

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMITTEE

Special Meeting Minutes

October 15, 2018

Subject to Approval

Chairman Ostop called the Meeting of the Public Building Committee to order at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, October 15, 2018, in the Board of Education Conference Room at 933 Hopmeadow Street, Simsbury, CT.

Present – Chairman Ostop, Messrs. Salvatore, Cortes, Kelly, Walter, and Egan.

Excused – Mr. Derr and Mr. Dragulski were excused.

Guests – Liaison Cooke, Messrs. LaClair, Shea; and for Downes Construction Company – Dave Heer, Pre-Construction Manager, Tracy Brennan, Estimator, and Thomas Romagnoli, Assistant Director of Operations; and Jennifer Mangiagli of Kaestle Boos.

1. Minutes of the October 1, 2018 Meetings

Mr. Cortes made a motion to approve the October 1, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes. Mr. Kelly seconded the motion. The motion was passed with Mr. Walter abstaining.

2. Henry James Memorial School Project – Review of Schematic Design Cost Estimate

Chairman Ostop recalled the discussion a couple of weeks ago to review updates, overall approach, site logistics, budget, etc. He and Mr. LaClair attended a coordination meeting last Friday at Downes with the architect and requested review of basics at this meeting. Mr. Cortes asked about the difference between \$834,233 in line 1. General Requirements and LS General Conditions of \$981,963. Mr. Heer explained the LS General Conditions responded to the RFP primarily for staffing and its elements and is currently a lump sum. He continued that the difference from project requirements currently are placeholders, e.g. means and methods and in the schematic phase those things will change once resolved – how will they clean up the space, dumpsters, etc. Chairman Ostop clarified the budget being discussed is dated October 12th.

Mr. Romagnoli summarized they are here to present the schematic design budget; they continue meeting every other week with the design team; and the schedule/milestones provided are updated and now show progress with actual dates. He noted the State PCR meeting would take place after the construction document and estimate reconciliation just prior to going out to bid. Chairman Ostop asked if that was Item 1100; Mr. Romagnoli confirmed that was correct. Mr. Romagnoli noted some things were re-sequenced, e.g. a few days for some design document durations, in order to meet the February 6th date for bid. He added in line item 1190 for Forensic Investigation indicating it is a substantial list which they would like to begin scheduling with the school in about the week after next. He anticipates that will assist with the rest of the design process for the October 29th date and enable Kaestle Boos to begin incorporating their findings into the design. He noted last week they had a site logistics/permitting meeting with Kaestle Boos to begin looking at wetlands and other local permitting. Chairman Ostop asked if they found anything unexpected; Mr. Romagnoli responded they did not. Mr. Romagnoli indicated the Forensic list generated since the last meeting has become more extensive and it will be modified as the project progresses what items to investigate further.

Mr. Heer noted the Executive Summary provided tonight now includes Add Alternates at the bottom; Chairman Ostop noted it results in the numbers changing slightly. Mr. Heer indicated they evaluated different building elements, e.g. the auditorium, media center, and renovations, with separate estimates for those elements including a quantitative survey, e.g. how far down a hall for electrical feeds, calculating concrete foundations, structural steel, etc. and discussed in workshop meetings with the design team what they would pay for structural steel in lbs. per sq. ft. for different types of structures/spans; and assembly rating variations will be clarified as the project progresses. He called this a CSI format synopsis but for the State meetings they will have to change to a USI format using these same numbers. He reviewed that the first box is for the 16 trades from general requirements to electrical, the second box is for construction manager fees and contingency. He indicated that at this point in time in the schematic estimate phase they carry a 10% design and estimating contingency – 5% is his level of accuracy and 5% is for the design as the roadmap is created and the 10% allows for fluctuation in both areas. He continued the CM contingency covers part of the agreement for the guaranteed maximum price, allowing it to be established if there are scope gaps with the subcontractors; the other contingency is for the owners for unforeseens, e.g. another project began and finds an old buried car no one knew about. He noted there are 3 different kinds of contingencies to manage as the project progresses – in the design development stage that contingency reduces as the level of accurate information received increases; they will start a ready check, cross-check, or constructability review, e.g. how a building roof drain gets through the building requires plumbing, structural, and civil engineers where there are possible connection issues; therefore, they work to eliminate RFIs and increase estimate accuracy. Mr. Heer continued to discuss how the payment performance bond and insurance were elements of the RFP and are percentage based fluctuating with the cost of the project; and they will be required to pay a permit fee to the State. Chairman Ostop and Mr. Shea confirmed for the record that the Town of Simsbury does not charge a building permit fee. Mr. Heer noted a smaller box line item adds in current soft costs and they will check items on their generic checkoff list to increase the level of accuracy, e.g. furniture once locked in. He indicated at the bottom they are tracking current under by about \$33,000; he felt it would report better at zero with anything under going into the owner contingency, as they have done on other projects,

but they will report as the Committee requests. Chairman Ostop responded for the record that the basic report is fine but as the project progresses to break it into 3 sections as they like to get into the details.

