

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting Minutes

November 1, 2021

Subject to Approval

Chairman Ostop called the Regular Meeting of the Public Building Committee to order at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, November 1, 2021, at the Simsbury Public Library.

Present – Chairman Ostop, Messrs. Cortes, Salvatore, Kelly, Burns, Egan, and Dragulski; and Jackie Battos, BOS Liaison

Excused – Mr. Derr

Guests - Mr. Shea, Simsbury Town Engineer; for Simsbury Public Schools – Andy O’Brien, Jason Casey, and Mike Luzietti, Principal, Latimer Lane School; for Downes Construction Company – Steve Smith; for Jacunski Humes – Al Jacunski; for Tecton -Jeffrey Wyszynski and Ernest Nepomuceno; for Arcadis – Jack Butkus; for CES – Derek Bride; and for Gilbane Building Company – Bryan Dodge, Business Development Manager, Peter Adamowicz, CPE, LEED GA,

No public audience comments.

1. Minutes of the October 18, 2021, Special PBC Meeting

Mr. Kelly made a motion to approve the October 18, 2021, Meeting Minutes with the correction of the prior meeting date in 1. to “October 4, 2021”. Mr. Cortes seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

2. Board of Selectmen Liaison Report

No update.

3. SHS Re-roofing Project

- a. Al Jacunski Update
- b. Punch List

Mr. Jacunski reported that the last regularly scheduled job meeting was held on 10/20/21 and the contractor updated the schedule with canopy work to resume on 10/25/21, and metal work completed by the end of the week. He continued that the change order work approved at the last meeting is to start within 2 weeks and louvers are the only long lead time item needing patience. He noted 18 punch list items with the contractor working on closing them out. He reviewed Application No. 6 requesting payment of \$152,738.15 leaving a balance of \$268,409.08. He stated there was a misunderstanding with the contractor as they found the fans come with the covers and not separately, so the cover approval for \$67,020 is not included in the change order and is not reimbursable. He indicated there will be a proposal coming for OSHA railings and roof because they are within 10 feet of the roof edge, but there is no reimbursement as it is outside the contract area. He hoped that construction/installation would be finished within 3 weeks.

- c. Greenwood Industries Pay Application #6

Mr. Kelly made a motion to approve payment to Greenwood Industries, Inc. for Payment Application No. 6 in the amount of \$152,738.15. Mr. Salvatore seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

- d. Jacunski Humes Invoice #21302

Mr. Salvatore made a motion to approve payment to Jacunski Humes Architects, Inc. for Invoice No. 21302 in the amount of \$1,180.00. Mr. Burns seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

4. Henry James Memorial School Project

Mr. Smith indicated no report.

5. Latimer Lane Renovation

a. Arcadis Monthly Report

Mr. Butkus advised they received qualifications and proposals from Commissioning Agents and distributed them to managers last week. Chairman Ostop responded that nothing was received and that the Committee had hoped to go through those qualifications at this meeting in order to select a short list. Mr. Cortes asked who the information was sent to. Mr. Butkus responded it was sent to Messrs. Casey and Shea; Mr. Shea confirmed receipt; and Mr. O'Brien did not receive them. Mr. Butkus indicated that given communication protocols they did not include Committee members and distributed to Mr. Casey who they believed would distribute to PBC. Chairman Ostop clarified building projects are PBC's responsibility, not the BOE. Mr. Butkus said they will adjust their communication to confirm Mr. Casey has provided communications to PBC members. Mr. Butkus confirmed 3 sets of qualifications/proposals were sent out as separate documents for PBC review and respondents were Horizon Engineering, Sustainability Engineering Sources, and Terva Engineering. The members discussed whether to short list those 3 for interviews and schedule a potential special meeting, which might also include review of Construction Manager (CM) proposals. Mr. Butkus noted responses from CMs are scheduled to be in 11/8/21 at noon. He continued they have since learned that the combined methodology of RFQ/RFP as not responsive to statute wording and as part of Addendum #2 asked they only submit qualifications at this point, then proposals submitted from those firms short listed; they are waiting for a response from the State as to whether the Commissioning Agents qualifications and scope / fee proposals should come in together published as one document or for proposals only reviewed as the best numbers and they are waiting for the State's answer. Chairman Ostop indicated the need to look at their qualifications and fee schedule now. Mr. Butkus indicated the requirement that the Committee complete qualification reviews before looking at any fee schedules so that no reimbursement is lost. Chairman Ostop requested receipt of qualification packages only ASAP. Members discussed how the last school project was done with Attorney approval; Mr. Butkus noted the key factor is the State audit, which has not occurred yet and that auditors can disallow reimbursement; they are pursuing a legal response for whether it can be split. Members discussed getting the Town Attorney involved and the possibility of having to extend the bid. Mr. Butkus indicated no need on the CM side because they only asked for qualifications, Commissioning Agents only sent qualifications and separate pricing; Mr. Casey will provide correct materials to members.

