

**Carey, Mary**

---

**From:** Jerry Rubino <JRubino@dicararubino.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 22, 2016 6:41 PM  
**To:** Edwards, James  
**Cc:** Carey, Mary  
**Subject:** Brick Patch  
**Attachments:** 2705 Ltr. toJ.Edwards re Window Repl. Article 8-22-16.pdf

Jim  
As discussed attached is a letter written in response to an article that was printed in the Brick Patch that was brought to my attention. Please distribute this to members of the Board and as stated I would like to appear at the next Board meeting to set the record straight.

Jerry R. Rubino, AIA  
Principal  
di cara | rubino architects  
30 galesi drive, west wing  
wayne, nj 07470  
973-256-0202 tel  
973-256-0227 fax  
[jrubino@dicararubino.com](mailto:jrubino@dicararubino.com)



August 22, 2016

Brick Township Public Schools  
101 Hendrickson Avenue  
Brick, NJ 08724

ATT: Mr. James Edwards,  
Business Administrator

**Re: Window Replacements at Various Schools  
D | R Project No. 2705**

Dear Mr. Edwards:

I am writing to you and the Brick Township Board of Education as it relates to an article that was published in The Brick Patch dated August 15, 2016. The headline for this article reads as "Issues with Windows Costing Brick School District an Extra \$200K." The headline for this article and most of the things reported in the article is not based on factual information. Additionally there are quotes that have been cited by various school officials and board members that are, in fact, inaccurate especially as they relate to work that was or was not performed by our firm.

Please accept this correspondence as our position to clarify what seem to be numerous misunderstandings regarding not only the window project but also other projects that were undertaken by the Board. We will address these various items as they appeared in the aforementioned article.

**As per the Article:** The Board President, Mr. Lamela, said that they (the Board) were concerned about the dramatic differences between the costs of the bids that were received for the East Gym project compared with what the Architect had estimated for the cost, and he said the initial design for the parking lot work being done behind Brick High School and at Lake Riviera Middle School was not what the District requested.

Di Cara | Rubino Architects never prepared a cost estimate for the proposed work to be performed in the East Gym. In fact, the first time that we were even aware of this project was when it was discussed at the Board's Facilities Committee Meeting of May. At this meeting we were given a list of items to be completed, together with their associated cost. As you may recall, I questioned where did the cost that were presented come from? It was indicated that the Committee thought the cost came from us and Mr. Bob Iamello of our office clearly stated that they did not come from this office. The thought at that time then became that the cost may have been prepared by the former Director of Facilities since he submitted those costs as part of his capital budget.

Additionally, there was additional scope of work that was added by the Committee, especially as it relates to upgrades to the West Gym. In fact, when we prepared the Schematic Design Application to the New Jersey Department of Education, the estimated cost of the work was listed at \$290,000.00, with a total project cost of \$368,500.00. The low bid came in at \$309,760.00.

30 galesi drive • west wing • wayne, new jersey 07470 • tel 973-256-0202 • fax 973-256-0227  
• [www.dicararubino.com](http://www.dicararubino.com) •

*I:\Projects\2705 Brick Twp. BOE - Part. Window Repl. @ Brick Memorial HS & Lake Riviera MS\General Correspondence\Letters\2705 Ltr. to J. Edwards re Window Repl. Article 8-22-16.docx*



Mr. James Edwards  
Business Administrator  
D | R Project No. 2705  
August 22, 2016  
Page 2 of 3

As for the parking lots, we had absolutely nothing to do with those projects. It is my understanding that a civil engineering firm was retained directly by the Board for those two projects.

**As per the Article:** (Mrs.) Pakala added the Architect was replaced because: "It was our understanding that his recommendations weren't followed in the past. We didn't think it was prudent to keep using a professional whose recommendations were not being followed," she said.

It's our position that if the Board did follow our recommendations and implemented the protocol that we insisted on, many of these issues would never have arisen.

