

Meeting Minutes
Farmington High School Building Committee Meeting
Wednesday, May 13, 2020
Online- Web Conference
6:30 PM

Attendees:

Meg Guerrera, Chair
Sharon Mazzochi
Michael Smith
Chris Fagan
Ellen Siuta
Beth Kintner
Johnny Carrier
Garth Meehan
Kathy Greider, Superintendent
Tim Harris, Director of School Facilities
Scott Hurwitz, FHS Principal
Lisa Kapcinski, Assistant Principal
Devon Aldave, Clerk of the Committee
Chris Cykley, Construction Solutions Group
Mark Garilli, Construction Solutions Group
Ryszard Szczypek, TSKP Studio
Michael Scott, TSKP Studio

A. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 P.M.

B. Pledge of Allegiance.

The committee members recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. Public Comment.

Emily Kaliney, 30 High Street, thanked the committee for the work they have done to this point. Emily expressed concern about last night's Town Council meeting. She felt that there was not much clarity about the pause and stated that that this project is very important. She would like more clarity around what will be done during the pause.

Marcus Fairbrother, 12 Candlewood Lane, is part of Comprehensive FHS. He commended the committee for staying on track with their work to this point. He expressed concerns about the project pause and felt there was a lack of transparency with the decision. He asked what the pause means for future decisions and if they will be made outside of the public eye. He asked what happens to the work that has been done to date and if there is an expiration date on this work. He stated that the challenges with the FHS facilities will persist through this pandemic and that a pause delays addressing those problems, putting the future success of students, faculty, and staff in jeopardy.

Sam Reisner, 41 Main Street, expressed his concerns around the lack of transparency in the decision to pause the project. He would like more details about how the decision was made. He stated that COVID-19 has created significant challenges, but the needs of high school will not disappear. He felt that a pause creates additional risk for accreditation status.

Jay Tulin, 39 Timberline Drive, stated that the Human Relations Commission fully supports the FHS Building Committee considering the use of an accessibility consultant when making the final presentation to Town Council. He also stated that the Human Relations Commission understands if the committee needs to focus more on how the project will move forward rather than an accessibility consultant in light of the current budget issues.

C.J. Thomas, 18 Hobart Street, apologized for any confusion from last night's Town Council meeting regarding the project pause. He stated that the reason for the pause is due to economic uncertainty regarding how much tax revenue the Town will collect due to the tax deferral program and COVID-19 issues. He believes that including the project on the ballot in November will set the project back substantially. C.J. stated that the Council fully supports all the work the building committee has done and universally agree to move forward with this committee in the future. However, due to much uncertainty, the Council did not feel that including a project of this magnitude on November is appropriate. He stated that once there is more economic clarity, the sooner we can move forward with the project.

D. Minutes.

1) To approve the attached April 29, 2020 minutes.

Upon a motion made and seconded (Mazzochi/Siuta) it was unanimously VOTED: to approve the April 29, 2020 minutes.

E. Correspondence.

Meg Guerrera reviewed the correspondence received.

F. Reports.

1) Chair Report.

Meg Guerrera gave the Chair Report. Her presentation is recorded with these minutes as Attachment A.

Michael Smith agreed with the idea of continuing to meet monthly. He stated that it makes sense to pause the project because of the economic challenges that we are facing. He stated that continuing to meet would also signal to the community that this project remains a priority. He suggested that the committee should explore how other Towns and firms are altering designs based upon challenges we are experiencing. Michael stated that the committee can analyze how circumstances are changing and consider how these changes may affect the schematic design before bringing this back to the Town Council while continuing to meet monthly.

Meg Guerrera stated that the milestone schedule will change due to the pause. She stated that the committee needs to respond to this and learn more about when it is appropriate to set a new referendum date. Meg believes that it is important for the committee to continue to meet and stay engaged and be a part of the planning process for setting a new date. She stated that it is important for the committee to stay in constant communication with the Town Council and Board of Education to learn new information as it comes.

Michael Smith suggested drafting a more formal statement or motion with C.J. Thomas, Town Council Chair, about the FHS Building Committee's approach moving forward during the pause.

Meg Guerrera stated that she can approach C.J. about this if the committee feels that this would be appropriate. She reiterated that there were no objections regarding the pause from any Councilmembers at their meeting last night.

Michael Smith stated that he made this suggestion because he feels that the pause was communicated more clearly tonight than at the Council meeting last night due to all the other topics that were being discussed last night.

Garth Meehan agreed with Michael Smith that the committee can use this time to adapt our design to the challenges we are currently facing. He stated that TSKP Studio will be working with us and feels that their design is adaptable. He stated that there is plenty to keep us busy and make this design better.

