

SHEPAUG BUILDING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING

February 1, 2016 at the Shepaug Valley School

- 1. Call to Order.** Mr. Gregory J. Cava, Chairman of the Shepaug Building Committee called the meeting order on February 1, 2016 at 6:01 PM.

Present were the following:

Committee:	Gregory J. Cava, Chairman, Alex McNaughton, John Kuck, and Rebecca Devine (Ms. Worobel was absent)
Administration:	Patricia Cosentino, Superintendent, Robert Giesen, Director of Finance & Operations, Donald O'Leary, Facilities Manager Kim Gallo, SVS Principal
Guests:	Charles Boos, Kaestle Boos Associates, Inc., project architects

- 2. Organization.** Mr. Cava led a brief discussion of the organization of the building committee and its principal purposes as well as the process. Mr. Cava requested that the Region set up email accounts for each committee member so email communications can be captured for FOIA purposes.

- 3. Interview O&G Industries Inc. ("O&G") for Project Construction Manager.** Mr. Cava indicated that following publication of our Request for Proposal ("RFP") and Request for Quotation ("RFQ") for the position of Construction Manager for the Ag-STEM building project ("CM"), the central office received a number of telephone calls from interested parties, but only one response to the RFP and RFQ and that from O&G, the entity that had provided the estimates of project cost submitted to referendum. The Committee briefly discussed the interview process and then the representatives from O&G were escorted into the room. The O&G presentation team consisted of

Greg Oneglia, Vice Chairman of O&G,
Ken Biega, Project Executive
Laura Purcell, who would be the manager of the pre-construction phase of the project,
Roger Johnson, who would be the project superintendent,
Robert Hall, and
Melissa Corey, who coordinated the slides and presentation materials.

O&G made a presentation on its capabilities which include being the largest project manager of school construction projects in Connecticut with four agriSTEM projects completed in Connecticut including Womogo, Suffield, Northwest in Winsted, and the Aquaculture program in New London. The written presentation materials are attached to these minutes. At the conclusion of the presentation, the O&G team was dismissed and the Committee began discussions of the role of the construction manager and in particular the advantages of having a construction manager at risk. Based on the O&G presentation, the only difference in cost is the cost of the district acquiring bonding to cover the payment guaranty. Members of the committee inquired as to whether Messrs. Giesen and O'Leary had any ideas as to why we received only one response to the RFP/RFQ. Mr. Giesen

indicated that the RFP and RFQ were advertised in the required manner by publishing them in the Waterbury *Republican American* in three consecutive issues. We were advised by Mr. Boos and Mr. Giesen that if we were to start the process over, we would likely lose at least two months and may not get any further responses. Moreover, re-bidding would allow the O&G bid to be revised upward and we could end up in a materially worse position. As the timelines are tight in order to obtain delivery of completed facilities by July 2018 following the 15-month construction period which is bookended by two summers, additional delays at this point could slow the process of finalizing our application with the State in time for action before the end of the current legislative session. Following considerable debate the fee proposal (RFQ) was opened and reviewed briefly. Ms. Devine moved that the Building Committee recommend to the Board of Education that O&G be selected as the construction manager at risk subject to a detailed review of the financial program, satisfactory answers to any questions we may have, and approval of the process and any contracts by our legal counsel. Mr. McNaughton seconded the motion, and following a vote of Ms. Devine, Mr. McNaughton, and Mr. Cava AYE and Mr. Kuck NAY, the motion was adopted.

4. Building Committee Process. This item was passed as adequate discussion was held during the portion of the meeting devoted to organizational matters.

5. Discussion – building project. There was further discussion of the building project and the proposed timeline with completion of the project expected for August 2018 occupancy.

6. Schedule Future Meetings. For the time being, two members of the Committee will have difficulty arriving at meetings before 6:00 PM. After individuals consulted their schedules, the Committee has adopted the following schedule of meetings:

February 4, 2016 at 4:00 PM at Shepaug Valley School. This is a special meeting to meet with a representative of O&G to obtain answers to questions and to review the proposed construction schedule.

Regular Building Committee Meetings will be held at the Shepaug Valley School at 6:00 PM on the following dates:

February 23, 2016;
March 22, 2016;
April 12, 2016;
April 26, 2016;
May 10, 2016;
May 31, 2016;
June 14, 2016; and
June 28, 2016.

The meetings have been scheduled at approximately 2-3 week intervals with the understanding that some meetings may be cancelled if not needed.

7. Adjournment. There being no further business to come before the meeting, it was adjourned by consent at 9:30 PM.