Mr. Butkus reviewed that a pre-proposal meeting was held at the school that Tecton handled with CM firms for mandatory walk through and believe all will be able to meet 11/8/21 qualification deadline. He said a meeting on 11/15/21 will look at the short list and asked if there is ample time, can the Committee respond within one week in order to get a response out ASAP. Chairman Ostop responded PBC should receive the package from Mr. Casey within the next few days regarding the 3 Commissioning submittals and then decide whether to short list any of them; he asked members once they have reviewed qualifications to call him with their ranked selections for interviews and whether it should be combined with CMs. Mr. Butkus noted the need to get the Commissioning Agents done. Mr. Burns suggested as there are only 3 proposals to bring them all in for interviews to for a determination.

Mr. Burns made a motion to bring in the three Commissioning Agent candidates for interviews. Mr. Salvatore seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Shea confirmed he could confirm availability and schedule the Library meeting room for Monday, November 8, 2021 at 7 p.m. for the interviews.

Mr. Kelly made a motion to hold a PBC Special Meeting at 7 p.m. on November 8, 2021 in the Simsbury Public Library to interview in alphabetical order in 30-minute time slots Commissioning Agent candidates. Mr. Cortes seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Butkus indicated responses from 14 CM candidates with an addendum issued last week and their response due on Monday, 11/8/21 at noon at the BOE office. Chairman Ostop noted meetings scheduled for Monday 11/8 and a special Zoom meeting the following week on Monday 11/15; he asked if PBC could be provided copies of the material due at noon at the 7 p.m. meeting on 11/8 and Mr. Butkus responded hard copies could be provided; Chairman Ostop believed that would potentially provide for CM interviews at the 11/15 meeting.

b. Tecton Report

c. Construction Manager RFP Addendum #2

Mr. Wyszynski provided a report dated 10/28/21 updating PBC on work completed, WIP, site plan development, floor plan highlights and focusing on MEP with a separate handout by Mr. Bride; included in the packet are wetland and geo reports of existing conditions. He continued the CM site walk and Clean Energy Task Force meeting were on the same day and notes of who attended with MEP

systems discussions set a foundation for discussions tonight. He discussed a pre-application meeting on 10/26 in which Mr. Shea participated regarding process, formats, needs, site discussion, etc. and will circulate as soon as received the surveys and traffic report. He indicated a school review tomorrow at 2 p.m. with Messrs. Casey, Shea and team to discuss floor plan requirements. He said they are working on a checklist for the CSRG virtual meeting coming up Thanksgiving week with the State and do not expect PBC to attend, but it is a milestone date with site plan development and to plan for necessary approvals is critical. Mr. Wyszynski noted regulatory approvals are critical and conservation and as soon as the draft pre-application package is together they will circulate it to PBC about 2-3 weeks out; entitlement approvals are key to getting building permit approvals. Chairman Ostop confirmed that is PBC's responsibility. Mr. Shea believed that Design Review Board can override PBC primarily for materials selection and signage. Mr. Nepomuceno said they intend on matching the brick exterior. Mr. Wyszynski said if substantial comments get back to PBC changing the project, it may make sense to have neighbors at meetings. He continued at the bottom of the sheet is fire access plan development along with civil engineering; modifications to entries for buses and parents with the difference being the parking lot they use with 24 existing non-conforming spaces, which would likely be left as is; they are looking at parking more on the south side close to the building auxiliary or grass pave and will be paved and lit. Chairman Ostop noted the need for more parking spaces and a lot of room on the left; Mr. Wyszynski noted the potential problem of overflow parking for special events. He discussed 2 slides from the meeting landscape, etc. and good information with the principal who is out of town tonight; following a good session, the landscape architect is beginning the design. He continued the revised floor plan addresses PBC comments; still central off main corridor with music separated with storage rooms and buffer and acoustic operation a better setup; media center tweaked and opened up main corridor for flexibility and main functions to occur and open up more area to look at core functions; area on right side addition is compacted more fully away from existing parking encroachment; will spend time tomorrow with Michael to assure reflecting program needs and square footage as revised.

