

GES Phase II and WPS Addition & Renovation Joint Building Committee
Meeting #20
January 18, 2007
Dover, New Hampshire 03820

- A. CALL TO ORDER:** A meeting of the WPS Addition and Renovations Joint Building Committee was called to order on Thursday, January 18, 2007 at 5:03 p.m. in Superintendent's office.
- B. ROLL CALL:** Present were Jason Hindle, Catherine Cheney, Carolyn Mebert, Doris Grady, and Raymond Bardwell teleconferenced beginning at 5:07 p.m. Mark Geuther arrived at 5:18 p.m. Also present were John O'Connor, Superintendent; Laurie Verville, Business Manager; Joanne Eaton, Facilities Manager; Patrick Boodey, Principal of WPS; Gary Goudreau, Goudreau & Associates; Keith McBey, Bonnette, Page & Stone (BPS); and Larry Clow, Foster's Daily Democrat.
- C. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:** Carolyn Mebert moved, Doris Grady seconded, approval of meeting minutes of January 11, 2007. An oral **VOTE PASSED: 4/0**
- D. PAYMENT OF BILLS:**
Mr. Hindle read the following payments into record:

- a. John Turner Consulting Inc. Invoice #06-212-010 (Revised) dated 1/11/07 for \$447.00

Mr. Hindle asked Ms. Verville if she had anything to add. Ms. Verville mentioned this was a traditional progress bill that Mr. Bliss has reviewed and signed off on the work completed to date. Mr. Hindle asked if there were any questions or comments. Hearing none, Mr. Hindle asked for a motion. Catherine Cheney moved, Carolyn Mebert seconded, payment to John Turner Consulting in the amount of \$447.00. A roll call **VOTE PASSED: 4/0**

- b. Goudreau & Associates Invoice #2006.02-12 dated 1/4/07 for \$8,440.00

Mr. Hindle asked for a discussion on the above invoice. Ms. Verville stated she asked Mr. Goudreau to write an explanation for this invoice where there was a lot of discussion on it at the January 11th JBC meeting. Ms. Verville mentioned she was not prepared for the amount of the invoice being in Dover and away from the work of Goudreau & Associates and also Rist, Frost & Shumway. She was surprised by the total at last weeks meeting. Mr. Goudreau sent a 3-page explanation; which is attached to this bill. Ms. Verville then asked Mr. Goudreau if he would address the committee. Mr. Goudreau stated instead of explaining his memo, he would like to address the specific concerns of the members. Ms. Grady stated her concern was at a previous meeting; Mr. Goudreau made a comment that every change made will cost more money. Mr. Goudreau mentioned that according to the contract, he is supposed to notify the committee of any major changes being made. However, after the last meeting he took the changes the committee had suggested and started working on the new scope so that he could get the information done and sent to Mr. McBey (BPS) so their documents could go out to bid. He removed the SAU office from the 6,000 sf and moved the music room to the location of the current library and also use part of the space SAU office was supposed to occupy as per the committees recommendations. Mr. Goudreau mentioned he felt under a lot of pressure to get these changes made and get the information to BPS so there weren't any further delays on going out to bid. He also said that part of him felt like he was doing the right thing. (At this time Mr. Bardwell phoned in and Mr. Hindle told him everyone who was at the meeting, that the January 11th minutes were accepted, and the bill from Turner was accepted.) Discussion had just begun on the invoice tabled at last weeks meeting for Goudreau & Associates in the amount of \$8,440. Mr. Hindle then asked if Ms. Grady would repeat her question for Mr. Bardwell. Ms. Grady stated her concern was a comment that was made at a

