

## **PUBLIC BUILDING COMMITTEE**

### **Regular Meeting Minutes**

**December 6, 2021**

*Subject to Approval*

Chairman Ostop called the Regular Meeting of the Public Building Committee to order at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, December 6, 2021, at the Simsbury Public Library.

Present – Chairman Ostop, Messrs. Cortes, Kelly, Burns, Egan, and Dragulski

Excused – Messrs. Derr and Salvatore

Guests - for Simsbury Public Schools – Andy O’Brien, Jason Casey, and Mike c, Principal, Latimer Lane School; for Jacunski Humes – Al Jacunski; for Tecton - Jeffrey Wyszynski and Justin Hopkins; for Arcadis – Jack Butkus, Business Development Manager, and for O&G – David Cravanzola; and Clean Energy Task Force – Mark Scully

No public audience comments.

#### **1. Minutes of the November 22 & 23, 2021, Special PBC Meetings**

*Mr. Egan made a motion to approve the November 22, 2021, Special Meeting Minutes, as written. Mr. Dragulski seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.*

*Mr. Burns made a motion to approve the November 23, 2021, Special Meeting Minutes, as written. Mr. Kelly seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.*

#### **2. Board of Selectmen Liaison Report**

No update.

### **3. SHS Re-roofing Project**

#### **a. Al Jacunski Update**

Mr. Jacunski advised that 11 of the 18 punch list items from 11/25 have been done. He is waiting for issuance of warranty, removal of construction materials – equipment and steel work; and fan replacement is back ordered potentially for January; replacement of louvers has started and mechanical engineering work. He noted Mr. O'Brien took photos of the canopy, which looks good. He will continue to verify punch list items completed. He discussed the proposal for the additional OSHA railings in the package; any equipment within 10 feet of roof edge requires OSHA railings and there are existing areas with no required railings and Mr. O'Brien asked for a proposal - amounts noted were \$18,673; \$13,022.58 for labor; and \$22,994.89 for 5 locations with quite a number of railings around the building and ineligible for reimbursement. He verified the railings are not part of the original contract. Chairman Ostop noted the railings are not part of this project, and while they may have been discussed with BOE, BOE would need to ask to add it to the project. Mr. Burns commented on the requirement for railings and being out of compliance. Mr. Jacunski responded the bid was started and he informed Mr. O'Brien about the requirement within 10 feet of roof edge. Chairman Ostop reiterated the railings are not part of the original contract for PBC to do presently and BOE must come back with the request. Mr. Burns was concerned about accelerating costs and how long the quotes were good for.

***Mr. Dragulski made a motion to approve payment to Greenwood Industries, Inc. for Application #7 in the amount of \$41,127.40. Mr. Egan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

Mr. Jacunski advised that after payment of Invoice #7, there is a remaining balance of \$270,281. Mr. Cortes noted the need to be clear about whether BOE wants to add railings to the project; Mr. Burns felt it was not out of the Committee's jurisdiction. Mr. Jacunski advised the railings are included in the budget update document and would be a credit change under allowances not utilized on the project; he noted as of 12/6 the current amounts of \$499,562.32 and \$11K with over \$500K balance remaining of \$2,591,085.

### **4. Henry James Memorial School Project**

Chairman Ostop noted Henry James is considered complete and can be taken off updates.

## **5. Latimer Lane Renovation**

### **a. Arcadis Monthly Report**

Mr. Butkus noted that Mr. Cravanzola of O&G is present tonight following the Committee's vote to select O&G for CM services pending negotiation of an acceptable contract. He said an 11/29 meeting was held to manage contract terms with changes before preconstruction services billed monthly on first \$200K of change orders funded by contingency; he is reviewing language dealing with liabilities and delays which will be forwarded to the Town Attorney. He continued they are looking at the first estimate following the schematic meeting with the State on 11/23 and MEP documents to access and are working with Tecton to get it in their hands. Arcadis is participating in weekly design coordination meetings and additional client meetings also attended by O&G and the Commissioning Agent.