Ellen Siuta thanked C.J. Thomas for attending tonight's meeting and providing clarity regarding the pause. She stated that it is important for the committee to receive economic updates throughout the pause. She stated that it is imperative to be updated regularly regarding where the Town stands with tax revenue and state or federal stimulus dollars.

Meg Guerrera stated that the committee can include these updates as new and important information that is required of the committee to evaluate as we move forward.

Meg Guerrera stated that the committee will continue to make decisions based on our guiding principles and based on information as we know it. Meg appreciates everyone's patience so the committee can make sure we get the details right and make sure we have a good forward-looking plan for the project. She stated that the committee will do its best to keep the community informed and appreciates and thoughts or comments community members have.

2) Communications Subcommittee Report.

Kathy Greider stated that the group met this morning. She stated that the subcommittee discussed the temporary pause. The subcommittee has put the Town-wide survey on hold. The subcommittee will continue to produce a video tour of the facility, create a side-by-side photo comparison of FHS with other school facilities, and update the website. The subcommittee will continue to meet once per month to touch base. The subcommittee discussed including information on the Town Newsletter to touch base with the community about the FHS Building Committee. Kathy thanked everyone for their commitment and support of this project and is very proud of what the committee has accomplished to date. She is happy that the committee will continue to meet.

3) Neighborhood Communications Subcommittee Report.

Sharon Mazzochi stated that the subcommittee met on April 30th with over 20 participants for the Neighborhood Engagement meeting. She stated that some questions concerned the berm around the property, lighting in the parking lot, and a preliminary site plan developed so that the neighbors could have the berm set up before construction for their privacy. TSKP Studio gave an informative presentation.

4) Architect Report.

Ryszard Szczypek stated that TSKP Studio has reviewed the project with their cost estimator and included that information in their presentation, including cost savings and cost additions. Ryszard stated that TSKP Studio is nearly finished with the schematic design. He stated that once the schematic is finished, TSKP Studio wants to package it and present it in a form that is publishable and available for download for the public. Before the design is finished, there are a few things to address including site changes (as there is not enough room to have 8 tennis courts, a softball field, 1928 Building, and additional parking).

Ryszard stated that adapting designs to the challenges of COVID-19 is a subject that is being discussed a lot in the industry. He stated that the State of Connecticut has not provided any guidelines for school planning. He stated that the Association for Learning Environments and the American Institute of Architects have given areas for consideration: operational considerations, information technology, facility planning (fresh air ventilation, energy consumption). Ryszard stated that the committee should continue to discuss what impact the virus has had on planning.

Michael Scott gave the Architect Report presentation which is recorded with these minutes as Attachment B.

After the presentation, Michael Scott asked the committee for their comments about the overall project budget and the alternates to help TSKP Studio finalize the schematic design deliverable.

Johnny Carrier thanked TSKP Studio for this presentation. He asked if the costs for Net Zero include additional rebates from utilities or other. He also asked if TSKP Studio estimated a payback period for the larger package for the first line item. Michael Scott stated that additional rebates were not included in the presentation due to potential changes in the rebate program because of the State economy. Regarding the payback period, Michael stated that the thresholds between "Additional Energy Saving Initiative" line item and the "Net-Zero Physical Plant" line item are 20-year paybacks. The modular chillers have around a 12-year payback and the ice storage is around 7 years. He stated that because the baseline building is so efficient, the PV arrays would take more than 20 years to pay back if they are purchased. If there was a lease program that the Town is comfortable with, then TSKP Studio can radically change the components in line item 5.2. Chris Cykley stated that if solar panels were to be leased, they would not be eligible for reimbursement from the State. Michael Scott clarified that line item 5.2 contains around \$4 million in PV and \$5 million in geothermal. If half of the component is altered, the numbers could change significantly. Johnny Carrier had a follow-up question about geothermal. He asked if this decision is made early on, if the design takes into account including solar arrays or if that would be something to build on. Ryszard stated that deciding about geothermal early on simplifies matters because of the different sets of mechanical equipment and makes the bidding less confusing. Michael Scott suggested carrying line item 5.1 as a bid alternate.

Tim Harris asked about future measures. He asked if it makes sense to build anything into the project if the Town did want to consider including PV in the future. For example, a conduit between the roof deck and insulation, or curbs built into the roof ahead of time, or expansion joints designed on the roof that wouldn't hinder the layout of PV. Ryszard Szczypek stated that TSKP Studio has included these before. He stated that the PV installer does pre-inspection walkthroughs with the contractor who did the roofing.

Ellen Siuta asked if any work done on Route 4 be under the purview of the State because it is a State road. Ryszard Szczypek explained that the State will take on State road projects if they are warranted or justifiable from the State traffic standpoint. After discussions with the Town Engineer, Ryszard agrees that the State would allow the Town to make these improvements and will review them to make sure it meets the State standards, however they will not provide financial assistance because the project is not justifiable from a State funding standpoint. Michael Scott stated that he feels the Route 4 project is a needed

improvement given that the Town has done an extended investigation about how to remediate the situation. He explained that TSKP Studio recommends carrying these improvements as a line item for the referendum. He feels that people who will support the new building will support these Route 4 improvements. Ellen agreed that these improvements are needed.