previous meeting on how any changes made was going to cost money and she was surprised when the invoice was presented last week. Mr. Goudreau mentioned to the committee that there have been several occasions where changes have been made to the plans/scope of work and he has not charged for the work his company has done any previous changes. However, recent changes requested by the committee to the nurses room, guidance office, reading room without any requesting any redesign fees, even though it was past the DD phase. He did this based on late input from the user group. Over time the square footage being worked on can add up and recent changes add up to approximately 13,000 sf. He mentioned that it took Mr. Silver and himself 3 ½ days to make the changes. They had 5 engineer layouts to change including some ceiling layouts. He had to bill for the work done by Mr. Silver, approximately 28 hours, at the billable rate. He mentioned that the original schedule was to have everything done by Dec. 15th; however, in October the project came to a halt because of the decision to not move the SAU office to WPS, leaving 6,000 sf still in need of renovation work. He also mentioned in his e-mail RFS had additional requests which was more money than what Mr. Goudreau billed. Mr. Goudreau stated at some point he has to account for man-hours because there have been several occasions where he has not charged for man-hours that he could have. Ms. Grady mentioned that at last night's City Council meeting they gave their approval for the SAU office to move over to the McConnell. However, she is concerned because they stated it was a "wash," (referring to the \$500,000) and she does not believe it is. Mr. Hindle stated for the record, he wanted to make it clear that it was the School Board who made the decision to move the SAU office to the McConnell Center and not the JBC. Ms. Cheney stated she did not have any questions or comments about the invoice; however, she mentioned she was surprised at the amount of the invoice and that it was unexpected. Mr. Goudreau said this was a different set of circumstances and felt that he was doing the right thing. He said he took the directive of the committee and ran with it. Mr. Bardwell stated in paragraph 1 of the contract, costs associated with any changes are to be brought to the Owner's/committee's attention prior to any revisions being made. Mr. Bardwell mentioned the comment regarding the bubblers that were in the new addition and not Phase 2 – 3. Mr. Goudreau said the mention of the bubblers was not to "muddy the waters," but he wanted the committee to know the work he did going back and forth with the inspector on the bubblers and code requirements. He also mentioned the code does not require bubblers in the corridor and the plumbing inspector agreed after all the e-mails and information exchanged saving the district approximately \$3,000.00 of additional costs. Also, relative to the plumbing inspector, or any inspector, Mr. Goudreau stated, "Authority having jurisdiction has the right to go beyond code required minimums. Mr. Bardwell mentioned paragraph 1 and the first sentence, "It's more than just a contract provision; it's the right thing to do. Mr. Goudreau stated the committee would not have seen an invoice unless he thought it wasn't the right thing to do. Mr. Hindle asked Mr. Geuther if he had any questions or comments. Mr. Geuther said he had no questions on the architectural, but he has questions on the mechanical portion. Mr. Goudreau stated the mechanical cost on the invoice is actually less than the original price requested by RFS.

Mr. Hindle asked if there were any questions or comments. Hearing none, Mr. Hindle asked for a motion. Doris Grady moved, Carolyn Mebert seconded, payment to Goudreau & Associates in the amount of \$8,440.00. A roll call **VOTE PASSED: 6/0**

E. UPDATE PROVIDED BY MICHAEL BLISS, CLERK OF THE WORKS: There is no update due to Mr. Bliss being out of state.

F. UPDATE FROM LAURIE VERVILLE ON PROJECT SOFT COSTS: Ms. Verville distributed the working document for the soft costs to the committee members. She stated that per the committee's request at the January 11th meeting, she came up with this document to help get a better handle on the project's soft costs. She stated it was separated it into 5 areas beginning with Property. She read the following into record:

Property:

FFE	\$185,000 <i>TBD</i>
Security System	\$ 13,375 <i>TBD</i>
Telephones	\$ 28,000 <i>TBD</i>

Sub-Total: \$226,375

She mentioned the figures given are still to be determined because she has not been able to do sufficient research. However, when she is finished with her research and is able to get better figures, she will give a progress report to the committee.

Administrative: (items)

Advertising	\$ 1,000
Builders Risk	\$ 15,000
Clerking Fees – 26 months	\$ 52,000
Permits	\$ 1,000
Copies	\$ 500
Abatement Monitoring	\$ 44,250
Asbestos Abatement-Phase II/III	<u>\$ 295,000</u>
Sub-Total	\$ 408,750

Ms. Verville stated the *Permits* also included the monies to the Treasurer – State of NH for the parking lot. Also, the Abatement Monitoring and Asbestos Abatement-Phase II/III is on the older building. She stated she preliminary engaged Rist, Frost & Shumway (RFS) for the Asbestos Abatement Phase II/III for an estimate of \$295,000 and also hired RFS for abatement monitoring for an additional cost of \$44,250. She mentioned she needed to confirm with RFS all areas of the building they included in their estimate and if it encapsulated/included the flooring. Ms. Mebert asked if the Abatement was for testing the air quality. Ms. Verville said it was and the number may be high. Ms. Verville also mentioned she met with Mr. Bliss to discuss the addition and she mentioned they were clearly within budget on the testing of materials. The wing is getting enclosed and where the structural part is completed, she does not believe there should be any more testing for the structural. All of the above are established numbers.

