DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
*165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut*

# School Building Projects Advisory Council

# Meeting Minutes

## February 18, 2015, 10:00 am

Legislative Office Building, Room 1B, 210 Capitol Ave., Hartford, CT

| Members Present |
|---|
| Pasquale "Bud" Salemi, Chair<br>Lou Casolo<br>John Woodmansee<br>Antonio Iadarola |

| Members Absent |
|---|
| Gian-Carl Casa |

| Department of Administrative Services |
|---|
| Melody A. Currey, Commissioner |

| Other Departmental Representatives |
|---|
| William Shea, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection |

| Attendance - Staff |
|---|
| Jenna Padula<br>David Barkin<br>Jason Crisco<br>Timothy O'Brien |

## Meeting business

The meeting was called to order by Chair Salemi at 10:05am.

| Agenda Item 2, Minutes of previous meeting |
|---|
| A **motion** (Casolo, Woodmansee) was made to approve the minutes of the December 8, 2014 meeting. **Motion approved.** |

| Agenda Item 3, Membership changes |
|---|
| Salemi announced the resignation from the Council of members Sara Bronin (architect seat) and William Turley (school safety seat). Letters from both were presented for the record (Appendix A and Appendix B).<br><br>Discussion (Casolo) occurred that William Turley brought expertise in school security to the Council, with the suggestion that someone with similar expertise be appointed to the Council to help make school security improvements cost-effective. |

Iadarola was seated.

| Agenda Item 4, Legislative recommendations |
|---|
| Padula introduced discussion of the concept of a proposal for legislation to change the statutes to allow a town until November 15th to submit evidence of its local funding authorization, if the town has a referendum bonding approval process and if the town has set the date of its referendum by the time of its grant application, due June 30th. Towns without bonding referendum would still be required to have local funding authorization in place by June 30th.<br><br>Discussion (Salemi) occurred about the recent New London bonding referendum and the delay in that process current law would require.<br><br>Salemi introduced new **DAS Commissioner Melody Currey**, who discussed that the proposal is a good idea, noting that applications would not be processed by DAS until after local bonding authorization is obtained. Cmsr. Currey discussed improving the grant process, that it takes too long and that she is looking forward to streamlining the process.<br><br>Gary Shettle of the Connecticut Association of School Business Officials (CASBO) was recognized by Chair Salemi, who asked about the wording required in the referendum questions. Discussion (Padula/Salemi) was that the key is the approval, prior to the June 30th application deadline, for the scheduling of the referendum.<br><br>Salemi closed the discussion, noting that this item is the only school construction policy project proposal possibly being sent to OPM for legislative consideration this year. |

| Agenda Item 5, subject a, Discussion on new Cost Reporting Policy |
|---|
| On introduction by Salemi, John Butkus of Arcadis, consultant to the state, discussed the School Construction Policy Report of February 10, 2015 (Appendix C) on the new Cost Reporting Policy being finalized by DAS, noting that changes were made in the proposed policy to address concerns raised at the previous Council meeting. Uniformat II Level 2 was determined to be what is needed for calculating the maximum reimbursable cost per square foot and other statistical purposes. Greater levels of Uniformat II reporting were determined to only be needed for cost estimates on new, extension, extension/alteration and renovate as new projects greater than $5 million, changing the $2 million threshold below which projects need not be reported in Uniformat under the current policy. Uniformat Level 2 reporting would be required for the actual construction costs for all projects.<br><br>Discussion (Casolo/Salemi) occurred on the current policy and how it is different from the new policy, and about the process of publicizing and informing school districts of the new change. Information is to be sent to superintendents and posted on the OSF website.<br><br>Discussion (Iadarola/Butkus/Salemi/Barkin/Casolo) occurred that Danbury and Stamford manage larger projects in-house under a general contractor format, not necessarily using firms that would do the Uniformat reporting on their behalf, but that Unformat Level 2 is similar to what is already done. The purpose of Level 4 data reporting was discussed as being needed for eligibility analysis of project components by OSF staff. What Uniformat levels are to be required at different design stages and that substantive design review is to occur earlier than currently, at the design document level, were discussed. Level 2 actual construction cost data was discussed as the data to be kept for statistical analysis. Level 4 detail was also discussed as aiding certain elements of project and policy planning.<br><br>Discussion (Iadarola/Barkin/Casolo) occurred about the need to publicize the policy changes to school districts and towns and about the planned, earlier, PREP meetings to provide more information to school districts at very early project stages. |

