

**Trumbull High School Building Committee**  
**February 25, 2009**  
**MINUTES**

**Call to Order:** The Vice- Chair, Mr. Lemay called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

**Present:** Ms. K. Bivona, (arrived at 7:04 p.m.), Mr. A. Chmielewski, Mr. D. Doyle, Ms. S. Flynn, Ms. M. Gottlieb, Mr. J. Jenkins, Mr. A. Lemay, Mr. R. McCabe, Mr. J. Nugent, (arrived at 9:04 p.m.)Mr. M. Ronnow, (arrived at 7:06 p.m.), and Ms. Timpanelli.

**Absent:** Ms. King.

**Also Present:** Atty. Daniel Schopick, (arrived at 7:08 p.m.), Mr. Al Barbarotta of AFB, Mr. John Barbarotta of AFB, Mr. Brian Holmes of O&G Construction, Mr. Tom Walsh, Walsh Construction, Mr. George Wiles of Wiles Associates, Mr. S. Burgess of JCJ and Mr. J. Elliott of JCJ Architects.

---

**Approval of Minutes:** Mr. Doyle and Ms. Timpanelli moved and seconded to approve the February 4, 2009 meeting minutes as submitted. VOTE: Motion approved 7-0-1 (Gottlieb abstained.)

**Owner's Representative Update:**

Ms. Bivona arrived at 7:04 p.m.

Mr. Barbarotta stated that hey will be presenting to the Town Council's Education sub-committee tomorrow evening, Thursday, Feb 26, 2009 to the full Town Council on Monday, March 2, 2009 and to the BoE on Tuesday, March 3, 2009. Mr. A. Barbarotta reported that this is a crucial step in the project's process. Mr. Ronnow arrived at 7:06 p.m. Mr. Barbarotta stated that he would be presenting the final plans and specs to the building committee at this meeting; therefore it will not be necessary to meet on Monday, March 2, 2009 at 5:30 as previously discussed. A color and pattern ad-hock committee is currently being organized by Ms. Timpanelli.

Atty. Schopick arrived at 7:08 p.m.

**Architect's Update:**

Mr. Burgess distributed a copy of the LEED for Schools Registered Project Trumbull High School Renovation & Additions of Trumbull, CT prepared by Winters Associates to the building committee members. The goal of silver LEED is for both building the renovation and the natatorium. The LEED requirements will be blended and will start developing in Phase II of the project. Mr. Burgess reported that the state of CT did not choose Trumbull High School for the wind turbine grant as discussed at the last meeting.

Mr. Elliott distributed a copy of the construction budget analysis to the building committee. Mr. Elliot reviewed the scope-renovations page with the building committee; alternates are identified and will be further reviewed after this phase goes out to bid. They will then be able to identify the cost and be able to determine if the project can support the alternate or not at that point. Mr. Burgess pointed out that tough decisions will have to be made throughout the process, everything will be measured against the project's budget.

***The Construction Budget Analysis is as follows:***

Hard costs - \$64,750,000.

Furniture in new spaces (allowance) - \$1,000,000.

Technology Infrastructure (allowance) - \$750,000.

Technology Equipment - \$500,000.

Contingency \$1,400,000.

Fees & Soft Costs - \$4,600,000.

*Grand Total - \$73,000,000*

State Reimbursement (30.71%) - \$20,882,800.

State Reimbursement Natatorium (15.35%) - \$767,500.

-21,650,300

***Cost to Trumbull -***

***\$51,349,700***

Mr. Barbarotta further explained the project does have inherent requirements to meet because it is a renovate-as-new project. The project is considered a renovate project until the State of CT accepts it as a renovate-as-new project. In response to a question from Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Burgess stated it is possible to identify each phase's cost.

Mr. Elliott clarified that the State of Ct is not accepting new projects at this time, but the projects they have committed to, such as this project, they are proceeding with. The auditorium's capacity is based upon no more than 50% of the student population; the auditorium does qualify for the full reimbursement rate. The athletic section of the project, (natatorium) qualifies for 50% of the reimbursement rate (15.35%); the auxiliary gymnasium qualifies for the full reimbursement rate. Mr. Elliott clarified any work done off-site is not reimbursable. The renovate-as-new is fully reimbursable. Mr. Lemay questioned the contingency rate, he has seen it to be at 10-15% and ours is at 2%. After some discussion it was clarified that this project's combined owner and construction contingency is at 10%.

