

Sutton School Building Committee

Regular Scheduled Mtg., Wednesday, 3/3/10, 7:00 PM
Town Hall Mtg. Rm.

Present: L. O'Neill, K. Stuart, R. Raymond, C. Watkins, M. Jerz, J. Smith,
W. Mead, G. Coulter, D. Davis, M. Roach, C. DiBella, R. Weaver.

Absent: T. Harrison

Guests: V. Dube (Flansburgh Assoc.), J. Winikur (SBS), M. Sklenka (SBS)

Ted Friend, incoming Superintendent of the School Department, was introduced by Wendy Mead.

Mark Sklenka, a project manager with SBS, was introduced by Jon Winikur

1. Wendy Mead stated that a Public Comment period would be added to the regular meeting of the committee. She invited members of the public to come forward to a microphone and speak on any topic related to the proposed school building project.

Kathy Lorkiewicz and Joan Cardin spoke as representatives of Sutton Advocates of Community Support (Sutton ACTS).

Sutton ACTS is an organization of Sutton residents. The goal of the organization is to support the school building project by:

- 1) Disseminating correct information on the project throughout the community in a timely manner
- 2) Encouraging Sutton residents to get the correct information
- 3) Encouraging Sutton residents to attend informational meetings and to ask questions

To achieve these objectives, the organization is or will be:

- Establishing a website (<http://site.google.com/site/suttonact/>)
- Establishing a Facebook page
- Creating a video of current school facility conditions, which will be available through the website
- Assembling an informational brochure
- Preparing and submitting information articles to the media
- Planning neighborhood meetings throughout the town
- Contacting various organization in the town to arrange informational meetings

Glenn Coulter asked if Sutton ACTS needs to be officially endorsed by the SSBC. Wendy Mead responded that the organization does not have to be endorsed by SSBC. As an organization of Sutton residents, it has the right to collect and disseminate information on the project. However, a disclaimer would be appropriate on the informational sites and on any information distributed by the organization that did not come directly from SSBC or MSBA.

Kathy Lorkiewicz stated that a disclaimer would be placed on the website, Facebook page, and any literature or articles that the organization prepares stating there is no affiliation with SSBC.

2. Minutes of the 8/19/09 meeting were presented. Motion to approve by Cecelia DiBella. Second by Ken Stuart. Vote to approve: 6-0-1 (the majority of those present at that meeting).

Minutes of the 9/23/09 meeting were presented. Motion to approve by Roger Raymond. Second by Mike Jerz. Vote to approve: 8-0-0 (the majority of those present at that meeting).

Minutes of the 2/3/10 meeting were presented. Motion to approve by Jim Smith. Second by Roger Raymond. Vote to approve: 12-0-0.

3. Jon Winikur gave an update on the MSBA schedule and the projected project schedule.

He prefaced this update by reminding all that the DC-1 option was presented to and agreed with by the MSBA BOD at their meeting of Wednesday, 1/27/10. The next steps were to refine the basic building plan – including developing technical specifications – and prepare a package to go to independent professional cost estimators.

SBS's and Flansburgh's understandings were that this information, together with the completed cost estimates and full budget, needed to be assembled and presented to MSBA by late-February in order to be reviewed and voted on at the 3/31/10 meeting of the MSBA BOD. This general timeframe was stated at the 2/3/10 SSBC meeting.

During or just prior to the 2/4/10 public forum, Jon received a voicemail from MSBA. The voicemail informed him that the deadline to submit the technical specifications and final cost estimates had been revised to 2/12/10. This new deadline was 16 days after the previous MSBA BOD meeting, from which the decision was required prior to moving onto the next phases of the process. It was also 8 days from the date of notification of the change, prior to the next scheduled SSBC meeting and a 47 days prior to the next MSBA BOD meeting for which the information is needed.

The technical specifications and basic design information were completed under the direction of Vince Dube by Flansburgh personnel and their consultants and submitted to MSBA by the 2/12/10 deadline. Based on that information, cost estimates were prepared by Davis Langdon and Cost Pro between 2/13 and 2/15. SBS, Flansburgh, Davis Langdon and Cost Pro personnel met on 2/17 to discuss and resolve variances in the cost estimates. This information was submitted to MSBA on 2/17/10.

(This is another example of the affects of the unrealistic time frame and deadlines being dictated by MSBA, which put excessive demands on those responsible for

developing and assembling information, eliminate sufficient time for SSBC to review the information prior to submittal deadlines and are increasing marginalizing the participation of SSBC in the overall process. It is particularly galling in comparison with the excessive time repeatedly taken by MSBA to review and approve information that is presented to MSBA, including their own documents.)

Jon then presented the revised project schedule. If the project and funding are approved by Sutton voters at the May town meeting and subsequent override vote, the detailed design and bidding phases will commence in June and are expected to be completed by May, 2011. The overall construction schedule is multi-phased – as expected – being heavily affected by the needs to maintain the academic schedule and safe conditions. Another factor is the desire to do demolitions and, to the extent possible, movement of academic programs during school vacation periods. The projected completion date is 12/31/2014.