Discussion (Iadarola/Butkus/Barkin/Salemi/Casolo) occurred that Level 2 actual costs would be generated from different data than earlier cost estimate reports, rather than be a roll-up of Level 3 or 4 data. Discussion occurred that the new policy would apply only to projects with applications submitted after July 1, 2015, though voluntary early compliance would be encouraged.

**Agenda Item 5, subject b, Discussion on design guidelines for school building projects**

Barkin presented on the process for the selection of a consultant to recommend design guidelines for school building projects. Design guidelines called for include space programs for various configurations of schools, graphic description of model learning spaces, quality standards guidelines that are both specific, in terms of material finishes and environmental air quality, and subjective, in terms of local considerations and developing a fifty year life cycle. The consultant is also to recommend procedural guidelines for DAS staff review. The RFQ was issued in mid-January. By February 6th, four responses were received, with telephone interviews set for January 23rd. Cost proposals are to be requested after interviews.

Discussion (Casolo/Barkin) occurred about firm expertise types responding, with responding firms including A/E and planners.

Discussion (Salemi/Barkin/Casolo/Iadarola) occurred about the role of design guidelines, the interest in flexibility to allow innovation, how current state rules discourage planning by school districts and the interest in flexibility for school districts. Discussion occurred on allowing flexibility for school districts in school design, while not removing constraints that limit cost.

Discussion (Casolo/Salemi/Barkin/Iadarola) occurred on the cost of the consultancy, to be less than $100,000, about the value of reviewing prospective consultants' work in other states and the need to discuss the role of technology and safety standards in design guidelines.

**Agenda Item 5, subject c, School Safety Infrastructure Council**

Crisco discussed the final report and update of the SSIC guidelines and the ongoing work on Appendix E – which is the design manual part of the guidelines.

Discussion (Casolo/Salemi/Woodmansee/Shea) occurred about outreach to local officials about the specific requirements of the guidelines, that many school districts are unclear about it, that the guidelines are designed to provide flexibility in design and that the manual will provide more clarification.

**Agenda Item 5, general topics**

Gary Shettle of CASBO was recognized by Chair Salemi, and commented about revising per-square-foot space standards due to being outdated.

Discussion (Salemi) occurred about the outreach work that has been done to include input from stakeholders in the school construction process.

Discussion (Salemi/Casolo/Iadarola/Barkin) occurred that older school buildings have problems being brought into compliance with space standards, that the standards tend to encourage demolition and that there is an intention to explore the creation of a statewide school asset management plan and standard contracts. Discussion occurred on how other jurisdictions address union/nonunion labor in school construction, that Massachusetts has a named sub-bids policy, that some community workforce agreements occur in Massachusetts, that the standard contracts that are developed should include options that have PLAs, that standard contracts and the maximum reimbursable cost per square foot work well in Massachusetts school projects and that the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) examines eligibility but does not do code review.

Discussion (Salemi/Iadarola/Casolo) occurred about expanded enrollment in Danbury, juxtaposed with decreasing enrollment and closing schools in neighborhood towns, about consideration of incentives for inter-town collaboration on school space use and how a capital asset plan may help in this, about regionalizing certain school construction procurement through capital asset management, about exploring ways to improve the state school construction grant approval process, about its differences to the state building approval process and about how an asset management plan may reveal greater need for capital work than funding that will be allocated to do it.

Discussion (Casolo/Salemi/Iadarola) occurred about providing earlier assurance that a project will be approved when design costs are incurred by a municipality, reducing the timeframe for grant approval by the state, about early work approval on state projects and how the MSBA covers design costs prior to local referendum approval.

| Agenda Item 6, Date and time of next meeting |
| --- |
| Salemi noted that the next meeting will occur in about two months. |

Chair Salemi declared the meeting adjourned at 12:17 pm.