Garth Meehan asked if it will hinder the project if a decision is not made about the 1928 Building sooner rather than including it on the ballot due to the spacing issues for site changes. Michael Scott stated that he feels the 1928 Building is important to a significant number of people in the Town. He suggested that this question be asked on the Town-wide survey when the committee decides to move forward with a survey to see where the community stands on the issue. Michael suggested generating a site plan that preserves the 1928 Building and put that forward as part of the project. If the voters decide to demolish the building, the site plan can be altered.

Michael Smith asked about the isolated cost of the total scope of work for 1928 Building. Michael Scott did not have that number handy but stated it is easily attainable.

Sharon Mazzochi asked if there would be room for parking, tennis courts, and a softball field if the 1928 Building is demolished. Michael Scott stated he believes it would be close. Ryszard Szczypek stated that TSKP Studio should show both scenarios: keep the 1928 Building and eliminating the 1928 Building to see if the site can then accommodate tennis courts, parking, and a softball field.

5) Owner's Representative Report.

Mark Garilli stated that CSG will be working on schedule predictions and the delivery of the schematic designs for the May 27, 2020 meeting. CSG will modify the current FHS Building Committee schedule and identify possible milestone dates and referendum dates.

G. New Business.

1) To approve the attached invoice from TSKP Studio in the amount of \$66,046.16.

Upon a motion made and seconded (Carrier/Mazzochi) it was unanimously VOTED: to approve the attached invoice form TSKP Studio in the amount of \$66,046.16.

H. Adjournment.

Upon a motion made and seconded (Siuta/Carrier) it was unanimously VOTED to adjourn at 8:21 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Devon Aldave
Clerk of the Committee

FHS Building Project Pause

Attachment A



On Tuesday, May 12th the Town Council agreed to not include the FHS Building Project on the November ballot and place the project on a temporary pause.

Until more clarity can be obtained on the impacts the pandemic has presented, the FHSBC will adjust committee operations until a new referendum date can be determined, and the full process can be resumed.

FHSBC Immediate Response



In response to the pause and change in referendum date, the FHSBC we will work with our consultants in the weeks ahead to complete the following:

- Complete schematic design
- Wrap up open items and any official committee business
- Prepare future schedule predictions
- Deliver messaging related to the temporary pause

FHSBC Future Planning



Following the close of our June 10, 2020 FHSBC meeting, the FHSBC will:

- Hold monthly meetings to evaluate new information and respond accordingly
- Continue with any communications to the public as necessary
- Work closely with Town Council and BOE to prepare for a new referendum date

Building Committee Update Attachment B

Farmington High School



Cost Update

Budget Review

On January 22, 2020:

	Detailed Estimate	In Millions
1. Arch./Eng. Design Fee	\$ 5,690,000	\$ 5.7
2. Professional Fees	\$ 3,018,487	\$ 3.0
3. Construction Costs	\$ 120,640,036	\$ 120.6
4. Alternates	\$ 0	\$ 0
5. FF&E and Technology	\$ 5,591,000	\$ 5.6
6. Owner Contingency (5%)	\$ 7,100,000	\$ 7.1
7. Grand Total	\$ 142,039,523	\$ 142.0

Budget Review

On January 22, 2020:

	Detailed Estimate	In Millions
1. Arch./Eng. Design Fee	\$ 5,690,000	\$ 5.7
2. Professional Fees	\$ 3,018,487	\$ 3.0
3. Construction Costs	\$ 120,640,036	\$ 120.6
4. Alternates	\$ 0	\$ 0
5. FF&E and Technology	\$ 5,591,000	\$ 5.6
6. Owner Contingency (5%)	\$ 7,100,000	\$ 7.1
7. Grand Total Cost	\$ 142,039,523	\$ 142.0
8. Est. State Reimbursement	- 28,007,905	- 28.0
9. Net Town Share	\$ 114,031,618	\$ 114.0

Budget Review

On January 22, 2020:

	Detailed Estimate	In Millions
1. Arch./Eng. Design Fee	\$ 5,690,000	\$ 5.7
2. Professional Fees	\$ 3,018,487	\$ 3.0
3. Construction Costs	\$ 120,640,036	\$ 120.6
4. Alternates	\$ 0	\$ 0
5. FF&E and Technology	\$ 5,591,000	\$ 5.6
6. Owner Contingency (5%)	\$ 7,100,000	\$ 7.1
7. Grand Total	\$ 142,039,523	\$ 142.0
8. Est. State Reimbursement	- 28,007,905	- 28.0
9. Net Town Share	\$ 114,031,618	\$ 114.0

