



## Agenda Item 3:

### **Report on Administrative Accomplishments and Administrative Initiatives.**

#### **a. Site Selection and Site Plan Review Process**

Recommendation #5 – Require districts to provide a formal evaluation of site conditions before completing the grant application (pg. 17 and 18 of the Report by School Building Projects Advisory Council, February 7, 2014).

#### **Current Standard:**

1. Form ED053 - Site Analysis is not required on all school construction projects.

#### **Administrative Action:**

1. Form ED053 has been updated to include a recommendation to districts to schedule a site plan review meeting prior to submitting construction drawing for the Plan Completion Test.

Guidelines & Checklists added to Form ED053 include:

- a. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) – flood maps showing 100 and 500 year floodplain, floodway & coastal hazards zones.
- b. Connecticut Environmental Conditions – inland/wetland, critical habitats, etc.
- c. Site Plan of Conservation & Development – protected lands, historical districts, conservation areas.

#### **Additional Recommendations:**

1. Site Analysis should be completed on all school construction projects, except for those projects that are only interior renovation or for those projects where there is minimal site disturbance.
2. Where applicable, Site Analysis Form completion should be a requirement of the School Construction Grant Application process and be made a part of the school construction grant application checklist.
3. Site analysis prior to grant application submission is consistent with new SSIC standards.



**b. School Construction Grant Program Application Submission and the Plan Review Process.**

Recommendation #6 (pg. 15 and 17 of the Report by School Building Projects Advisory Council, February 7, 2014) – Require or encourage standardized procedures in for school districts construction management process. More specifically develop and implement a design and construction team evaluation process.

**Current Standard:**

1. Pre-Review Evaluation Process (PREP) meeting is scheduled prior to the start of construction documents.
2. Plan Completion Test (PCT) meeting is scheduled at 100% completion of construction documents. PCT meeting is labor intensive and is heavily focused on code issues.
3. PCT utilizes a customized checklist that blends regulatory requirements with building code requirements.
4. Approval of final plans serves as the impetus for a “sign off” letter from the Commissioner allowing a project to go out to bid pursuant to CGS 10-292.
5. District has the option of submitting final plans to local officials having jurisdiction if the Commissioner cannot complete his/her review of final plans within thirty days of submission, pursuant to 10-292 (c).

**Recommended Action:**

1. The PREP meeting should occur prior to the submission of the school construction grant application and should be included on the grant application checklist as a requirement in submitting a school construction grant application.
2. Site analysis should be complete prior to the submission of a grant application and the introduction of the site plan analysis form should take place at the PREP meeting.
3. The minimum standard submission of design documents to be considered for a school construction grant application should be schematic design (35%).



4. The cost estimate submitted as part of the school construction grant application process should be based on schematic design.
5. A plan review meeting should be held at the completion of design development (60%), not at the completion of construction documents (100%).
6. Construction documents (100% completion) should be submitted upon completion for an in-house review.
  - a. In-house review of construction documents would primarily be done to ensure compliance with Chapter 173 of the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) – Public School Building Projects, and the DCS Regulations Concerning School Construction Grants.
7. Utilize standard ICC checklist (w/ CT supplements) at final review for code compliance.
  - a. Code compliance review would be limited to standard requirements for public safety, which include Connecticut State Building Code Chapters 3-9 and Chapter 23.
    - i. Included with the construction document submission should be a completed ICC standard checklist with modifications to include Connecticut amendments. The Plan Review Record (PRR) should include detailed summary of the dialog between the design team and local officials having jurisdiction regarding the issues of nonconformance and actions taken to remedy the issue.
    - ii. A cover letter should accompany the submission of the ICC checklist and PRR Site stating that all issues of nonconformance have been addressed. This letter should be signed by the fire marshal, building official, health official and ADA official.

### **c. Cost Reporting Database/Uniform Standard for Cost Estimates**

Recommendation #1 Establish a cap on maximum reimbursable project costs (pg. 17 and 18 of the Report by School Building Projects Advisory Council, February 7, 2014).



Recommendation #8 – Create a process for consistent construction related data collection, in addition to current grant data collection (pg.17 and 19 of the Report by School Building Projects Advisory Council, February 7, 2014).

**Current Standard:**

1. The OSF grants management and plan review units collect school construction data as required under state statute and departmental regulations. The data collected is insufficient to perform construction data analysis to establish a cap on maximum reimbursable costs.

