

JFK Pre-Referendum Committee

August 24, 2016

Enfield Room

6:30 pm

Called to order at 6:30 pm

Present: Tom Arnone, Scott Ellis, Mary Keller, Tina LeBlanc, Joseph Muller, Trish Neild-Barry, Walter Kruzel for Ray Peabody, Christopher Rutledge, Steve Sargalski, Bryan Chodkowski, (Scott Kaupin attends the end of the meeting).

Question on if there is a discussion on the minutes submitted. Question as to whether or not past meeting minutes were passed. It is confirmed that they were.

There is a motion by Steve Sargalski to approve minutes. It is second by Joseph Muller. Motion passes.

Comments from public gallery-

The committee is going to implement the similar rules as the Town Council in regards to public comment. They should not be more than 3 minutes in length and will have to be relevant to the business of the committee at hand.

Vinnie Weselisa 12 Deer Run-Comment that \$75,000 seems high for a feasibility study. We haven't come close to spending that in the past for an investigation report. According to the Board of Education this is information that we already knew.

Comments from the committee-none

Funds to support the Silver Petrucelli evaluation discussion-The Council has asked for 3 competitive bids to be more transparent and have brought in the on call engineering firms to bring in bids.

Request to clarify what will get accomplished through the evaluation. Will be discussed during the bid process item

New business-

The executive committee discussed a liaison to the Town Council. It seems it came off as a more formal point than it was meant. Going forward, is it necessary to get on the agenda or should they come during the open forum portion for updates on committee progress?

Special boards and reports are in the normal Council meeting. There could be a report as often as the committee deems necessary. Scott and Tom can also provide updates. Please call ahead and Council will be able to accommodate.

If the committee is going to report to the Town Council, they should also attend the Board of Education meetings for the same purpose. It can be added to the agenda with notice as a Board guest, or speak from the audience.

Regarding the bid process-There was a suggestion from one of the councilors to pass this by the committee including the feasibility study, RFP, the and the award date of September 19<sup>th</sup>. The RFP's are due into the TMO by Friday, September 2. This gives the other firms that are not pre-qualified more time to prepare. To expedite the process in order to get it to Council before the next meeting but would short cut review from this committee. TMO will review the technical responses that are electronically submitted to make sure that they are all qualified. Will give the committee time in advance to review and provide feedback to Council, which will be the ultimate decision maker. The RFP is based principally on the Silver Petrucelli Study and also the high school study that was done a few years prior. A lot of the content has to do with reuse feasibility and utility expansion as well as how to qualify most of the work to be reimbursable by the state. There will be back end commitments from the organizations that will review.

Timeline- asked in the proposal for them to be responsive of the Committee's timeline. None of the respondents were asked to provide a timeline, but to attend the committee's meetings. 45 days are lost in the process which makes it tighter, but not out of the realm to meet some of the initial time tables, depending. Contact TM with any questions and answers will be shared with the committee via email.

B&L, Silver Petrucelli, Weston & Sampson are 3 of the 5 companies that were qualified. This process is not based strictly on the lowest, but on getting the desired product.

Next Council meetings are September 6 & 19. Can get materials out Friday before Labor Day and meet on the 7<sup>th</sup> or 14<sup>th</sup>. Council packet would go out on the 16<sup>th</sup>. Can communicate with Council before they meet.

In addressing Mr. Weselisa's statements on the RFP and the cost-if it is comparable to the high school. The frame of reference is not available at the time, but once they have the numbers from the other engineers they will have a better view on what is reasonable.

If the money that went to the high school was initially 150,000 and we asked for 75,000 it makes more sense. Based on information that had already been garnered, it had been concluded that someone who knows how to navigate the state reimbursement process is necessary. Some of the information was based on a building that was not at old, not meaning that it wasn't valuable. Wanted to make sure that answer was on record. Does anyone know about high school?

Just over \$100,000 was spent on the high schools process. There is also time separation between the two, and there will be increased charges for services. To the various studies that exist-looking at structural pieces not feasibility. SBS and Honeywell studies assume that the buildings are going to be used in the same capacity. These studies will help with this project. There will be overlap later down the line. Clean energy had the same kind of process. Councilman Arnone was also questioning the price and sees now that it comes in line. He is curious to see what these 5 engineering groups come up with.

High level timeline-September 2<sup>nd</sup> information submission, discussion on September 14<sup>th</sup>. When does the engineering firm have to have the study in? Reimbursement items? To Town Council for approval? Feedback?

Anticipating 3-4 months for preparation. Jim Guiliano is asked to comment. 182,000 sq feet would take 3-4 months. He asks if there is a referendum planned. Made a note that Jim Guiliano is not really an audience member, he is hired staff. Point made that the study is design, not feasibility. The descriptions of services in the language of the RFP will bring different ways to modify the building.

Additional comments before closing from the gallery of the committee? Jim Guiliano, Construction Solutions Group, finishes up on the timeline. 5 months will give a couple of good construction estimates. Next November will be the referendum date. Grant application can be submitted by June 30<sup>th</sup>. The state now allows grant application with schematic design and estimate with a hold off on the referendum until November so it can be done at the same time as general elections. November 18 is the cutoff date to have the resolution and referendum information signed and sealed by the Town Clerk and submitted to the school construction grants. June 30 is the cutoff to get the format and estimate together

Question-can information on making state deadlines be provided in writing? Have educational specifications been developed? No, group is still in the conceptual stage. The design firm that ends up selected may ask for it. Has been advertised, no questions received as of this time. They are a blueprint for the architects as to what is desired and required.

Additional comments? Question that Vinny brought up about the study because there is confusion. In light of being transparent, there are a bunch of studies that have been looked at to get to this point and this is not another one of the same as what has already been done. This is the same process that we went through with the high school to get to the design portion with reimbursements etc. The word study should not be used.

No other comments.

Next meeting date set for September 14 at 6:30 in order to have enough time to review the documents.

One packet with all the information will be sent out the 6<sup>th</sup>.

A point is made that the committee wants to keep everything transparent. It was discussed at the last meeting not to have a fluid stream with guest speakers. The high school pre-referendum meetings can serve as an example to how these meetings are run.

Motion to adjourn, second.

Adjourned at 7:11 pm