Mr. Salvatore asked about the 4% for escalation given bidding is only about 4 months out in February. Mr. Heer responded they carry escalation to the mid-point of construction, which is industry standard, and as a contingency item they will look at the market affect. Mr. Salvatore noted with the bid in February they will be carrying those prices. Mr. Heer responded that is correct and the subcontractors will have to carry any escalating prices when they bid; if he gets 3 bids, he tries to be in the middle with his estimate. Mr. Salvatore expressed concerned about bumping the project up another 4% given the bidding process is close. Mr. Heer responded that in managing those fluctuating items, they manage bid day results with Add Alternates as well because the bids fluctuate on how well they do getting on the street – prices will increase moving into spring as contractors fill up their workload. Chairman Ostop noted that is why they are shooting for the February date. Mr. Egan asked if the permit fee was for education and whether it was off a decimal point at 26 per thousand. Mr. Herr confirmed it should be 26 cents per thousand of construction cost. Mr. Egan asked if the fee was on top of the bond as well or the base before the bond. Mr. Romagnoli responded the bond is on the cost overrun. Mr. Shea asked which budget line includes the owner's contingency; Mr. Heer responded it is included in the soft cost number. Mr. LaClair provided a handout working back from the \$4 Million soft cost number tying it to the summary developed Friday; the architectural number is \$1,040,000; environmental and special testing is \$85K, Other includes contingency and other costs, e.g. commissioning, etc. which are uncertain at \$784,470; the original Kaestle Boos estimate for technology is \$850K and furnishings is \$850K, which remains to be vetted; and the updated bond and issuance cost is \$479,312; printing and advertising is \$10K; and the difference between \$4,015,528 is that he added in the estimate under budget line of \$33,254 to reach the total. Mr. LaClair indicated more detail is needed on all ends and he has begun filling out the template for detailing soft costs provided by Mr. Heer and as the details are received, it will be shared with the Committee. Mr. Cortes asked if the subtotal of \$15,575,490 and the items under it should add up to the total construction and noted finding a difference of about \$38K. Mr. Heer responded that was because the pre-construction was not picked up. Mr. Salvatore suggested listing owner's contingency as an item separate from the \$784,470. Mr. LaClair indicated he is working to identify those separate pieces.

Chairman Ostop noted questions regarding renovations. Mr. Salvatore commented that the concrete number for the addition seemed on the high side at about \$100 sq. ft. Mr. Heer responded it is hard to evaluate a renovation project with sq. ft. numbers. Mr. Salvatore noted \$97 for the media center and \$84 for the auditorium and believed the auditorium would require a more complex foundation and slab. Mr. Heer responded they came up with 5,863 sq. ft. on the media center and about \$580K for the concrete. Mr. Salvatore continued that the \$100 sq. ft. number seemed high. Mr. Heer responded they concentrated on the putting the whole project for concrete together at \$13 sq. ft., but looking at the different comparisons they can double-check with the structural engineer and assure the moisture mitigation number is correct. Mr. Salvatore asked how many tons were figured for structural steel. Mr. Heer responded for the media center

almost 50 tons at \$4160 per ton avg. broken into roof framing at \$10/lb.; columns at \$7/lb.; and \$3900/ton on the big framing and \$4160 for smaller. For the auditorium, Mr. Herr used for the main structure 51 tons at \$12 sq. ft. and \$3900/ton and 9 lbs. per sq. ft. for structural steel at \$41.60/ton. He added these numbers are typical for this type of building. Mr. Heer noted a relieving angle for some of the higher brick was discussed and a catwalk was put in the auditorium and is under Miscellaneous.

Chairman Ostop asked what the next step would be. Mr. Heer indicated they would continue with the design process meetings and the MEP engineer will also evaluate his numbers to assure the scope is appropriate. He said they will assist in the design process elements/costs to meet the very aggressive schedule. Chairman Ostop asked if anything unusual had come up. Mr. Romagnoli responded that a couple of items came up that were added to forensics: 1) how new electric service is fed to various parts of the building as it appears the transformer will be upgraded, and how to get from the electrical room on top of the mezzanine level down to the mezzanine - options are being looked at. Ms. Mangiagli explained they need to figure out the best route and showed the location of the main electrical room above the mezzanine; there is an option to get into the auditorium above ground, but the levels don't connect and they have to either go through the auditorium or go under. She noted the additions in general will likely require additional power. Mr. Heer noted the switch gear was appropriately upsized, but transformer power is currently not adequate so it will be changed out of the a transformer and the Town will have to determine how to have power on at the same time the transformer is taken off to build the vault. Mr. Salvatore suggested it could be done on a weekend or in the summer. Mr. Romagnoli indicated the best way will evolve in design discussions. Mr. Romagnoli continued that also added to forensics was: 2) a storm line on the media center which is close to the corner with testing to determine its exact location; while the sanitary line would be incorporated into the foundation, the storm line will likely need to be re-routed with a manhole as it is too close to the excavation for it to be supported. He added other things will come up as the project progresses requiring evaluating design intent and sequence. Chairman Ostop was encouraged by the reasonable length so far of unexpected items.

Messrs. Heer and LaClair noted there was a meeting with Zoning, and the Town Engineer regarding site logistics and that those costs are incorporated. Chairman Ostop commented those would occur on the north side of the building on Seminary Road and there is a corner house that could be an issue. Mr. Heer said their efforts are to keep as far away from that corner property as possible and to utilize the right protections and fences. Mr. Shea indicated nothing has been officially approved, but comments the meeting was positive. Mr. Shea asked about local approvals will not be approved until December and the schedule shows approval in November. Ms. Mangiagli indicated they will put in applications November 9th for the Zoning Commission and Design Review Board with hearings scheduled in early December. Mr. Shea asked in the summary estimate shows a column labeled as new construction and question if this includes all construction; Mr. Heer agreed to do relabel the column to all construction.

Chairman Ostop asked if an update would be provided at the Committee's November 5th meeting; Mr. Romagnoli agreed to do so.

3. Adjourn

Mr. Salvatore made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:47 p.m. Mr. Walter seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Prifti

Commission Clerk