Fees & Services:

Architectural Fees (all inclusive)	\$770,975	
Testing	\$ 18,000	
Survey & Geotech	\$ 13,600	
Energy Analysis	\$ 11,000	
Additional Engineering	<u>\$ 2,500</u>	
Sub-Total	<u>\$816,075</u>	\$805,705

Ms. Verville stated she had asked Mr. Goudreau about the architectural fees and how his fees were based on percentage. She said he told her he used 6.5% for new construction and 7.5% for renovations and came up with his rates, but it also allows for reimbursables. She then asked Mr. Goudreau if she was double counting the Energy Analysis because she noticed it was also included in his figures. Mr. Goudreau stated he had \$11,280 for additional services for the energy remodeling report. Ms. Verville then reported the \$11,000 should be taken out of her report, thus leaving a balance of \$805,075 (as noted above). She also mentioned the \$2,500 for additional engineering is to RFS to help with the wetlands project and that this money might get trimmed down.

Construction Cost:

Phase I GMP (with roof replacement)	\$4,931,572
Change Proposals	\$ 20,974
Phase II/III Interior Renovations	<u>\$6,191,560</u> TBD
Sub-Total	\$ 11,144,106

Ms. Verville stated she had questions on the construction costs. She said her figure for the Phase I GMP was \$4,931,572; however BPS figures are \$4,934,000. After looking over his numbers, Mr. McBey stated he agreed with Ms. Verville's figure of \$4,931,572. Ms. Verville then asked how BPS generally handles changes made during a project. Mr. McBey stated the company writes up a change order (change order #1, #2 . . .). Ms. Verville asked if everyone recalled the change orders to date and mentioned they were for drainage and roof materials. Ms. Verville then mentioned for Phase II/III there is a slight change to the

\$6,191,560 because we are removing \$10,000 allowance for clean up. Mr. McBey said to remove another \$20,000 in allowance for the kitchen/health inspection. Mr. Goudreau mentioned the kitchen wasn't there. Mr. McBey stated where it wasn't in the scope it was removed from the figures. Mr. Goudreau stated in his documents it shows the work being done. Ms. Verville stated she believes they are talking about two different items. Mr. McBey said he has general mechanical included. Mr. Goudreau stated there is a new number for the electrical. Ms. Verville said the \$20,000 being removed, what was that money intended for. Mr. McBey said it was for the grease traps to be removed. Mr. Goudreau stated he recalled the inspector mentioning the existing floor drains could remain. Mr. Boodey said the meeting he was at; the inspector mentioned the current floor drains didn't have to be replaced; they just needed to be cleaned. Ms. Verville then mentioned an adjustment to architectural fees in the amount of \$11,144 to show the figures approved at the 1/11/07 meeting and this evening. Mr. Geuther asked where they came up with \$40,000. Mr. McBey stated it was for the library casework. Mr. Geuther asked about the display board; Mr. Goudreau said it was moved to the FFE. Ms. Verville mentioned she has not done moved the amount to the FFE yet. Mr. Geuther then asked if that figure has been double counted; Ms. Verville stated it hasn't because it has not been moved to FFE. Mr. Bardwell asked if someone could clarify "visual". Ms. Verville stated it was for the library storage and casework. Mr. Goudreau asked if it could be moved to FFE.

Mr. Hindle stated he met with Ms. Verville before the City Council meeting Wednesday to clarify for the City Manager suggestions for the scope of the budget. He also mentioned the comments from the Fiscal Committee was to follow the same 1%-2% debt finance and exclude it from the CIP balance. He suggested to Ms. Verville and also in talking with Mr. Boodey, it may be prudent to have a separate line item in the WPS general fund operating budget versus bonded monies. This is something that is not new and has been done in the past. He said there needs to be a discussion on furnishing and security and give direction on where monies are allocated. Mr. Hindle then asked if there were any questions or comments. Mr. Bardwell stated we still need a bottom line. Dr. O'Connor mentioned he has a concern taking in capital under general funds; it's a big number to absorb and with everything else, the School Board has to understand that this money is not bonded. Mr. Hindle said that was an absolute and the School Board also needs to know that in doing it this way there is a cost savings versus bonding.

