

Date Prepared	7/5/2015	
Project Name	<b>Stamford Interdistrict IB Magnet Extension; K-5 Phases I and II</b> <b>OSF No. 135-0277 / MAG / PF / EA</b>	
Project Number	61860.00	
Subject	Project Building Committee Meeting No. 5	
Meeting Location	Stamford Government Center, 7 <sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room	
	888 Washington Blvd., Stamford, CT	
Meeting Date	7/1/2015	
Meeting Time	11:00 am	
Prepared By	Tina Greco, AIA, Project Manager	t.greco@perkinseastman.com
	T: 203 251 7419	F: -
Participants	<p>Louis Casolo, City Engineer, City of Stamford                  Domenic Tramontozzi, Senior Construction Manager, City of Stamford                  Mary Savage, Board of Reps                  Rich Lyons, Board of Education Facilities                  Cindy Grafstein, Mayor's Office                  Al Barbarotta, Board of Education Facilities                  Tamu Lucero, Assistant Superintendent Elementary, Stamford Public Schools                  Ernie Orgera, Operations                  Jackie Heftman, Board of Education                  Wareeya Sripa, Admin Officer, City of Stamford                  Molly Sperduti Matesevac, Engineering Intern, City of Stamford</p> <p>Joe Costa, Principal, Perkins Eastman                  Mark McCarthy, Principal, Perkins Eastman                  Robert Pogue, Intern, Perkins Eastman                  Tina Greco, Project Manager, Perkins Eastman</p>	



**A. General**

- 1) Meeting began at approximately 11:05 am.
- 2) The Meeting Minutes of the June 17, 2015 and June 24, 2015 meetings were reviewed.

**June 17, 2015 Meeting Minutes**

- Mary Savage made a motion to approve the meeting minutes.
- Lou Casolo seconded the motion.
- There was a vote, no objections, all in favor.
- Meeting minutes were approved.

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.

**June 24, 2015 Meeting Minutes**

- Comment that the meeting minutes represented well the discussions at the meeting
- Lou Casolo made a motion to approve the meeting minutes.
- Jackie Heftman seconded the motion.
- There was a vote, no objections, all in favor.
- Meeting minutes were approved.

**B. Schematic Design Drawings**1) Schematic Design Submission

The Schematic Design Drawing package was submitted to the City in PDF format on June 30, 2015. Additionally, 11" x 17" copies were distributed at the meeting for each Building Committee member at the meeting.

The information and layouts, etc. generally represent the (flushed out) to date decisions and conclusions that have come out of the meetings with the Building Committee, the Sub Committee, City Engineering, and the meetings with the Health Department, Building Inspector and Fire Marshal representatives. Everyone has been working to develop the design / drawings together so everyone should have a very good familiarity with the content.

PE pointed out that there are areas, such as IT and security that require some catch-up work and that the Site has not been fully hashed out. PE will develop a list of areas that require development in the design and /or additional information.

PE needs the Building Committee's acceptance of the drawings to confirm the direction being followed (please note that a formal vote for drawing acceptance was not made at the meeting, PE will seek formal approval at the July 8<sup>th</sup> meeting).

It was noted that the Code Modifications that are being sought for the project are expected to be accepted as they have been developed with the City's Building Inspector's and Fire Marshal's office; however, there is a chance that they are not accepted and design alternatives would be necessary to pursue, which could change some of the plans. PE did not have a schedule of when the Modifications were expected to be submitted, but will develop that and provide the information to the Building Committee. This is part of the process.

It was also highlighted that based on lead tests the City's Health Department conducted on the water, lead is present at many of the fixtures. There are lead levels at the "ACTION" level. The subject was reviewed at the Monday, June 29<sup>th</sup> meeting with PE, their Haz Mat consultant (Langan), the City Health Department and Engineering. The Health Department was to look into the matter more and report back to the group. It is likely that a great deal of piping will require replacement. This work is NOT part of the Schematic Design drawings. So that the cost is captured at the Schematic Design level, PE will review the spectrum of possible scope with the estimator.

City noted that MEP drawings were not part of the set and asked that the MEP be released.

2) Phase II Cost Estimate

The estimate based on the Schematic Design submission is expected on July 8<sup>th</sup>, it will be reviewed by the Committee at the next meeting, July 15<sup>th</sup>. The Committee will then compare the estimate amount to the City's budgeted amount for Phase II, which is \$2.8 million. The cost estimate will also include an

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.

amount for abatement work required for Phase II (but the resource for abatement work comes from Phase I of the Project).

The Building Committee will be asked to evaluate the estimate as it compares to the City Budget. There has been some scope increase, which could result in an estimate that is higher than the City's Budget. The Building Committee will need to give direction to PE on what scope to continue to develop or modify.

PE will work with the estimator so that the estimate is presented in a menu like format so that pieces of scope can possibly be removed and/or there is an understanding of the cost of discrete parts of the project. Additionally, instruments, such as the ALTERNATES are being used as a kind of cost 'valve' as the scope can be added or taken away from the project as necessary to work within the City's budget. Additionally eligible vs ineligible costs will be identified.