**As per the Article:** Interim Superintendent Thomas Gialanella is quoted as saying "We are spending an extra \$200,000.00 on the window project because of problems that weren't anticipated," Gialanella said. "And we're spending \$30,000.00 or \$40,000.00 on doors at Brick Memorial," though he said there is a dispute over why doors that did not comply with fire codes were installed.

First let me address the doors that are being alluded to by Mr. Gialanella. These are doors that were replaced by a former Facilities Director over two years ago. These were doors at the Auditorium of Brick Memorial High School. We were never consulted on this work; we never prepared drawings for this work; nor did we ever take bids on this project. If I recall correctly, this former Facilities Director received two or three quotes for this work. Unfortunately the quotes were not for fire-rated doors, which is what the fire code official required. Again, we had nothing to do with the original door replacement project, but now we have fingers being pointed at us when all we are doing is trying to remedy the situation.

Which now bring us to the real crux of the matter. The remainder of the article speaks to the fact that there were no window air-conditioning units installed in the Kalwall window system. Reading the article, it seems that certain members of the Board reached a conclusion that these units were not included because the Kalwall System could not accommodate them or that we failed to address the inclusion of these a/c window units. Again, nothing can be further from the truth and it seems some people have failed to remember what actually took place during the design of the window project.

When the project first went out to bid on August 4, 2014, the plans for the window replacement indicated where all existing a/c window units were located. The plans called for the contractor to provide a one inch insulated aluminum panel above the vented window at all of those locations and was required to provide a cut out in the aluminum panel and re-install the a/c window units.

Bids were received on September 3, 2014, and those bids were substantially over the budget. The project was then put aside until the bids were received for the remainder of other projects, such as the HVAC project at Brick High School. Once all the other projects were bid, it was determined that additional funds were available to put the window project out for a Re-Bid. However, before doing so, Di Cara | Rubino Architects performed an analysis to see what the cost differential would be if the District utilized thermally-broken aluminum double-hung window in lieu of the Kalwall System. Our analysis indicated





Mr. James Edwards  
Business Administrator  
D | R Project No. 2705  
August 22, 2016  
Page 3 of 3

that the use of the alternative window would save the District approximately \$250,000.00. The Facilities Committee ultimately reached the conclusion to proceed with the Kalwall System due to its higher energy efficiency. At the same time the District made a decision that classrooms which would require air-conditioning due to a child's IEP would receive a wall-mounted cassette split system in lieu of a/c window units. We were then directed to meet with the former Facilities Director to determine the location for immediate use of a/c window units and where rooms to be air-conditioned would utilize the split system approach.

Bob Iamello of our office met with the Facilities Department prior to going out for a re-bid and the Facilities Department marked a set of drawings where the District wanted a/c window units under this project and eliminated those units where the split system would be utilized. As you may know, we still have in our possession the drawings that the Facilities Department marked up which we used to finalize the Re-Bid documents. Based on the direction we were given by the Facilities Department, there are three (3) locations at Osbornville Elementary School where a/c window units can be cut in, eight (8) locations at Midstreams Elementary School, fourteen (14) locations at Lanes Mill Elementary School, eighteen (18) locations at Lake Riviera Middle School, twelve (12) locations at Veterans Memorial Middle School, two (2) locations at Drum Point Elementary School, and one (1) location at Veterans Memorial Elementary School.

Therefore, contrary to what was said at a public meeting and what was written, the Kalwall System can accommodate a/c window units if the current Board wishes to utilize those units. It was the prior Board's decision not to utilize the a/c window units and to proceed with a split system air-conditioning unit. It is because of that decision that the Board is now spending \$2,500.00 per room for air-conditioning, not because of anything we did as your design professional.

Based upon the above, we are hereby requesting that the Board of Education retract all of the misinformation that was expressed by various members of the Board. It is my intention to be present at the Board's meeting of August 25, 2016, to address this matter, answer any questions that the Board may have, and to set the record straight.

Please be advised accordingly.

Very truly yours,  
**DI CARA | RUBINO ARCHITECTS**

Germano R. Rubino, AIA  
Principal

GRR/dac

cc: Mr. Gary Chiumento, Esq., Chiumento, McNally, LLC