Other: Owner's Contingency \$309,578 (5% only on Phase II/III)

Ms. Verville stated this is a lean number and calculated at 5% for renovation phases only. Dr. O'Connor asked what the average usually is. Mr. McBey stated it runs between 5-10%, but most contractors like to see it at 7-1/2%. He also stated that 2% is his construction which he feels is not an irresponsible amount. Ms. Verville then stated BPS is carrying \$10,0000; Mr. McBey stated that was roughly 2%.

Ms. Verville stated the funding under appropriation for conceptual design/fees last balance was \$189,000. Mr. Hindle asked if Ms. Verville looked at the calendar year. Ms. Verville mentioned she looked ahead on fees and funds intended to go towards schools increasing in size. Ms. Verville then noted that after the corrections and deductions the new net amount is \$3,514,484.

Mr. Hindle noted for the record a different approach might need to be looked at. Original CIP monies were \$9.5 million and in his mind that is the figure he's still looking at. However, the direction of the School Board to move the SAU to the McConnell Ctr., the Council took the \$500,000 for the McConnell Ctr. There is now 6,000 sf of space at WPS that needs to be renovated that is not included in the CIP monies. If we were looking at \$9.5 million then it would be closer to \$3 million the committee would be asking for from the City Council. Ms. Mebert said she did not understand what Mr. Hindle was trying to say. Mr. Hindle stated the School Board and City Council appropriate \$9.5 million for the WPS project, but he believes some of the Council members don't understand that the \$500,000 is for the 6,000 sf at WPS and was not allocated for renovations of the SAU office. Mr. Goudreau asked if it was a 2-part appropriation with the \$500,000. Mr. Hindle stated the \$9 million was put into two bond cycles and the SAU was 2 years out. He mentioned the School Board has to inform the Council that the \$500,000 is for renovating the 6,000 sf at WPS and not for the SAU office. Option B is for the JBC committee to handle the 6,000 sf and request the additional \$500,000. Either way the committee needs a starting point as to why there is a need for additional monies. Mr. Bardwell questioned if this was a prudent request and wasn't the City doing a

space needs analysis. Mr. Hindle stated the City is in the process of an analysis. Ms. Grady stated that what she thinks Mr. Hindle is trying to say is that the JBC committee will be asking for \$3 million, but at last evenings meeting the Council put the \$500,000 towards the McConnell Center and called it a wash. However, nothing was said about the 6,000 sf at WPS so in reality, the JBC committee will be approaching the Council for \$3.5 million versus the \$3 million as it should be. Ms. Verville mentioned she is working on a document from a list of changes the committee has made and would like the JBC to look at what other items might be able to be carved out. She also received information on a Block Grant that has a code requirement for wheel chair lifts and Braille signage throughout the building. She has an approximate cost of \$15,500 to put these items throughout the building. Mr. Goudreau stated he doesn't know the criteria for the Grant. Ms. Verville mentioned she received the Grant application from the planning department the end of last week and was told it needs to be sent in sometime in February. She has not had time to look into the Grant at this time, but will get back to the committee with what she finds out.

G. PROGRESS REPORT BY BONNETTE, PAGE & STONE: Mr. McBey stated the addition has been closed in and is 100% sheathed. Currently being done is the rough plumbing and mechanical and they are looking at the end of the week/beginning of next to kick out the rough on the electrical. The high roof is now watertight. Ms. Verville asked if this was the trouble area; Ms. Eaton mentioned the area that leaked at the last rainfall leaked again during the last storm. Mr. McBey mentioned it was the new addition roof that was watertight. Ms. Verville then asked what the rough schedule for finishing the roof was. Mr. McBey mentioned it was weather permitting. He stated the roof over the gym is done and the other areas will be done as they can be because the temperature doesn't have to be 55°. He also mentioned that as soon as the staging starts coming down, the area will look very different and people can see the progress being made. Mr. McBey also mentioned the doors and frames are well under way at the manufacturer. Mr. Hindle mentioned the schedule presented at the last meeting and asked Mr. McBey when he feels the project would be completed on the addition. Mr. McBey stated he is optimistically looking at late May; however, it may spill into June for any final finishing touches. Mr. Hindle then mentioned to Mr. Clow of Foster's that residents and parents can go to the WPS website page and get updates on the project. Mr. Boodey stated they are looking to update the site by late next week. He has an appointment with Mr. Cooper and Mr. Bliss to go in and take pictures if he can and then it will be given to Ms. Horan, WPS Librarian, to place the updated pictures on the computer by next Friday. Mr. Hindle asked if updates are put in the parent newsletter. Mr. Boodey said they are encouraging, through the Bugle, to have people go to the website to see the progress. Mr. Bardwell asked if someone could clarify "visual". Ms. Verville stated it was for the library storage and casework. Mr. Goudreau asked if it could be moved to FFE.