## Appendix A: Resignation of Sara Bronin

UCONN
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Sara C. Bronin
Professor of Law & Faculty Director,
Center for Energy & Environmental Law
School of Law

December 16, 2014

The Honorable Dannel P. Malloy
Office of the Governor
State Capitol
210 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Re: State of Connecticut School Building Projects Advisory Council

Dear Governor Malloy:

I am writing to tender my resignation as a member of the School Building Projects Advisory Council, effective January 31, 2015. As you know, you appointed me to the Council on March 21, 2012, to serve as the member of the Council with experience in architecture, pursuant to section 132 of Public Act 11-51 and Section 4-1a of the Connecticut General Statutes.

It has been a real pleasure to serve on the Council, chaired by Deputy Commissioner Salemi, for the last nearly three years. I have greatly enjoyed learning from my fellow appointees, who have admirably given of their time and talents to fulfill their responsibilities, as well as the staff at the Department of Administrative Services who have very capably served the Council.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve the people of the state!

Sincerely,

Sara C. Bronin

cc: Luke A. Bronin, General Counsel, Office of the Governor
cc: The Honorable Pasquale J. Salemi, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Administrative Services & Chairman of the School Building Projects Advisory Council
cc: Members and Staff of the School Building Projects Advisory Council

55 ELIZABETH STREET
HARTFORD, CT 06105-2296
PHONE 860.570.5100
www.law.uconn.edu

*An Equal Opportunity Employer*

## Appendix B: Resignation of William Turley

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY SERVICES & PUBLIC PROTECTION
DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT & HOMELAND SECURITY

William Turley
Area Coordinator
School Safety Program
Division Emergency Management
And Homeland Security
25 Sigourney St
Hartford CT. 06106

February 13, 2015

Pasquale J. Salemi,
Deputy Commissioner
Department of Administrative Services
Division of Construction Services
Chair, School Building Projects Advisory Council

Dear Mr. Pasquale J. Salemi:

It is with regret that I must inform you that I am resigning from my position as the Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (DEMHS) representative on the School Building Projects Advisory Council effective February 15, 2015.

My durational position with DEMHS as the Area Coordinator for the School Safety Program will end on February 15, 2015.

It was an honor and a privilege to serve with such a distinguished and dedicated group of professionals serving on the School Building Projects Advisory Council. Thank you for the tremendous opportunity to serve the citizens of Connecticut.

Sincerely,

William M. Turley Jr.

*25 Sigourney Street, 6th floor, Hartford, CT 06106*
*Phone: 860.256.0800 / Fax: 860.256.0815*
*An Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Employer*

# Appendix C. Policy on Reporting of Estimated and Actual School Construction Costs.

DAS Department of Administrative Services

## School Construction Policy Report

February 10, 2015

| SBPAC Recommendations[1] | Report on |
|---|---|
| 8[2] and 1[3] | Policy on Reporting of Estimated and Actual School Construction Costs, proposed on February 2, 2015. |

### Background

As discussed previously in *Staff Activities Report, May 9, 2014* (DAS, 2014 p. 1), **SBPAC Finding 7**[4] (SBPAC, 2014 p. 16), points out that, "data collection for school construction projects costs is inadequate." **Finding 7** adds that, "the DCS does not have adequate resources or tools to collect sufficient construction-related data that would allow it to thoroughly evaluate projects or to make comparisons among projects."

The Office of School Facilities (OSF) does currently collect school construction data as required under the provisions of Chapter 173 of the Connecticut General Statutes (CGA, 2013) and the state regulations concerning School Construction Grants (DCS, 2012). "Data collected contains more than 300 data elements, including original costs authorized, current project costs, re-authorized amounts, and final costs." (SBPAC, 2014 p. 16)

But, as **Finding 7** points out, "These data elements are insufficient, however, to allow careful and detailed evaluation of costs per square foot, costs per student, or special factors driving costs." The lack of clear, consistent and accessible data on the cost of school construction projects has hindered the policymaking of DAS and the SBPAC, including in the establishment of a cap on maximum reimbursable costs. It also hinders the ongoing administration of the school construction grant program by preventing the monitoring of real costs of school construction projects.