Chairman Ostop asked about entry areas. Mr. Wyszynski responded there are 2 doors on the end and currently for gym sizing there are questions of whether bleachers are needed and will be used. Chairman Ostop indicated that Latimer Lane is a school where voting occurs and the gym will continue to be used for that. Mr. Wyszynski noted the gym is also use for assembly in the morning so there

would be no change to its function. Mr. Egan asked about kindergarten being moved from the building front to the back because of drop off. Mr. Wyszynski responded 2 options will be discussed with Michael again and confirmed kindergarten has 4 rooms and will see what the principal wants; Mr. Nepomuceno is present to hear Committee comments as he is working on floor plans, renderings and material selections. He continued that Mr. Bride of CES will present MEP system options tied back to conceptual budget and how it compares.

Mr. Bride reviewed MEP system goals in relation to sustainability and clean energy. He provided a package to the Committee beginning with the first page on ventilation systems constant for all space conditioning systems. He said within space conditioning systems there are different options – some hybrid systems removing carbon from the building and more energy usage and geothermal system; each will be discussed to make it as valuable as possible with questions invited. He continued with the DOAS design in the building or on the roof and bringing ventilation into each building space, changing air in each classroom and lasting 10-15 years, designed and modified to change building infrastructure; heats, dehumidifies, and more economic with reheated air to 70 degrees and air going direct to rooms whenever the building is occupied – how air is heated/cooled; and potentially to maximize space and put more cost-effective PV on the roof. Mr. Burns asked about the issue of ducts. Mr. Bride responded the biggest issue is getting ducting around and DOAS provides the smallest duct work possible in the building, which is essential.

Mr. Bride continued system options are broken into 3 different system designs; the budget was discussed for \$58.64 sq. ft. at a cost of \$4 Million in education spaces and conceptual budget; 3 system options vary by \$10-20 sq. ft.; the lower range is for more traditional design if removing boilers as system 1 and 2 electrical remove boilers; geothermal would be discussed if changing energy and the best way to reduce building boiler usage. Chairman Ostop asked Mr. Bride from a building standpoint what he recommended. Mr. Bride responded he liked the Chilled Beam System on page 8 which has primarily air through DOA to chilled beam sitting in ceiling 2400 sq. ft. per classroom; air is heated/cooled as required; lots of air movement and extremely quiet; and inside classrooms there is no maintenance. He noted there is one in a Bloomfield school and they are pleased with no maintenance in classroom and very reliable. Mr. Bride said it was the best system and what he recommends for this facility. He discussed hybrid geothermal with heat pump and small hvac with geothermal water and savings with air sourced heat

pumps. His last option was a general geothermal system model heating/cooling with water sent to the building; larger cost for bore field and more costly part of job. Mr. Bride indicated #3 is more efficient system and conceptually highest cost; and he wants to get real numbers to see where cost is to get to a more efficient design. Mr. Salvatore commented it would be energy savings. Mr. Bride indicated going with a full gas option allows progress within the building and is advantageous to the total project costs getting back good transition; wants project to have the best system going to cost of energy, but because hybrid option is so efficient may not offset costs in timely manner but getting lower cost comes to PV; at least 25 EOI net 25 Kw in base cost; with air source EOI goes up another half million to \$2 million with PV. Chairman Ostop believed they should look at #3 and the numbers. Mr. Bride noted they are still designing the same building and the only change is within the mechanical room and outside at the site. Mr. Salvatore asked him to make the full geothermal base as the alternate. Mr. Bride confirmed they can do that to the design schematic as it is not a big change in design. Mr. Burns noted heat pumps were skipped; Mr. Bride responded they take up valuable floor space and need significant maintenance. Mr. Burns asked about PV and the conceptual budget. Mr. Bride indicated PV is not part of this project's conceptual budget, but they could look at another project. Mr. Burns asked where the new boilers fit into the design. Mr. Bride indicated the boilers would provide backup heat in the event of power failure and going on a generator to heat the building and likely a State requirement. Mr. Dragulski asked about PV working for 30-40,000 sq. ft. with 35,000 available. Mr. Bride indicated that was approximate because work is needed. Mr. Dragulski commented it would be a supplement, so 30-40,000 sq. ft. would not be needed. Mr. Bride indicated they may not get all future PV on the roof with PV purchased to maximize sq. ft. and not handicap those costs. Mr. Dragulski suggested if PV is \$1.5 Million and 30% of package from State that is something to think about. Mr. Bride responded it could be written up as an alternate. Mr. Dragulski agreed and indicated it is something for the Committee to think about with additions north and south with budgets somewhere 2x or 4x system. Mr. Bride responded 4x. Regarding hot water ventilation, Mr. Bride responded 110 for baseboard and same for POS unit. Mr. Dragulski commented 4x, and north/south, and everything going at the same time. Mr. Bride confirmed that and correction planning on just geothermal on DOAS would reduce piping and keep bore size smaller. Mr. Dragulski asked both at the same time? Mr. Bride said yes and they will use the boilers. Mr. Dragulski asked that they figure geothermal and hot water at the same time during phasing. Mr. Bride agreed. Mr. Egan asked about mechanical spaces for water and heat