H. OTHER: Ms. Verville stated she sent Mr. McBey some questions for clarification and are as follows:

1. How did the GC increase 20.1% to \$317,300? Mr. McBey stated that in setting the initial budget the general conditions had been negotiated to a lump sum amount in March 2006 based on a construction cost of approximately \$8 million with a time line of 22 months. It should be noted that the scope of work for the renovation had not been pinned down and the construction costs were simply based on currently approved funding. Since that time, the construction budget for the project has been formally reviewed with construction cost currently in the \$11 million range. A portion of this increase is due to the additional 6,000 sf of space that had been anticipated as a new home for the SAU. The effect of this additional scope was an increase in the time line and in the intensity of hours needed to complete the work during the summers of 2007 & 2008. Ms. Verville stated it would be ideal if a breakdown of Phase I. Ms. Verville asked over how many months Phase I was to take until completion. Mr. McBey said it is 13 months. Then mentioned they are trying to drive to get the addition finished by the beginning of June because there are spaces at the school that are summer sensitive. Mr. Geuther asked other than the 6,000 sf for the SAU office, what else changed in the scope? Mr. McBey said everything based on \$8 million in construction (new only, not the renovations). Dr. O'Connor asked why the numbers were based on \$8 million even though BPS knew it wasn't going to be enough money. Mr. McBey stated he disagreed with that statement. Phase II/III even today he doesn't know where the committee is going and back on 3/13/06, he didn't know we would be discussing increasing the general conditions. Ms. Grady asked for confirmation that some part of the work included under Phase II/III

was actually done in Phase I; like the roof. Mr. Goudreau also stated the piping for the boiler was also included under Phase I but not the purchase/installation of a new boiler. Ms. Cheney mentioned that this number is different from the first figure given and asked by how much. Mr. McBey stated by \$317,300, which were the numbers given at the 1/11/07 meeting. Ms. Cheney asked is the update was based on fell and amount as of today. Mr. McBey said the cost was driven by changes made. He also mentioned that when the general conditions were being discussed he told the committee he was nervous that costs would be more per sf and seeing where we are at now, he's convinced he was right. Mr. Bardwell mentioned back in November, Mr. McBey gave a number of \$264,00, but now in January it's \$317,300. He then mentioned that with the recent deductions and less demo being done, the numbers should have gone down but the figure is higher. Mr. McBey stated at the 11/9/06 meeting, he tried to be clear on the changes in scope and the numbers could go up going into the 6,000 sf of space originally set aside for the SAU office. The bottom line is the cost of products has also gone up. Mr. Bardwell then mentioned that it isn't the scope increase but product increase driving the new figure. Mr. Goudreau said the second general condition number, \$70,000 for SAU space, was swallowed up by the other changes. Dr. O'Connor asked what the general percentage was; Mr. McBey stated between 7-10%. Mr. Goudreau mentioned a project done for a police department and the CM did the project at 6.8%; which was cut to the bone and the company lost money. Mr. Geuther said contractually, general conditions are a lump sum number. Mr. McBey said the intent of the letter the lump sum is "not to exceed" . . . Mr. Geuther said it is what it is. Mr. McBey then reminded the members that 100% of the savings goes back to the district. Ms. Grady asked if Phase I ran pretty close to budget. Mr. McBey said it ran very close to the budget. Ms. Grady stated when Mr. Nick Skaltsis presented this to the Council, Mr. Skaltsis mentioned that once renovations on the old section of the building started the numbers wouldn't be true because of the unknown. Ms. Grady also stated that some changes were made to save money and some to spend money for the areas that are necessary. Ms. Grady then said the asbestos figure was pretty good. Ms. Verville then mentioned that number is still unknown.