Chairman Ostop asked if the Commissioning Agent is ready to move. Mr. Butkus responded that the contract is with the Town Manager's office for signature and once signed they can get a purchase order. Chairman Ostop noted for the record the Committee has not yet received any reports from the CA. Mr. Butkus has received calls from the Office of School Construction Grants requesting additional information which Tecton provided verifying square footages and parsed in more detail re: existing square footages and size of additions; and the result is the project is in good shape based on square footage for the additions and basement based on enrollment with no grant impacts at this time. He is working with Mr. Casey to procure environmental consultant services to understand impact on abatement and remediation as necessary and not spend the same dollar twice on construction but on environmental using a firm from the State contract list, and noted there is a firm the Town has previously worked with; he hopes to solidify in the next week working to ensure enough detail of what they are asking for and that it be practical. This concluded his report.

Mr. Egan asked about the allowance and VIM as part of preconstruction services and what was agreed with O&G. Mr. Butkus confirmed that O&G included use of VIM in both preconstruction and during construction with \$40K for investigative services in preconstruction services on built-in allowing them to open up and look around to do a better job.

Mr. Egan asked if water balancing is part of the boiler replacement project. Mr. Casey responded it is part of commissioning. Mr. Dragulski commented the boiler project may not have commissioning. Mr. Wyszynski noted that CES is not here tonight. Mr. Egan commented it may be part of investigations and not done if there is a balancing report. Mr. Wyszynski will check on that.

#### b. Tecton Report

Mr. Hopkins indicated an update was provided on Thursday for PBC's packet, including a summary of work completed with highlighted notes on slide 2. He confirmed with the Fire Marshal no perimeter access road is required based on the fully sprinklered design, otherwise 360-degree access would be required around the building. He continued that the site survey has been completed and distributed to the project team and is serving as the project baseline. They held review meetings on 11/12 with Simsbury public schools with notes provided in the packet for food services and media center. He noted they continue to hold weekly coordination meetings on Monday. He said on 11/23 they held an OSCG&R schematic site review meeting and also responded to their grant review questions; and they also held sequencing and logistics meeting Thursday afternoon; Mr. Wyszynski added O&G was also at the meeting and an administrative update is part of the packet review material.

Mr. Hopkins provided slide information as follows:

On slide 5, page 3 they show the existing bus loop will remain as it is currently because of setback requirements for any new parking area to be outside of 50 feet of the street and keeping existing parking allows maximizing parking.

Slide B shows significant wider separation landscape buffer for bus/parent entry, which is currently difficult.

Slide C shows accommodation of new addition keeping north boundary of parking area and circulation intact and reconfiguring the parking area to accommodate a new drop off/loading sequence; they are providing new age-appropriate play areas with landscape buffers, and around the building beginning on the northwest a grade 4-6 play area to south of the building for grades 1-3 and kindergarten play.

Slide D shows formal/informal outdoor learning with formal in an outdoor courtyard positioned with access to those areas from art and media center rooms; they also have provided along the west some informal areas to sit outside.

Slide E shows accommodation of formal/informal outdoor learning in courtyard positioning access through some of special rooms, e.g., music, art, media and some informal areas on the north also.

Slide 10 is building an outdoor presentation area fronting the gym. Slide F indicates outside presentation space to exterior.

Slide G shows space accommodating 20-25 bikes.

Slide 12 provides a technical drawing of grading and topography, but does not include State required accessibility path to recreation field that is uphill and will be included in future iterations.

Mr. Wyszynski commented this plan was reviewed with the school principal in further detail with many of their comments to be incorporated and this is the basis of site planning for Zoning, Planning, etc. and they are in a good position of schematic layout and would like to incorporate any comments before going to those groups with formal applications.

Chairman Ostop invited questions.

Mr. Cortes asked where bike space is currently located. Mr. Wyszynski indicated it would continue to be generally where it is now. Mr. Cortes noted parent drop off cars from the right, buses in front to the left and a very narrow sidewalk space in front of the school for kids to get their bikes up to the rack and it might be safer to have the bike rack toward the south end. Mr. Wyszynski believed bikes are placed there because it is directly in front of administration; and the principal added the majority of bikers come across from Mountain View Drive and up the sidewalk adjacent to the drop off loop and as soon as they cross over the bike racks are right there and with parent drop off coming in the side/back doors and buses through main front doors there is not a lot of pedestrian traffic there – formerly they were in the back with a hike required.