PE will also work with the estimator to identify ALLOWANCES where scope is not fully defined, such as the roof work, an assumed 10% replacement of existing fixtures, piping work related to the presence of lead, etc.

### 3) Plan Review

Perkins Eastman walked through the set of drawings so that the Committee would be able to navigate the set.

PE will need direction from the Building Committee on what to do with the existing religious symbols (the cross on the top of the building and "Sacred Heart" above the building entry).

#### Site

The current site plan shows an 'expansion loop' that uses the flat portion of the field perimeter:

- Includes 42 cars stored + cars that could be queued at the northern strip (closing the circuit)
- Expansion loop work could be done for August 2017 opening (instead of 2016)
- MUST include a fence to separate field from the drive (otherwise people will drive onto the field)
- No queuing on 5<sup>th</sup> Street
- Roadway drainage will be required
- Include some asphalt repair as part of site work

#### 1<sup>st</sup> Level

##### Classroom Building

- Point made that PE has shown (2) sinks in the nurse's office (1 for hand washing and 1 for fluids), as good practice. It is not required nor was it requested by the City. PE will ask for an itemized cost on this.

##### Gym Building

- City asked that the wall separating the closet from the janitor's closet (near the eastern entry) be removed. This work should be an itemized cost on the estimate.
- PE pointed out that Kindergarten Classroom (No. 134) has a column at the southern end of the open area. It is a column that currently exists buried in an existing wall, the wall is slated to be removed and the column will be uncovered.

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.

2<sup>nd</sup> Level

## Classroom Building

- Resolution on the how to handle existing IT equipment in Room 206 is required. This room will otherwise be a single occupied bathroom. This requires further investigation.

## Gym Building

- Cafeteria tables were changed from oval to rectangle per direction from the City. Per further discussion at the Building Committee meeting, the tables should be changed back to the oval tables, with attached benches, to match the specification of the tables used at Rogers.
- Table storage is shown on the stage. The current plan figures that a moveable ramp that fits over the stairs would be used to get the tables onto the stage.
- PE noted that the ALTERNATE for the bathroom at the gym area would be to locate it at the northern existing storage room, rather than the location where the kitchen is planned as the kitchen is a slightly larger area, the kitchen requires the space.
- Question about whether there is room under the stage/platform for storage (probably not, but will be confirmed).

3<sup>rd</sup> Level

- No Change.

4<sup>th</sup> Level

- No Change.

Furniture

- Cafeteria tables, see notes above
- PE noted that the furniture plans now show furniture that was used at Rogers (which was larger than what was shown in the preliminary schematic drawings) and that the furniture plans will need to be reviewed with the Sub Committee. Furniture is shown for **20 student classrooms**.
- City pointed out that the furniture package is outside the \$2.8 million project cost for Phase II.
- Computer Room: teacher's desk should be moved and positioned to view what is on the student's screens.

C. Abatement

- 1) PE provided a general update.
- 2) Langan, PE's Haz Mat consultant, as taken somewhere around 300 to 400 samples. Full results have not been received. Langan will prepare a report.
- 3) The ceiling tile in the Gym was found to have asbestos.
- 4) Containment of a building for abatement is expensive. Therefore it is best to work towards a single containment (one abatement that captures all of the work rather than more than one). It looks like the gym building will require / be fully abated for Phase II project. If the building were to be demolished at a future phase, abatement would still be required as part of the demolition work.
- 5) Facilities will need a care maintenance plan for any products that are allowed to remain for Phase II.

D. Other

- 1) Site signage should include a historic signage (an explanation of the site's history, etc.).
- 2) Historic Update
  - PE is planning to meet the historic consultant at the site next week
  - City is planning to advertise the cottages on the 'excess properties' exchange, if there is no interest, they will be listed 'for salvage.' If there is still no interest the cottages will be slated for demolition.

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.

**E. Process to Date: suggestions for improvements**

- 1) Make font on drawings larger so that it is readable on 11" x 17" sets.
- 2) PE to email meeting notes by Monday before the Wednesday meeting so that they can be distributed and Committee members will be responsible to bring a copy of the notes to the meeting (to save paper PE will not bring copies to the meeting).

**F. Public Informational Meeting**

- 1) Discussion on best time to have a public information meeting on the Phase II work
  - End of July, the last Wednesday or Thursday (July 29<sup>th</sup> or 30<sup>th</sup>)
  - Project should be reviewed at the BOE meeting on July 21<sup>st</sup> before the Public Information Meeting
  - Presentation may just include a site plan.

**G. K-8 study**

- City is working with PE to figure out what the scope of their services will be.
- A meeting to further develop the program will be scheduled for early next week.

**H. Exciting News**

On June 30<sup>th</sup> (day before the meeting), the House of Representatives passed a bill to fund the project. However, there it appears that there may be some implementation language that is still required to make it final.

**I. Meeting Adjourned**

Meeting was adjourned at about 1:05.

**J. Next Meeting**

- o Wednesday, July 15, 2015 at 11am

**K. Meeting Handouts:**

- From Perkins Eastman
  - o Meeting Agenda
  - o 11" x 17" set of the Schematic Design Drawings

Next Meeting: 7/15/2015

cc:

Attachments: None

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.