Mr. Lemay questioned the natatorium estimate of \$5.7 million. Mr. Barbarotta stated that if the bids come in within 10% of the estimates we are speaking of at this meeting, then professionals have done an excellent job. It would be difficult to come in at \$5 million on the nose for the natatorium right now, we need costs associated when it is bid, this will allow for identifying what would be removed from the natatorium. Mr. Wiles agreed designing add-alternates would be the prudent thing to do at this time; the natatorium has been designed bare bones and would recommend going out to bid. They have worked on this pool for 4 months and believes they have designed a pool as close to \$5 million as possible. Going out to bid on this design/estimate would identify exact costs. Through the designing process and all meetings to date much has already been reduced the different schematic design deliberations. Mr. Wiles clarified that if the pool is eliminated the team rooms and bathrooms which are included in the pool design would need to be relocated elsewhere in the project, there will be a cost associated with that, handicap accessibility to all fields will also be necessary to be located elsewhere in the project. Mr. Wiles agreed the cost of \$800,000 would be appropriate for moving those items which are separate from the pool but would still be necessary for the renovation, and would suspect that the cost would be even more than \$800,000, (i.e. fire walls, ramps and other residual elements). Mr. Wiles explained the pool is achieving the goals of

reaching multiple generations, multiple programs, (i.e. - visiting teams will no longer enter the main school). Mr. Ronnow stated that the renovation of Hillcrest pool would be necessary if the pool were eliminated and questioned what the cost for that would entail. Mr. McCabe questioned the cost of decommissioning the Hillcrest pool. Mr. Barbarotta reported that there are serious egress issues with the Hillcrest pool, explaining this is the reason the building committee was charged with the pool. In response to a question from Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Wiles stated the exact costs associated with LEED for the pool area have not been identified to date. Mr. Elliott added that 1, 2 or 3% is a typical up-cost for LEED Silver and payback is usually within 5 years.

Mr. Doyle commended the design team for being in striking distance of the \$5 million.

Mr. Barbarotta requested the building committee to consider the Phase I plans and specifications, including the natatorium at \$5.7 million. Approval of the plans and specifications would allow the EDO 42 to be submitted to state of CT. After the plans are approved at the local level the state will review them in detail page by page, making sure all codes are in compliance, they will red-line the plans and make comments. This is usually a 35-40 day process. March 10, 2009 is the PCT (Planned Completion Test) date. Ultimately after the state reviews the plans, it is the goal to receive authorization from the state to go out to bid. The bidders will be given approximately one month to review the bid documents and create their bids.

Ms. Bivona and Mr. Ronnow moved and seconded to approve the final plans and specifications of the auditorium and boiler room (1 set each of plans and specifications) and the natatorium (1 set each of plans and specifications), 2 sets total of plans and specifications.

Ms. Gottlieb identified the auditorium as part of the project which carries a significant cost. Ms. Bivona discussed the pool and the fact that the \$5 million cost estimate had been discussed early on in the process and did not consider it to be an arbitrary number explaining that it had been identified after research and discussion. Mr. Barbarotta stated that the auditorium's cost had been discussed and it was all around using it as swing space and the cost savings associated for the project by using it for swing space.

Mr. Burgess reviewed the plans and specifications in detail with building committee.

Mr. Nugent arrived at 9:04 p.m.

Atty. Schopick stated that according to building committee rules it would be necessary to have the Town Fire Marshal's approval as well. Mr. Barbarotta added that ad-hoc meetings with the users of all of these spaces and program have taken place throughout the entire design process, and have been included all along.

VOTE: 9-1-1 (Gottlieb against) (Jenkins abstain).

### **New Business:**

Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Lemay moved and seconded to authorize the Town Purchasing Agent to publicize/print the RFP (request for proposal) for the commissioning agent for this project. Mr. Barbarotta requested authorization from the building committee for a commissioning agent request for proposal to be publicized. It is a requirement of LEED to include a commissioning agent on the project. Ms. Gottlieb spoke against the

commissioning agent, explaining the building committee's charge is to try to achieve LEED Silver. Mr. Doyle spoke in favor of a commissioning agent explaining it would be remiss of the building committee not to include a commissioning agent on this type of project.

A copy of the RFP was distributed to the building committee for their review.

VOTE: Motion approved unanimously.

The THSBC agreed by unanimous consent that the next scheduled meeting would be on Wednesday, March 11, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. at the Helen Plumb Building, 571 Church Hill Road. There would be no need to meet on March 2, 2009 as previously discussed.

There being no further business to discuss the THS Building Committee adjourned by unanimous consent at 9:53 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Margaret D. Mastroni