Mr. Egan asked for an explanation of car traffic for parent drop off. Mr. Wyszynski indicated the center arrow was wrong. Mr. Egan asked about play spaces and areas that are student projects. Mr. Wyszynski said they were duly noted, including trees/benches and will not lose site of it.

Mr. Burns asked about slide 5 top left portion showing the new addition section and if classroom renovation or modification is in this portion. Mr. Hopkins confirmed that is correct. Mr. Burns asked if it was modifying or what. Mr.

Hopkins responded the floor plan yellow line shows the extent of the existing building and keeping 3 classrooms and addition situated within the existing footprint and site plan will be updated to show new additions for more of a Tetris piece. Mr. Burns asked about changing elevations and ADA accessibility. Mr. Hopkins said yes, they are able to accommodate all elevation changes, so no hand rails for accessibility are required on the site.

Mr. Burns asked about slide 10 outdoor presentation space facing the new gym. Mr. Hopkins said to look at slide 13 to the far right of the gym and above that the stage multipurpose room with stage in front for interior presentations and also with a sliding door on it can provide for outdoor presentations with nothing facing toward the building and will be at ground level with a step between stage and gym accommodating 19-inch interior elevation change. It was noted there was a mandate to not have a lot of railings Mr. Dragulski asked about the step between multipurpose and the gym. Mr. Hopkins indicated there would be a set of sliding doors enclosing the gym from the stage multipurpose area if there is an event to function like a platform with no rail requirement and with stairs that go down to the right of the stage for egress, and on the left side of the gym a ramp from the upper to main level. Mr. Burns asked if there are any bleachers in the new gym on the far wall. Mr. Wyszynski responded that is a great question with plenty of space to accommodate bleachers, but they did not remember and acknowledged it is sized for it and will get an answer. Mr. Dragulski asked if storage next to the multipurpose area is where gym chairs would be stored. Mr. Wyszynski indicated that storage would be at the same level as the gym; the single door is to the back room; and double door is to move chairs in/out.

Mr. Hopkins continued with the floor plan on slide 13 and the orange line showing the existing building with north and south additions On slide 14: amenity highlights; keeping administration near main entrance and major circulation points; discussed with the principal at length the proper location for kindergarten located at the bottom left portion of the floorplan with access to the main entrance, but in the quiet part of building with not a lot of circulation in kinder wing. Mr. Wyszynski noted the grade 1 classrooms with 3 above that and there will be utilities located there with the potential plan to relocate to Henry James. Mr. Hopkins commented that slide 16 shows the cafeteria/gym able to be separated from the rest of the school in the event of night/weekend activities and be self-functioning. Mr. Wyszynski indicated the black area in the kitchen area is because

food service needs to be laid out in detail and they will provide the plan to Principal Luzietti.

Mr. Dragulski asked about the cafeteria corridor in front near the media area and going to the north exits at cafeteria and that it can be isolated from the rest of the building, and if the door is closed there, it can be closed at one end. Mr. Hopkins confirmed that and indicated they would make sure there are no dead-end corridors with passage inside/outside building; and from standalone in the gym/cafeteria, if someone is closed in the building, they can egress through the cafeteria. Mr. Dragulski asked if that was the same for grade 6. Mr. Hopkins said yes and when partitioning for nights/weekends that no one should be in that portion of the building, but will be able to egress out and cannot enter the rest of the building; Mr. Wyszynski noted that was a good point and needs to be cleaned up.

Mr. Hopkins said slide 17 core space is centrally located with art, media, music and band spaces in the heart of the building; and nice positioning of core spaces in the center of the building gives a feeling of what is going on. He noted an effort to space special education and resource rooms throughout to be age appropriate and located where students are. Mr. Wyszynski added janitor closets, etc. need to be pushed into nooks. Mr. Dragulski asked about the slide 18 administrative area being different then in slide 17. Mr. Hopkins noted they did not update slide 17 and slide 18 is correct.

Mr. Hopkins continued with slide 19 protected outdoor learning and they are in the process of positioning correct doors for music, media, and art areas. Mr. Wyszynski noted a grading issue for doors to the outdoor courtyard. Mr. Dragulski asked about internal space re outdoor courtyards and how they are accessed, and what the treatment - solid surface, grass is. Mr. Wyszynski responded it would be low access/maintenance plantings but no grass to be mowed. Mr. Hopkins added that as design development continues, they will be able to blow areas up. Mr. Burns asked about drainage issues in the planting area. Mr. Hopkins responded it is what they are working on. Mr. Wyszynski added there is some storm drainage that wraps around, and they should be able to tie into it. Mr. Hopkins noted they will need to accommodate some additional stormwater. Mr. Dragulski asked for other spaces if there were 2 exits. Mr. Wyszynski indicated that is a good question and upcoming building code egress requirements have changed and they will look at it for upcoming building revisions.