2. Approximate cost of new rails @ balcony & railing @ stair 1 & 2 serving balcony. Mr. McBey said he estimates the cost to remove the railings on the balcony to be about \$2,000 and another \$28580 for the new railings. Mr. Hindle asked if this would fall under community. Ms. Mebert asked what the nature was; Ms. Verville said she just received the information for the grant last week. Ms. Mebert asked if it was strictly for ADA compliance. Ms. Verville mentioned that DALC received monies to move to the McConnell Center. Mr. McBey stated he had concerns on the CDBG grant. He has another client that received the grant and at the end of the project the people for the grant are requesting things to be done that were not requested as a qualification for the grant. He just wants to make sure that we do not fall into the same situation and would like to keep it out of BPS's area.
3. Phase I figure (4,934,000.) does not reflect price in GMP documents (\$4,931,572): Mr. McBey stated it was an item discrepancy that Ms. Verville has corrected and the correct number is \$4,931,572.
4. Where are the 3 Change Proposals (\$18,050.) reflected in your report? Mr. McBey stated the change orders would be included in his financial statement for around \$20,000; he did not have the exact figure with him. Ms. Verville asked if he could clarify and get another financial report to the committee. Mr. McBey stated he would.
5. Absent the Ansul system, what is approximate cost of hood? Need Clarification of \$30,000 cost for what type of food service equipment? Mr. McBey stated the \$30,000 allowance is for the Ansul system, hood and grease duct. This is per RFS's recommendation that we carry this in the scope. Mr. Goudreau stated Mr. Silver had spoken with a kitchen designer who came up with the current figure. Ms. Verville asked for a point of clarification that there is a commitment from the Food Service Director, Mark Covell, in the amount of \$35,000; \$30,000 is for new equipment and \$5,000 if for the Ansul system only and not the hood. Mr. Goudreau mentioned to Mr. McBey that he is carrying \$30,000 and can deduct \$5,000. Ms. Verville then mentioned the change orders listed in the amount of \$20,974 is accurate because there is a third change order for the upper level drains.
6. What does the membrane roofing for \$21,326 represent? Canopies? Mr. McBey stated that the membrane is for the roof and **all** canopies at the school.
7. What is \$20,000 Health Inspection Allowance for? Mr. McBey stated the \$20,000 Health Inspection Allowance has been taken out of the current GMP. **RECORD NOTE:** Mr. Bliss sent an e-mail with the

following: In Reading through the minutes of 1-18 JBC meeting, I wanted to clarify the discussion on the \$20,000 allowance for the kitchen/health inspection. The plumbing and health inspectors are requiring 2 new, properly sized grease traps in the kitchen floor; these will replace the existing ones. The inspectors are also requiring a designated hand wash sink. The plumbing inspector is allowing us to only clean out, not replace, existing floor drains, but these are separate from the grease traps. (Copy of e-mail attached.)

8. Would you provide us with a definitive number for plastic laminate savings? Mr. Goudreau stated the cost for the plastic laminate was estimated at \$20,000 but has been cut down to \$10,000 because of the decision the committee made at the 1/11/07 meeting to cap the stud wall with wood trim glued together to get the proper width needed. Mr. Goudreau mentioned it could either be poplar, if it was going to be painted, or oak, if it was going to receive a clear finish. Ms. Verville asked if BPS is working up a Change Proposal request and asked if this was voted on yet. Dr. O'Connor said he didn't remember the discussion of plywood; he thought it was for poplar or oak. Mr. Goudreau then asked if the committee was looking to paint or leave the wood a clear finish. Mr. Geuther thought they discussed painting the wood. Mr. Goudreau said this would be a decent size shelf. Ms. Mebert said Mr. McBey convinced the committee that going with wood would be a better option because of plants that would be placed on the sills, which could leave to water stains. She thought a decision was made for a solid wood. Mr. Goudreau suggested going with a clear finish and asked Mr. McBey is gluing two pieces of wood together to fit the 12" span would work. Mr. McBey said it could be done. Mr. Bardwell also mentioned he thought it was changed from laminate to a solid wood. Mr. Goudreau then suggested if going with a clear finish to choose the red oak, which would match the doors. The committee's consensus was to leave the wood unpainted, but with a clear coat.