4. Jon Winikur then presented the cost estimates and proposed budget. Jon explained that the cost estimators focus on the budget categories directly related to construction. Several budget categories are not included in their reviews such as administration, architectural and engineering costs, construction contingency, miscellaneous project costs, furnishing and equipment, and owner's contingency. However, these categories are included in the overall budget prepared by SBS.

Jon pointed out revisions in the square footages designated as new construction and as renovation, although the total square footage remained essentially the same. The variances were primarily due to categorizing certain changes in the High School (current Core Building) as new construction rather than as renovation. The total for the entire project is now set at 175,132 square feet.

Jon highlighted that the two construction cost estimates were very similar in total cost (a \$49,000 variance) although there were greater variances in specific categories. The total project cost is given as \$60,924,700 (an increase of \$363,300 over the original estimated cost for Option DC-1).

Seeing the document for the first time, several members of the SSBC presented questions.

Glenn Coulter asked about the basis for the design & construction contingency. The response was that for new construction a 5% contingency is common and for renovation a 10% contingency is usually carried. A “blended” contingency of about 6% was used for this project.

Glenn asked if the total cost was presented in current or future dollars. Jon responded that category V.M. is the adjustment that escalates cost to the mid-point of the project as a best attempt to arrive at a final total cost.

Glenn inquired if the \$60.9M was the maximum dollar amount. Jon responded that, once agreed to by MSBA, it would be the not-to-exceed cost on which reimbursement would be based. He further stated that the cost was both within

the guidelines given by the SSBC and was not overly restrictive. He felt that the entire project was achievable within the stated budget.

Jon indicated that – at present – he estimated a 55.39% reimbursement on the reimbursable portions of the project. The non-reimbursable portions would include temporary space (e.g., portable classrooms), hazmat abatement in the demolitions, the water treatment system, athletic field work, space for the central office (however, MSBA had agreed to allow this to be put in the a portion of the existing Elementary School that will become available when all 6th grade classrooms are relocated to the new Middle School) and the 13,012 sq. ft of “excess” space.

Christine Watkins asked that the non-reimbursable “excess” space be clearly defined on information presented to the public so that it is clear to all what that entails, why it was needed and why it was considered as non-reimbursable.

Donna Davis inquired about the facilities maintenance trust fund as a means of qualifying for more reimbursement. Cecilia DiBella commented that the town’s capital trust fund should qualify for this purpose and that the information had been provided to MSBA.

Lea Anne O’Neill noted that the Owner’s Contingency (IX) had been reduced from \$2.57M to \$500K. The response was that a portion of the original estimate had been moved to category V.F.1, Special Construction, to include the cost of (non-reimbursable) Central Office construction and that it was felt there was sufficient funding in the design contingency category. Additionally, the Owner’s Contingency category is now within the MSBA defined ratio.

The substantial increase in Architectural and Engineering expense was questioned. Vince Dube responded that the projected additional costs were the result of the length of the project being extended by approximately 2 years and would include architectural, MPE engineering, site consultant, civil engineering, technology consultant, water testing and water treatment system design expenses.

Glenn questioned variations between the two cost estimators in substructure, insurance and bond categories. Jon explained that these were mostly due to how the estimators chose to categorize a particular expense when working independently and that the variances were resolved during the 2/17 meeting.

Donna Davis inquired about the CM-at-risk approach. Jon responded that most recent information based on other projects indicates that using CM-at-risk would increase the overall project cost by \$5-\$7M dollars with only a 1% increase in reimbursement from the state (i.e., less than \$600K additional reimbursement).

Jon further stated that by pre-qualifying the contractors and requiring filed sub-bids, the ability to manage the project within the budget should be equivalent to the CM-at-risk method.

Glenn asked if a larger Construction Contingency was needed. Jon responded that although some costs cannot be determined until the digging begins and walls are opened, he is confident that the budget value is good.

Christine inquired about the tennis court lighting, etc. Vince responded that a site master plan would be prepared. Jon added that not all of the potential site work was included in the construction cost estimates.

Glenn commented on the courtyard space – specifically that it be accessible for maintenance equipment and that it be put to use. Roger Raymond commented that although the preliminary design did not show access doors to that area, he would be on the lookout for that in the final plans. With suitable access, he believes the area can be properly maintained and well used.

Jon commented that with completion of the graphical representation of the major spaces, Flansburgh Associates has completed their work under the current contract.

5. New Business

Christine asked if there was any way for a business (or individuals) to contribute to the funding of the project. Wendy advised discussing this with Jim Smith.

Wendy advised all of upcoming public fora:

Thursday, March 25, 7:00 PM at Middle School Auditorium
Thursday, April 29, 7:00 PM at Middle School Auditorium

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 7, 2010, 7:00 PM.

Motion by Roger Raymond to adjourn, second by Ken Stuart. Vote unanimous.
Adjourned at 8:50 PM.

Ross Weaver, Recording Secretary