Mr. Hopkins noted slide G shows proximity to outdoor play and a myriad of exits from rooms to outdoor spaces. Chairman Ostrop noted 5 exits, and Mr. Hopkins confirmed that.

Mr. Hopkins went through construction sequencing as discussed in their Thursday meeting; O&G will also be ramping up and providing project feedback. He said key criteria include: 22 classroom spaces during all construction sequences, egress at all times, and limited disruption with no student in a classroom all day long adjacent to a construction wall. He noted construction sequence 1A is cafeteria, gym, and physical kitchen, which needs to be built before they can displace existing kitchen/cafeteria; construction sequence 1B utilizes 3 existing classrooms and added classrooms built around them to create more space for remaining sequences. He highlighted those 2 sections identifying classroom spaces for faculty workroom or resource rooms and will need to separate one of the open classrooms to provide a corridor with no dead-end corridors.

Mr. Hopkins discussed slide 23 area which shows construction sequence 2 for admin wing and core spaces and provides gym, cafeteria and kitchen, 22 classrooms, and fossilized bathroom, maintaining existing front entrance and new entrances.

Mr. Hopkins continued with construction sequence 3 which could be a summer slammer for toilet, infrastructure work in 1<sup>st</sup> grade wing and requires borrowing some of the newly constructed space with core and addition spaces completed and taking K offline.

Mr. Hopkins indicated there are some areas where they do not have any plumbing infrastructure work, limited space modifications with utility infrastructure and space modifications project work for 2 consecutive summers and this is the 1<sup>st</sup> pass.

Mr. Egan asked re slide 24 if classrooms 11-20 are addressed. Mr. Hopkins noted they would be summer work and not taken offline.

Mr. Cortes asked if an 18-wheeler backed up in the service area, if there is sufficient room assuming they come in headfirst. The principal responded they typically back up with lines of cars and currently it works, and it also should in this plan, but it is snug.



Mr. Hopkins asked about initial coordination items, including: 1) the 2011 roofing project and impact on their contemplated work and what can remain or be modified; the 10-year old roof energy code required ½ inch slope/foot average insulation and here there is at center roof drains ½ inch insulation and 17 inches at the perimeter and it all must be brought up to the minimum R value required now; they have a strategy for discussion. 2) The building envelope with existing primary 6- inch CMU system and a 4-inch brick with no air space or insulation between; exterior brick is in good condition and not in need of repair/replacement and any envelope modification should be done inside; the CMU provides lateral support to the overall building assembly with steel columns interior to the building and steel beams span to structural peak on the outside with CMU providing T for support and to avoid a substantial structural reinforcement project, they will try to keep that existing structure intact and provide thermal requirements on the interior, likely with metal frame, inside steel stud, and spray foam insulation.

Mr. Hopkins discussed slide 28 building systems distribution and in order to accomplish assembly they are looking at mechanical systems of 2 RTUs at 7500 and 10,000 CFM and 2 dedicated outside air units at 11,000 and 14,000 CFM; due to existing height limitations they are looking at a rooftop utility raceway, which also addresses clearance issues for duct work on building interior corridor and for classrooms and is also an opportunity to address roof thermal issues. He said the low point of insulation is center of the building and the most efficient way of running system utilities is at building center above the corridors and providing the raceway above the center with a very small structure above the corridor which tackles both issues. Mr. Egan asked if the raceway would interfere with putting in a PV array. Mr. Hopkins confirmed it would and they are discussing with CES the potential future location and siting rooftop units and raceway to achieve maximum space available for a PV array. Mr. Egan asked if geothermal is the way to go, will there be wells on the other side of the building, and how much does that reduce system efficiency. Mr. Hopkins indicated he would get the answer. Mr. Wyszynski added they debated the utility entrance location and decided to keep it with the other mechanicals, but it is a good point and they will clarify; he also noted there are 2 DOAs with another on top of the gym. Mr. Dragulski asked if the raceway goes around the corridor how do you get access to it and not quickly destroy it. Mr. Wyszynski indicated they would like to avoid ladders and have access from either side of the building, and they have to figure that out and it is a good point. Mr. Dragulski asked on slide 59 re the mechanical room how the