Mr. McBey then moved on to state that he has the GMP document with an amendment. Mr. Hindle asked if Ms. Verville wanted to discuss her concerns. Ms. Verville said she would like to set up additional meeting to take a look at additional areas to "sharpen their pencils on" for value engineering. Mr. Bardwell asked if the committee could have a new summary sheet with the new figures before deciding on the GMP document. Mr. Hindle said they are asking for both Mr. Goudreau's and Mr. McBey's help so when the JBC goes before the Council and the public, it will show the diligence the committee has made to try to keep the project near cost and the reason for the request for additional monies. Mr. Bardwell mentioned he thought at the last meeting Mr. McBey was going to write a letter of intent regarding the value engineering and going out to bid. He said the committee needs to move forward, but the documents are big numbers. The committee needs to guide both Goudreau & Associates and BPS on where the project is going and what is expected. Mr. McBey stated he has executed the contract to enter into the GMP so they can move forward on the bidding process. He would like to know that the project is funded before making commitments to the contractors being awarded the bids. Mr. Bardwell said he can't commit and would like to have a letter of content before moving forward. Mr. Geuther said that Mr. McBey has taken this one step further from the letter by having the GMP document. Mr. Geuther said it shows that BPS is confident in their prices given. Ms. Verville asked the legality of a formal vote. Mr. McBey asked about moving forward on funding. Mr. Goudreau said funding needs to be 100% in place because there is little time to sign sub contractors. Mr. Hindle said the money will be there if the Council knows; he knows the Council has concerns because of other City projects that have come in well above the original price. Mr. Hindle said he also wants to show the Council and community that the JBC is continuing its commitment by being professional, diligent and confident in the final product. Mr. Bardwell then asked if in the bid it's mentioned that this is supporting documents and inform the subs that it could be 30-60 days before signing a contract. Mr. McBey stated he doesn't want to advertise that point; it could affect the prices we receive. Ms. Grady brought up the comment Mr. Geuther made about the GMP document and the confidence BPS is showing in their numbers. Mr. Geuther said the GMP document is one better than a contract because it shows the confidence that BPS is willing to stand behind their numbers.

Mr. Goudreau then mentioned the performances of the current boilers are failing and that one is leaking continuously. Mr. Geuther asked how old they are. Mr. Goudreau said he wasn't sure, but they estimated the boilers had another 10-15 years of life; however, over the last year they are showing they can't last much longer. Mr. Hindle mentioned the hot water heater was 50 years old. Mr. Bardwell mentioned Mr. Geuther made a good point because the documents are in good faith. He then asked if the committee could

have further clarification on the savings; Mr. McBey said he would supply an updated document to the committee. Ms. Grady said the committee can go and cut more from the project; however, don't know what will run into once renovations start on the existing building. It could balance each other out. Ms. Cheney asked when the soonest presentation to the School Board could be made. Mr. Hindle said he would like to have one more meeting before presenting to the School Board. Ms. Mebert stated she thought tonight's meeting was supposed to clear up any questions on costs. Ms. Cheney mentioned there are still a few big-ticket items that need clarification. Mr. Goudreau asked if clarification could be done by e-mail. Mr. Hindle stated that was fine as long as the e-mails are placed on the agenda for further discussion. Dr. O'Connor stated the next School Board meeting was Feb. 12th. Mr. Grady asked if a special meeting could be called. Dr. O'Connor said it could; however, the workshops are set up for the budget. Mr. Hindle mentioned the other issue of the FFE and how much is budgeted out. Mr. Geuther asked if we could hit the street on bidding before approval. Mr. Bardwell said he would like to have one more meeting to go over the plus and minus' and dove tail it in. Mr. Hindle asked about meeting in one week. Dr. O'Connor said if a presentation is going to be made before the School Board, the JBC should be there. Mr. Hindle mentioned a list needs to be put together for the School Board as to why the additional monies are being requested. There is the increase in price for steel and cooper, the 6,000 sf of SAU space, the change in scope for the kindergarten/preschool area, increase in woodwork to take out the middle school feel, and the removal of the lockers from the hallways. Ms. Cheney said we should go through the CIP calendar to give Mr. McBey and idea, where he does not know the process. Mr. Hindle said we are looking at the second week in March for approval; Ms. Cheney mentioned this is going through the whole process. Mr. Hindle asked if the JBC can wrap their hands around the questions tonight and if there is a clear reasoning behind the additional monies. Dr. O'Connor said there is a budget workshop scheduled for February 5th and then it could go to the Council for February 14th. Mr. Bardwell said to get this ready, the minutes need to be done as soon as possible, ideas put together and sent out to the members to get add ons from everyone and then do a master list for the presentation.

J. NEXT MEETING: The next meeting for the JBC is scheduled for Tuesday, January 30, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. in the Superintendent's Office.

K. ADJOURNMENT: Carolyn Mebert moved, Catherine Cheney seconded, adjournment of the JBC Committee at 7:00 p.m. An oral **VOTE PASSED 6/0**.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason Hindle, Chair
Joint Building Committee
JH/pb