**SBPAC Recommendation 8** (SBPAC, 2014 p. 18) is to "Create a process for consistent construction-related data collection, in addition to current grant data collection." While the narrative of **Recommendation 8** in the SBPAC Report of February 7, 2014 (SBPAC, 2014 p. 19) discusses the requirement for the submission of reports on cost estimates and actual costs in UNIFORMAT, Level 3, effective January, 1, 2014, this policy applies to only to projects costing greater than $2 million. While this policy was a good first step, a more refined policy is needed to ensure the reporting of the data necessary for cost analysis.

### Research and Data Reporting Tool

As DAS staff has reviewed the rollout of the construction cost reporting policy, it was determined that the best way to proceed with a revision to this policy would be to include it as part of the larger initiative,

---

[1] *The term "SBPAC Recommendation" or "Recommendation" refers to the numbered Recommendations of the School Building Projects Advisory Council* (SBPAC, 2014).

[2] *SBPAC Recommendation 8 – Create a process for consistent construction related data collection, in addition to current grant data collection* (SBPAC, 2014 pp. 17, 19).

[3] *SBPAC Recommendation 1 – Establish a cap on maximum reimbursable project costs* (SBPAC, 2014 pp. 12, 17, 18).

[4] *The term "SBPAC Finding" or "Finding" refers to the numbered Findings of the School Building Projects Advisory Council* (SBPAC, 2014).

DAS Department of Administrative Services

involving the creation of a school construction cost database system. A better policy could be created, it was determined, by taking account of such factors as:

- The data needed by OSF staff in conducting their reviews of the eligibility for state reimbursement of different elements in school construction projects.
- Looking ahead to the implementation of a software application to be actually used to store and process the construction cost data reported to OSF, the specific data that would be collected in this database application and how it would be recorded in the database.
- The practicality of gaining compliance with the reporting requirement and making compliance simpler and more straightforward by providing a structured reporting format.

To facilitate both the new policy and system for the collection of the data, a construction cost estimating consultant has been selected. This consultant has been collecting data from existing school construction cost information on file with the State, collecting school construction cost data from various municipal and regional school districts, as well as soliciting information from design consultants and contractors participating in public school construction in Connecticut and neighboring states. The consultant has been analyzing and evaluating methodologies and formats for the collection and recording of school construction cost data in Connecticut, and has been providing strategic consultation regarding OSF policy, practices and activities involved in the collection of this data.

From this effort, the consultant has been creating a dynamic cost reporting system. This system is built from an Excel spreadsheet template that will allow school districts and their consultants and contractors to enter data on construction estimates and actual costs at designated intervals. By using this template,[5] data will be kept in a consistent format for both recording and analysis.

The data submission system being built will allow school districts and their consultants and contractors a structured form to use in order to make reporting compliance simple and straightforward. It includes columns to identify eligible and ineligible costs. It will ensure that school districts are taking account of all costs in construction project accounting, including "soft costs", like acquisition cost, fees, consultant costs and contingency – items that are, in most cases, needed for determinations of state grant eligibility. These soft costs are listed in the spreadsheet, after the part of the form calling for UNIFORMAT data, and provide structure so that school districts and their contractors and consultants will know what to report and how.

Data from these forms, once submitted, will be populated into a state cost reporting database. Matters such as the method for submitting the data from school districts, the means to populate data into the state database and what database the state will use for these purposes are still to be determined. DAS is working closely with its consultant on this.

## Data Reporting Policy

The consultant working on the data submission system has advised on the creation of a new cost reporting policy for school construction. DAS has refined this advice and is issuing a new policy, "***Policy on Reporting of Estimated and Actual School Construction Costs***", proposed on February 2, 2015.[6] The core element of this new policy, as in the case of previous policy, is the requirement for the submission of construction cost estimates and actual construction costs following the format of the American Society for Testing and

[5] *See Appendix A.*
[6] *See Appendix B.*

DAS Department of Administrative Services

Materials (ASTM) Standard #E1557, Classification of Building Elements and Related Sitework—UNIFORMAT II. The previous policy required data to be submitted in UNIFORMAT II, Level 3, only for school construction projects with project costs in excess of $2 million (DAS, 2014). The new policy requires reporting of the actual costs of school construction projects of any size in UNIFORMAT and requires UNIFORMAT reporting of cost estimates for projects of generally larger project types costing more than $5 million. These larger project types are those classified by OSF as:

- New Construction (N)
- Extension (E)
- Extension/Alteration (EA)
- Approved Renovation (RNV) (renovated as new)

The new policy was built following review of the data requirements of OSF staff and advice from industry experts. From this review and advice, it was been determined that reporting should be in different Levels of UNIFORMAT II, depending on the stage of project completion. The following are the Levels to be required in the new policy for the reporting for projects classified including one of the larger project types discussed above (when the projects are more than $5 million):

| | |
|---|---|
| At time of grant application | Uniformat II Level 2 estimate |
| At completion of design development phase | Uniformat II Level 3 estimate |
| At submission of final documents for bidding (100% construction documents) | Uniformat II Level 4 estimate |
| After substantial completion/prior to submission for audit | Uniformat II Level 2 with actual costs |

For projects in other project types, and for all projects of $5 million or less, reporting in UNIFORMAT II, Level 2 is required for actual cost data. Cost estimates for these projects are also required at grant application, design development completion and construction document completion, but these reports may be in a different reporting format that provides a detailed cost estimate.

## Conclusion

This reporting system and reporting format will accomplish a number of things.

First, this new cost reporting system will be used in coordination with design standards to inform the process of determining the actual dollar amounts of the statutory maximum reimbursable cost per square foot of various types of public schools. By using data drawn from the actual experienced costs, the maximum reimbursable cost per square foot can represent realistic costs of construction, rather than arbitrary numbers.

More broadly, real cost data will help in efficient administration of the School Construction Grant program and in policy development. This data will allow the OSF have real data with which to compare cost estimates from particular school projects with actual expenditures from other school districts doing the

DAS Department of Administrative Services

same or a similar thing. It will enable OSF staff to have a good representation of the costs of various items in the school construction process.

While considerably more work must be done before the system for setting the maximum reimbursable cost is complete, the foundation is set for the further development of the data reporting part of the School Building Policy project.

DAS Department of Administrative Services

## Appendix A: Example UNIFORMAT II, Level 2 Estimate/Cost Reporting Form

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STATE PROJECT # | | | | | |
| SCHOOL DISTRICT | GRISWOLD | | | | |
| SCHOOL NAME | GRISWOLD HIGH SCHOOL | | | | |
| PROJECT TYPE | Roof Renovation | | | | |
| SQUARE FEET | | | | | |
| GRADES | | | | | |
| ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS | 0 | | | | |
| REIMBURSEMENT RATE | 0% | | COST/SQ FT | | INELIGIBLE COST |
| TOTAL COST | $ | 2,699,050.00 | 0 | | |
| CONSTRUCTION COST | $ | 2,549,050 | 0 | | |
| SOFT COST | $ | 150,000.00 | 0 | | |

| CONSTRUCTION COSTS | | LEVEL II CATEGORY TOTAL | LEVEL II SUB TOTAL | INELIGIBLES |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A SUBSTRUCTURE | | $ 4,000 | | |
| | A10 FOUNDATIONS | | $ - | $ - |
| | A20 BASEMENTS | | $ 4,000 | $ - |
| B SHELL | | $ 2,187,400 | | |
| | B10 SUPER STRUCTURE | | $ 2,187,400 | $ - |
| | B20 EXTERIOR ENCLOURES | | $ - | $ - |
| | B30 ROOFING | | $ - | $ - |
| C INTERIORS | | $ - | | |
| | C10 INTERIOR CONSTRUCTION | | $ - | $ - |
| | C20 STAIRS | | $ - | $ - |
| | C30 INTERIOR FINISHES | | $ - | $ - |
| D SERVICES | | $ 189,800 | | |
| | D10 CONVEYING | | $ - | $ - |
| | D20 PLUMBING | | $ 189,800 | $ - |
| | D30 HVAC | | $ - | $ - |
| | D40 FIRE PROTECTION | | $ - | $ - |
| | D50 ELECTRICAL | | $ - | $ - |
| E EQUIPMENT & FURNISHINGS | | $ - | | |
| | E10 EQUIPMENT | | $ - | $ - |
| | E20 FURNISHINGS | | $ - | $ - |
| F SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION | | $ 167,850 | | |
| | F10 SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION | | $ 167,850.00 | $ - |
| | F20 SELECTIVE BUILDING DEMOLITION | | $ - | $ - |
| | PCB/ASBESTOS/LEAD ABATEMENT ALLOWANCE | | $ - | $ - |
| G BUILDING SITEWORK | | $ - | | |
| | G10 SITE PREPARATION | | $ - | $ - |
| | G20 SITE IMPROVEMENTS | | $ - | $ - |
| | G30 SITE MECHANICAL UTILITIES | | $ - | $ - |
| | G40 SITE ELECTRICAL UTILITIES | | $ - | $ - |
| | G90 OTHER SITE CONSTRUCTION | | $ - | $ - |
| | REMEDIATION ALLOWANCE | | $ - | $ - |
| ESCALATION COSTS | | $ - | | |
| | ESCALATION COSTS | | $ - | $ - |