**Administrative Actions:**

1. The Commissioner of DAS has the authority to establish a maximum reimbursable cost per square foot for school construction projects pursuant to CGS 10-284 (5).
2. DAS will implement a new database system to input, store and analyze cost reporting data for school construction projects. The new database system will consist of:
  - a. Survey of existing cost information on file with the State.
  - b. The collection of school construction cost data from various municipal and regional districts.
  - c. Soliciting information industry experts, design consultants and contractors participating in public school construction in Connecticut and neighboring states.
3. DAS will draft regulations pursuant to CGS 10-284 (5) to establish the maximum reimbursable cost per square foot.
4. DAS will create a dynamic cost estimating system, based on the data collection, to be integrated into the application process for the funding of design and construction services based on the maximum reimbursable cost per square foot.
5. The cost estimating system will be used in coordination with design standards (Items for SBPAC Discussion and Future Consideration) so that the maximum reimbursable cost per square foot is reflective of recommended minimum construction standards and program requirements.
6. DAS will issue a new policy requiring the submission of construction cost for all projects in Unifomat.

**Recommended Action:**



1. Amend the current policy to include all school construction projects and change the uniform standard to Unifomat II, Level 4.

## Agenda Item 4:

### **Items for SBPAC Discussion and Future Consideration**

#### **a. Standard Specifications – David Barkin**

Recommendation #3 – Develop and implement design and construction standards for public schools (pg. 17 and 18 of the Report by School Building Projects Advisory Council, February 7, 2014).

Recommendation # 4 - Provide school districts with school project planning, design standards, and construction services either through the DCS or a newly created school construction authority (pg. 17 and 18 of the Report by School Building Projects Advisory Council, February 7, 2014).

#### **Current Standard:**

1. In Connecticut, there is no standard or accepted practices for school design. Design decisions vary greatly from project to project.
2. Eligible/ineligible items are defined by statute.
3. Allowable area is calculated and can reduce the reimbursement rates.

#### **Options:**

1. CGS 10-292q (b) stipulates that model blueprints be developed for new school building projects.
  - a. Do we provide a model template that dictates solutions?
  - b. Do we provide templates based on existing proven school designs?
  - c. Do we establish program templates, templates of learning spaces, and establish minimum quality standards to provide for adaptable solutions with long life cycle?

#### **Recommended Action:**



1. Hire a multi-disciplined consulting team – Architects / Engineers / Ed Planners.
2. Create a “Guidelines for School Construction.”
3. Develop multiple space programs for schools of differing sizes and educational levels.
4. Provide graphic and written descriptions of model learning spaces.
5. Develop quality standards that act as a minimum standard and reflect a 50 year life cycle.
6. Allow flexibility in the standards to respond to individual district needs allowing for innovation with educational pedagogy.

## **b. Standard Contracts – Jenna Padula**

Recommendation #6 – Require or encourage standardized procedures in school district’s contracting, procurement and construction management processes (pg. 17 and 19 of the Report by School Building Projects Advisory Council, February 7, 2014).

### **Current Standard:**

CGS Section 10-292(d) allows districts to use state contracts for school construction projects. The state does not actually have any school construction contracts to offer. We should have contracts available that reference Chapter 173 and its requirements and that clearly define the owner’s role. As is the case now, the state would not be a party to the contract. The goal should be to develop a family of contracts that are integrated—owner’s representative, design and other professional services, and construction for CMR and design-bid-build projects. Districts that use the state’s family of standardized contracts would benefit from a set of contracts that complement one another and help ensure continuity and efficiency in projects and a streamlined change order process.

Both MA and NYC require that a district use the school construction authority’s standard contracts.

### **Recommended Action:**



With the help of a legal consultant, we plan to develop a family of standardized contracts districts could use for their Chapter 173 school construction projects.

**Potential Council Action:**

The SBPAC should consider the benefits of having such standardized contracts and whether they warrant a legislative change to require their use or to provide an incentive to encourage their use.

**c. School Design and Construction Process**

**i. Comparative Analysis of School Construction Processes (MSBA, NYSCA, CT)**

See attachment “Comparing School Construction Program Processes.”

**ii. Program Administration funding**

Staff is currently funded from the general fund. Staffing is limited and the primary focus of staff is on administering school construction grant program and limited plan review. To ensure greater quality control on school construction costs, additional staff is needed to oversee project procurement, contract administration, and assist in project management.

**Recommended Action:**

Create a special fund account from which school construction grant program staff and administration would be paid 0.25% from all school construction grant monies. Paying school construction program staff utilizing the same funding source as used for school construction development is the standard methodology for funding construction services. Massachusetts utilizes a percentage of its annual school construction program cost to staff the MSBA and the State of Connecticut uses a percent of its program resources to fund the administration of state construction programs.