On February 4, 2020:

10. Target Net Town Share		\$105 to \$110
----------------------------------	--	-----------------------

Budget Review

On April 1, 2020 (Budget in Millions):

	Feb 2020	Target Apr 2020
1. Arch./Eng. Design Fee	\$ 5.7	\$ 5.7
2. Professional Fees	\$ 3.0	\$ 3.0
3. Construction Costs	\$ 120.6	\$ 115.3
4. Alternates	\$ 0	\$ 0
5. FF&E and Technology	\$ 5.6	\$ 5.1
6. Owner Contingency (5%)	\$ 7.1	\$ 6.5
7. Grand Total	\$ 142.0	\$ 135.6
8. Est. State Reimbursement	- 28.0	- 27.1
9. Net Town Share	\$ 114.0	\$ 108.5

**Savings targeted: reduced square footage
removing green roof, softball field, and cupola rehab
reducing FFE/IT budget**

Budget Review

On May 13, 2020 (Budget in Millions):

	Feb 2020	Apr 2020	May 2020
1. Arch./Eng. Design Fee	\$ 5.7	\$ 5.7	\$ 5.7
2. Professional Fees	\$ 3.0	\$ 3.0	\$ 3.0
3. Construction Costs	\$ 120.6	\$ 115.3	\$ 117.0
4. Alternates	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
5. FF&E and Technology	\$ 5.6	\$ 5.1	\$ 5.1
6. Owner Contingency (5%)	\$ 7.1	\$ 6.5	\$ 6.5
7. Grand Total	\$ 142.0	\$ 135.6	\$ 136.8
8. Est. State Reimbursement	- 28.0	- 27.1	- 27.4
9. Net Town Share	\$ 114.0	\$ 108.5	\$ 109.4

On February 4, 2020:

10. Target Net Town Share		\$105 to \$110
----------------------------------	--	-----------------------

Budget Review

On May 13, 2020 (Budget in Millions):

	Feb 2020	Apr 2020	May 2020
1. Arch./Eng. Design Fee	\$ 5.7	\$ 5.7	\$ 5.7
2. Professional Fees	\$ 3.0	\$ 3.0	\$ 3.0
3. Construction Costs	\$ 120.6	\$ 115.3	\$ 117.0
* 4. Alternates	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
5. FF&E and Technology	\$ 5.6	\$ 5.1	\$ 5.1
6. Owner Contingency (5%)	\$ 7.1	\$ 6.5	\$ 6.5
7. Grand Total	\$ 142.0	\$ 135.6	\$ 136.8
8. Est. State Reimbursement	- 28.0	- 27.1	- 27.4
9. Net Town Share	\$ 114.0	\$ 108.5	\$ 109.4

On February 4, 2020:

10. Target Net Town Share		\$105 to \$110
----------------------------------	--	-----------------------

Alternates Review

	Description	Construction Cost	Project Cost (rounded)	Cost to Town (rounded)
1	Motorized partition between gyms	\$ 95,722	\$ 113,300	\$ 90,600
2	Stone in lieu of masonry	\$ 572,048	\$ 676,900	\$ 541,500
3.1	Mothball 1928 building	\$ 880,805	\$ 1,042,300	\$ 1,042,300
3.2	Renovate as New 1928 building	\$ 8,300,000	\$ 9,821,700	\$ 9,821,700
4	Additional Softball Field	\$ 291,215	\$ 344,600	\$ 275,700
5.1	Additional energy saving initiative	\$ 714,429	\$ 845,400	\$ 676,300
5.2	Net-Zero physical plant	\$ 9,660,004	\$ 11,431,000	\$ 9,144,800
6	Route 4 improvements	\$ 645,000	\$ 763,300	\$ 763,300
7	Universal Design	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,800	\$ 12,600
8	Additional FFE allowance	\$ 500,000	\$ 525,000	\$ 420,000

Alternates Review

	Description	Cost to Town (rounded)	ACTION
1	Motorized partition between gyms	\$ 90,600	Carry as alternate
2	Stone in lieu of masonry	\$ 541,500	Reduce and carry as alt.
3.1	Mothball 1928 building	\$ 1,042,300	Line item referendum
3.2	Renovate as New 1928 building	\$ 9,821,700	Line item referendum
4	Additional Softball Field	\$ 275,700	Remove from scope
5.1	Additional energy saving initiative	\$ 676,300	Line item referendum
5.2	Net-Zero physical plant	\$ 9,144,800	Line item referendum
6	Route 4 improvements	\$ 763,300	Line item referendum
7	Universal Design	\$ 12,600	Include
8	Additional FFE allowance	\$ 420,000	Carry as alternate

The End