



School Building Projects Advisory Council

Meeting Minutes

September 30, 2014, 2:00pm

Legislative Office Building, Room 1B

Members Present
Pasquale "Bud" Salemi, Chair Gian-Carl Casa Sara Bronin Antonio Iadarola

Members Absent
Lou Casolo John Woodmansee

Attendance – Staff
Craig Russell David Barkin Jenna Padula Jason Crisco Timothy O'Brien

Attendance – Departmental representatives
William M. Turley, Area Coordinator, School Safety Program, DEMHS

Meeting Business:

Meeting called to order by Chair Salemi at 2:08pm.

Minutes of June 19, 2014 Meeting
Motion (Casa) to adopt the draft minutes. Motion to table (Bronin/Iadarola). Motion approved. Item tabled.

Agenda Item 3.a. regarding site selection and site plan review process
Russell discussed the presentation materials for Item 3.a., and noting these staff recommendations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site Analysis should be performed on all school construction projects, except for those projects that are exclusively interior renovation or for those projects where site disturbance is limited to project activities. 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. Discussion occurred on the report (Bronin, Iadarola, Russell) regarding the necessity of altering the application form(s) presented on the website.

Agenda Item 3.b. regarding the school construction grant application submission process and the building plan review process

Russell discussed the presentation materials for Item 3.b., and noting these staff recommendations:

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. PREP meetings could be changed from district-by-district meetings to regular monthly meetings with as many districts as choose to attend. Earlier in the process, PREP meetings would serve as informational for districts at the beginning of the process.
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.
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. Currently, the PCT is not held until final design.
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 review.
 - 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 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 municipal fire marshal, building official, health official and ADA official.

Barkin added further information on code review and having more complete code compliance submissions by the project architect at PCT meetings.

Discussion occurred on the staff recommendations (Iadarola/Russell/Salemi/Barkin/Bronin), including:

- differing experiences at PCT meetings, based on the quality of a district's consultants
- Schematic Design and its definition, including whether municipalities would be reimbursed for this, should their referenda fail
- how the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) process requires Schematic Design and cost estimates based on those documents before local bonding authorization
- the sense that moving the PREP and PCT meetings to earlier in the process, before final design, makes sense, but that there should be more discussion on the design recommendations and that there should be more DCS staffing to support these functions.

Agenda Item 3.c. regarding cost reporting and uniform standard for cost estimates

Russell discussed the presentation materials for Item 3.c., noting the staff recommendation to amend the current policy to include all school construction projects regardless of construction cost and change the uniform standard to Unifomat II, Level 4.

Discussion occurred on this agenda item (Salemi/Russell), noting the difficulties SBPAC has experienced with obtaining cost data from municipalities and the fact that the State has accurate school construction cost data in Unifomat from recent state technical high school projects.

Agenda Item 4.a. regarding standard specifications

Barkin discussed the presentation materials for Item 4.a., noting the staff recommendations to

1. Hire a multi-disciplined consulting team – Architects / Engineers / Ed Planners.
2. Create a “Guidelines for School Construction,” including Standard Specifications.
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.

Barkin elaborated that standard specifications would work with a maximum reimbursable cost per square foot in that the specifications would inform the level of the maximum cost and that the two would provide local flexibility within clear parameters: the standards providing a minimum for educational need and the maximum reimbursable cost limiting overall cost.

Discussion occurred on this agenda item (Iadarola/Barkin/Salemi/Bronin), noting

- need for some standardization of design for guidance to school districts
- the context of how this is a practical approach to the generalized call for “model blueprints”
- how the MSBA is reconsidering its “model schools” program
- the consultancy to create draft specifications and the timeline for that work
- how state policy (per capita space allowance) is onerous on school districts in renovation projects, due to an infrastructure built for a much larger statewide student population

Discussion regarding consultancies

Discussion occurred in consultancies related to the work under discussion (Bronin/Salemi/Casa/Barkin/Iadarola). Casa/Bronin asked about the consultant contracting process and whether the Council or DAS has the budget for and hires the consultants. Salemi stated that the funding is in the DAS budget and will research and provide the Council with more information. Iadarola expressed desire for a clear scope of work for consultants and the observation that the first report did not meet all expectations. Salemi discussed difficulties the consultant faced in obtaining data, due to lack of availability from municipalities.

Agenda Item 4.b. regarding standard contracts

Padula discussed the presentation materials for Item 4.b., the recommendation for a consultancy to prepare standard contracts in accordance with CGS Sec. 10-292(d), and offered the staff recommendation that
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.

Discussion occurred on the agenda item and the potential Council action (Bronin/Salemi), noting that there should be a public comment period in the process of promulgating these contracts, having Council Public Hearings on this matter, having the contracts establish clear interrelationships between different types of contracting on school construction projects (project management, A/E/Design, General Contracting/Construction Manager At-Risk) and how standard contracts can improve such things as the change order process by standardization.

Item 4.c.i. regarding a comparative analysis of the school construction processes in CT, NYC and MA

Russell introduced a chart, “Comparing School Construction Programs” and offered it for Council members’ review.

Council members (Bronin/Iadarola) discussed the chart, noting that it was a very useful synthesis of prior meetings.

Item 4.c.ii. regarding program administration funding

Russell discussed the presentation materials for Item 4.c.ii., noting the staff recommendation to:

- Create a special fund from which school construction grant program staff and administration would be paid, generated from school construction grant funds (capital funds).

Discussion occurred on this agenda item (Bronin/O'Brien) regarding what entities and what funds pay for school construction program staffing in New York City and Massachusetts.

Agenda Item 5 regarding a report on stakeholder meetings

O'Brien presented the "School Construction Policy Report, September 30, 2014, Update on stakeholder outreach", noting the work to build lines of communication in support of the work of the SBPAC and DAS in creating new school construction policies.

Discussion occurred on the agenda item (Bronin/Salemi) about having Public Hearings, with stakeholders presenting their commentary.

Adjournment

Motion (Bronin/Iadarola) to adjourn. **Motion approved.**

Chair Salemi declared the meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.