pump. Mr. Bride indicated they would assure adequate space, including maintenance access. Mr. Egan noted comparison of 2 geothermal systems and asked if the system can be maintained by the Facility Department and, if not, how is it maintained so it is not off for weeks at a time? Mr. Bride responded they will look at heat pump model sizes. Mr. Egan asked with the boiler up they should not put too much on it; Mr. Bride agreed so it would not have to evacuate kids. Mr. Dragulski asked if the boiler is on building sides and Mr. Bride confirmed that; Mr. Wyszynski indicated it would be near the kitchen service area in general, but they have not worked on it yet. Mr. Dragulski asked what they think about distribution around the building; Mr. Bride responded they will follow up and submit plans that can be worked on together. Mr. Egan asked if it is part of the BIM model being developed; Mr. Bride confirmed that. Mr. Burns commented that PBC needs CM input on the advantage of going full geothermal, staffing, components needed and impact schedule and to think of all aspects; Mr. Bride agreed and noted the benefit of a larger base of land. Mr. Egan commented the bore field out back could be more over-burdened and re-located to a more advantageous spot in order to save costs. Mr. Dragulski commented net zero is not being pursued; Mr. Bride confirmed that is not into PV. Mr. Dragulski continued if net zero was pursued, does it impact your effort, and is it additional base; Mr. Bride responded it is not additional base within the project budget and they could work to get more money back with no extra fees on Tecton's end; Mr. Wyszynski agreed.

Mr. Egan asked about the kitchen. Mr. Wyszynski indicated if all electric is needed in the kitchen, they need to prepare and guide the designer to get as much as possible for net zero as it changes all the equipment and specifications because there are no deviations with kitchen designers. Mr. Dragulski asked that if pursuing net zero is not a big cost impact to the budget in general, is it more expensive than a regular building? Mr. Wyszynski responded that obvious costs are PV and bore field; the advantage of PV looks at different glaze and installation system and they need to know how far to take it. Chairman Ostop added the project needs to stay within the budget. Mr. Wyszynski commented out of budget is the bore field and need to know what is the owner idea of what is not in the budget discussed at the conceptual level. Mr. Dragulski asked about the potential of the budget going up with the possibility of doing full PV. Mr. Bride commented they are pursuing an efficient building even if the bore field is not available, which is still a concept design. Chairman Ostop reiterated the need to stay within the budget. Mr. Burns asked where is the biggest energy return to prioritize? Chairman Ostop responded the CM is needed to walk PBC through numbers for

both items. Mr. Burns added PBC needs to know for the design. Mr. Bride responded they can start running some models with Tecton to get values and calculate ROIs and choose one with more energy savings within the project budget. Mr. Egan suggested revisions for PV to allow for the need to only put on panels with no construction. Mr. Bride indicated they have done that with many schools. Mr. Burns asked when PBC would know about the kitchen. Mr. Wyszynski responded discussions would be initiated with the school and kitchen design provider, as there have been no conversations yet. Chairman Ostop asked for comments, questions and advised Mr. Casey of the need to get packages to members ASAP.

6. Other

None.

7. Old Business

None.

8. New Business

Chairman Ostop confirmed the next meeting will be Monday, November 8th at the Simsbury Library at 7 p.m.

9. Adjourn

Mr. Burns made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 p.m. Mr. Cortes seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Prifti

Commission Clerk