boilers will be reused. Mr. Wyszynski responded for emergency use only and Mr. Hopkins added it reduces the size of electric generators needed. Mr. Dragulski asked about building the physical plant that has to be in use while construction is ongoing to keep the existing occupied building running with heat and how will that be done. Mr. Wyszynski noted the boilers just installed in the basement would be left there throughout construction and they could be backup to reduce the generator with the current plan to leave the boilers in place, but if it is not geothermal, they may be relocated. Mr. Wyszynski indicated they have not yet appropriately planned for what will happen if geothermal is not done. Mr. Dragulski said if they do not go geothermal and it is chilled water where will it go, the wells could be buried under the parking lot; if they go geothermal, will it be individual heat pump for each classroom and a 2- or 4-part system. Mr. Wyszynski said it would be a 4-part system. Mr. Egan asked about duct work for the chase on the roof and asked about the plan for placement of chilled/hot water. Mr. Wyszynski indicated CES is looking at it and what is more efficient with chilled beams 6-8 feet off the outside wall and noted 90% of the classrooms won't have ceilings and are exposed concrete. Mr. Dragulski asked how chilled beam could be done in that case. Mr. Hopkins indicated there are specific units for that and the duct work in that section is from the DOAs would come through a spiral duct along the teaching wall with a soffit because power is needed for the teaching wall and they are trying to figure out a building systems diagram to locate it in one spot and show the Committee. . Mr. Dragulski asked about placement of the mechanical room and if the building would be sprinklered and that it be reviewed. Mr. Cravanzola confirmed that it was and said they will diagram physical classrooms next. Mr. Egan was eager to receive O&Gs input on both sequencing of keeping mechanicals alive and how they are phased in in case they are moving in a direction requiring a U turn if not constructable. Mr. Cravanzola noted that was their intention working with Tecton. Mr. Dragulski noted the need to sequence everything and have 2 systems in the building. Mr. Egan asked if the RTUs serve the gym and cafeteria and DOAs units serve the classrooms; Mr. Hopkins confirmed that.

Mr. Hopkins said the next steps are SD estimates for site plans, floor plans and design narratives for building systems areas that will go to O&G; and their estimator will finalize the schedule for bid packages. He noted dates in the update for regulatory approvals targeting submission to the Conservation Commission for January 11 and 18 and February 1 meetings, and that meetings for DRB and Planning and Zoning Commissions meet on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Mondays/month. Concurrent with the Conservation submission, they plan to have an informal

meeting with DRB to prevent any roadblocks; subsequent DRB, and Planning and Zoning meetings will be on February 7, 21, and March 7, which is likely a public hearing. Mr. Cortes informed them that the Town has separate Planning and Zoning Commissions and Planning meets on Tuesdays.

Mr. Hopkins continued they have also identified Latimer Lane communication updates for meetings with faculty and staff for January 4<sup>th</sup> and a PTO Community update on January 10<sup>th</sup>. He noted they are assembling a list of energy efficiency related items for the building. Mr. Wyszynski added an update meeting is also scheduled with BOE on 12/14.

Mr. Egan asked if all of the parking lots are being resurfaced in this project. Mr. Hopkins confirmed that it is part of the project and grant application.

c. Arcadis Invoice #54265039

***Mr. Burns made a motion to approve payment of Arcadis Invoice #54265039 in the amount of \$13,750.00. Mr. Egan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

d. Tecton Invoice #44531

***Mr. Egan made a motion to approve payment of Tecton Invoice #44531 in the amount of \$167,218.00. Mr. Dragulski seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

## **6. Other**

None.

## **7. Old Business**

None.

## **8. New Business**

Chairman Ostop confirmed the next meeting will be Monday, January 3, 2022, at the Simsbury Public Library at 7 p.m. and will be noticed.

## **9. Adjourn**

*Mr. Kelly made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:12 p.m. Mr. Burns seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.*

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Prifti

Commission Clerk