| SOFT COSTS | | LEVEL II CATEGORY TOTAL | LEVEL II SUB TOTAL | INELIGIBLES |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACQUISITION COSTS | | $ - | | |
| | Land/Building Purchase | | $ - | $ - |
| | Swing Space/Portables | | $ - | $ - |
| | Site Remediation | | $ - | $ - |
| | Appraisals | | $ - | $ - |
| | Land Survey | | $ - | $ - |
| CONSULTANTS | | $ - | | |
| | Architect/Engineering Fees | | $ - | $ - |
| | Environmental | | $ - | $ - |
| | Commissioning | | $ - | $ - |
| | Legal Consultants | | $ - | $ - |
| | FF&E Coordinator | | $ - | $ - |
| | Estimator | | $ - | $ - |
| | Project Management | | $ - | $ - |
| | Construction Manager Pre Construction | | $ - | $ - |
| | Other Consultants | | $ - | $ - |
| FF&E | | $ - | | |
| | Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment | | $ - | $ - |
| | Technology | | $ - | $ - |
| | Moving | | $ - | $ - |
| FEES | | $ 150,000.00 | | |
| | Bonding Fees | | $ - | $ - |
| | Insurance Costs | | $ - | $ - |
| | Town Staff Costs | | $ - | $ - |
| | Town Permit Fees | | $ - | $ - |
| | State Permit Fees | | $ - | |
| | Testing/Inspection Fees | | $ - | $ - |
| | Overhead & Profit Costs | | $ 150,000.00 | $ - |
| | Printing & Mailing Costs | | $ - | |
| | Other Costs | | $ - | $ - |
| CONTINGENCY | | $ - | | |
| | Construction Contingency | | $ - | $ - |
| | Owner's Contingency | | $ - | $ - |
| | Design Contingency | | $ - | $ - |

DAS Department of Administrative Services

## Appendix B: Policy on Reporting of Estimated and Actual School Construction Costs, proposed on February 2, 2015.

**Summary**

Section 10-287c-21 (a) of the Connecticut Regulations of State Agencies, concerning school construction grants states that "the applicant shall file with the department in such manner as the Commissioner may prescribe final plans including: … (2) A professional cost estimate of such project or phase and of any site acquisition." The documented submission and review of the professional cost estimate is submitted and reviewed as part of a district's Request for Review of Final Plans (Form ED042) as submitted to the Office of School Facilities Plan Review Unit.

**Issue**

The current process of collecting school construction cost data, based on the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard #E1557, Classification of Building Elements and Related Sitework—UNIFORMAT II Level 3 at the time of submission of final documents does not allow staff to conduct a sufficiently detailed evaluation of project costs.

**Recommended Policy**

Sec. 1. Each district with a school construction project shall submit reports of cost estimates and actual costs in a standard uniform format as prescribed by the Department of Administrative Services to allow for detailed cost analysis. Cost reporting shall be completed by a registered architect or other licensed design professional, or a certified construction cost estimator. As provided in section 2 of this policy, the professional cost reports shall be done in accordance with the ASTM Standard #E1557, Classification of Building Elements and Related Sitework—UNIFORMAT II or other format for certain project types as listed. Cost estimates shall be submitted at the time of grant application, at the completion of the design development phase and at submission of final documents for bidding. Actual cost figures shall be submitted at substantial completion/prior to submission for audit.

