeline...desire to push things forward as quickly as possible without sacrificing quality.

timeline

Communication between the Committee and Kevin Reich explored the issue of who promotes and informs the community of the project: Kevin indicated that the PTO is limited and there is a need for a PAC group; Kevin further directed the Committee that they cannot be part of the PAC group, but they can provide factual information to the PAC.

Roy Gauthier suggested that maybe if some areas are slated for demolition that it be considered for community use (i.e. community center) to enhance the attractiveness of the project to the community; Tom Cooke suggested an open house to heighten awareness of the project need; Kevin Reich also suggested getting a representative for each neighborhood to promote the project.

Review of action items from last Meeting Minutes:

- The “funding request” recommended by Sue Weintraub during the 4/11/12 meeting will be addressed when the Committee approves the architect from the RFP process; Recording Secretary will draft letter (to TC and BOF) regarding “funding request” to be enable the Committee to be ready to move forward when funding is needed.
- BOE package did not include the Executive Summary and Judy Golden’s timeline; the Committee still desires to receive these items for their next meeting.
- Recording Secretary will notify Cathy Sirois (T.Mgr.’s secretary) that Town e-mail addresses are desired by all Committee Members.
- Recording Secretary will follow-up on receipt of “hierarchy” item requested during the 4/11/12 meeting.
- Frank Grzyb will talk with Kevin Reich regarding substitution and/or replacement for Recording Secretary.

AGENDA ITEM #7: Adjournment

Roy Gauthier made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:29 p.m.; Michael Zimmerman seconded; all voted in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda L. Tirone
Recording Secretary

cc: Sue Weintraub
John Weichsel
Judy Golden
Kevin Reich
John Fidler
Frank Grzyb
Sandra Wieleba (for posting)
Cathy Sirois (for posting)