Sec. 2. School construction grant applications submitted to the Office of School Facilities on and after July 1, 2015, shall include the following cost estimates:

(a) For a project classified as New Construction (N), Extension (E), Extension/Alteration (EA) or Approved Renovation (RNV):

(1) At time of grant application: Uniformat II Level 2 estimate
(2) At completion of design development phase: Uniformat II Level 3 estimate
(3) At submission of final documents for bidding (100% construction documents): Uniformat II Level 4 estimate
(4) After substantial completion/prior to submission for audit: Uniformat II Level 2 with actual costs

(b) For all project types except New Construction (N), Extension (E), Extension/Alteration (EA) or Approved Renovation (RNV) and for Extension (E) or Extension/Alteration (EA) projects with a project cost of five million dollars or less:

(1) At time of grant application: Detailed cost estimate
(2) At completion of design development phase: Detailed cost estimate
(3) At submission of final documents for bidding (100% Construction Documents): Detailed cost estimate
(4) After substantial completion/prior to submission for audit: UNIFORMAT II Level 2 with actual costs

Estimates for projects falling under subsection (b) of section 2 of this policy shall be in a format of the project team's choosing, provided the level of detail is sufficient for the Office of School Facilities to verify the claimed eligible and ineligible costs. Estimates for non-construction phases of construction projects (e.g. furniture, furnishings and equipment, technology equipment, playgrounds, etc.) shall also be submitted on a format of the project team's choosing of sufficient detail as noted above.

DAS Department of Administrative Services

Sec. 3. Project costs reported in UNIFORMAT shall include all soft and hard costs of school construction. Line item detail shall be added to the UNIFORMAT standard to include costs related to site acquisition (site and/or facility), remediation, temporary facilities, swing space costs, off-site costs, professional design fees, testing and inspection fees, project management fees, construction management fees, overhead and profit, construction interest, escalation, all other professional fees, design and building alternates, contingencies, reimbursable expenses and allowances, and all other costs and fees determined by the Office of School Facilities as requiring justification for purposes of cost estimation. In addition, the cost report shall include columns listing all eligible and ineligible school construction costs.

Sec. 4. Cost estimates that accompany final documents for bidding shall be submitted to the Office of School Facilities Plan Review Unit with the submission of Form ED042 – Request for Review of Final Plans, in accordance with Section 10-291 of the Connecticut General Statutes.

Sec. 5. Cost estimate data shall be submitted to the Office of School Facilities Plan Review Unit in the electronic Excel spreadsheet format prescribed by the Department of Administrative Services. Any revisions to a project cost estimate or final actual project costs shall be submitted as a new worksheet within the cost estimate workbook originally established for the school construction project.

**Rationale**

A more refined cost estimate system will allow for a detailed analysis and comparison of school construction cost estimates and construction cost management. The Department of Administrative Services currently requires that all large state project construction cost estimates be submitted in UNIFORMAT. This policy extends and refines the existing policy requiring UNIFORMAT while providing that cost estimates for generally smaller project types are to be submitted in a detailed cost estimate.

DAS Department of Administrative Services

## Appendix C: Bibliography

**CGA. 2013.** Connecticut General Statutes. *State of Connecticut, Connecticut General Assembly (CGA).* [Online] State of Connecticut, Connecticut General Assembly (CGA), January 1, 2013. http://www.cga.ct.gov/current/pub/chap_173.htm.

**DAS. 2014.** *Staff Activities Report, May 9, 2014.* Hartford : State of Connecticut, Department of Administrative Services, School Building Policy Project, 2014.

**DCS. 2012.** Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, Sec. 10-287c, School Construction Grants. *State of Connecticut, Secretary of the State.* [Online] October 26, 2012. http://www.sots.ct.gov/sots/lib/sots/regulations/title_10/287c.pdf.

**SBPAC. 2014.** *Report by the School Building Projects Advisory Council, February 7, 2014.* Hartford : State of Connecticut, Department of Administrative Services, 2014.