

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting Minutes

January 5, 2022

Subject to Approval

Chairman Ostop called the Regular Meeting of the Public Building Committee to order at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 5, 2022, via Zoom.

Present – Chairman Ostop, Messrs. Salvatore, Cortes, Kelly, Derr, Egan, and Dragulski; and Eric Wellman, BOS Liaison

Excused – Mr. Burns

Guests – Jeff Shea, Simsbury Town Engineer; for Simsbury Public Schools – Andy O’Brien, Jason Casey, and Mike Luzietti, 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; for Richter and Cegan - Mike Cegan and Cynthia Jensen; and for CES -Brian Hamel

No public audience comments.

1. Minutes of the December 6, 2021, Regular Meeting Minutes

Corrections to the minutes included: 1) on page 1, Guests, correct the last name of Latimer Lane Principal to “Luzietti”; 2) on page 3, second to last paragraph, changing “VIM” to “BIM” in 2 places; and 3) on page 12. Section 8. change the meeting date from “January 3, 2022” to “January 5, 2022”.

Mr. Cortes made a motion to approve the December 6, 2021, Special Meeting Minutes, as corrected. Mr. Salvatore seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

2. Board of Selectmen Liaison Report

Mr. Wellman, the new BOS liaison, met Committee members and expressed appreciation for participating in meetings. Chairman Ostop welcomed him as the new BOS point of contact.

3. SHS Re-roofing Project

- a. Al Jacunski Update
- b. Guide Rail Quote

Chairman Ostop read into the record an email from Susan Salina, Chair of the Simsbury Board of Education to “Please accept this email as my approval for the addition of safety railings for the 7 rooftop locations at Simsbury High School at a cost of \$22,984.89.”; and it was added to the meeting agenda with no further comment from Mr. Casey.

Mr. Salvatore made a motion to accept the email from Susan Salina, Chair of the Simsbury Board of Education, as approval to move forward with the addition of safety railings for the 7 rooftop locations at Simsbury High School at a cost of \$22,984.89. Mr. Derr seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

Mr. Jacunski noted a contractor update received Sunday indicates 4 of the 18 punch list items remain; Greenwood has the manufacturers warranty and it remains to be provided; completion of access ladders requires some additional bolts; and still needed is a replacement landscape cable box cover; fans are scheduled to be in about January 14th. He indicated no further billings at this time. As directed by Chairman Ostop he will notify Greenwood tomorrow to proceed with the OSHA railings and restated the items to be completed for the roof and is not aware of any leaks to date and will verify onsite. Mr. Derr asked about the timeline for the guide rails and fan completion. Mr. Jacunski noted the fans are to be in 1/14 and he will find out tomorrow if there is a lead time for the railings and confirm to Messrs. Casey and O’Brien.

4. Latimer Lane Renovation

a. Arcadis Monthly Report

Chairman Ostop requested that items/questions discussed at each meeting as noted in the minutes should be followed up with responses to the Committee at every meeting. Mr. Butkus agreed to incorporate these items/questions into their monthly report.

Mr. Butkus provided the first Tecton Report and will update future reports to comply with requested responses to items discussed at each meeting. He said the best news for the last month is that the priority list of projects delivered to the Governor listed the Latimer project on 12/15/21 following several discussions with OSCG to assure an accurate understanding/description and verified pertinent information acceptable to them; they anticipate approval at the end of the spring legislative session, which is a short session due to fall elections, with notification sometime in May that the priority list has been authorized. He said once the commitment letter is received reimbursements can begin to be drawn so funds expended until then by the Town for general costs and architect's fees can be reimbursed.

Mr. Butkus continued they did a 90-day look ahead and the first item for January was a virtual meeting yesterday with Latimer staff/faculty; and a virtual PTO meeting is scheduled for next week. He noted the schematic estimate has been finalized/reviewed with the architects estimate in process and none yet from O&G – both will be reconciled when they are available; procurement of the environmental consultant will occur in January and Tecton will share a schedule for pre-meetings and submissions to Town regulatory agencies, which is working on pace. He said overall the project progress is following the original design schedule and is pleased with that; and the next step is for Tecton, CES, and the CA to schedule a time next week for a preliminary meeting so that the CA can draw up the owner's project requirements, which is the touchstone for systems design and verification after construction.

Regarding any problems, Mr. Butkus noted continued challenges in the market with material availability; looking forward to construction, he has had recent bids that were challenging, including for the supply chain where some of their other clients are finding suppliers not willing to hold prices. He indicated volatility in the materials market is a concern both for cost and timing to procure materials and O&G will have their work cut out for them in the bidding community; he hoped that the Committee would be able to act quickly once the numbers are available after bidding in order to secure contracts before the suppliers don't respect

numbers given to contractors. Mr. Cravanzola saw a lot of problems and noted the need to potentially shorten the amount of time for bidders holding prices, e.g. roofers quotes are now set for the time of delivery to the job, and steel prices are changing outside of the 30-90 day standard timeframe for award; and they will work with Arcadis to develop the right thresholds for bidder participation while providing protections as contracts are awarded in the desired timeframe. Mr. Cravanzola concluded they will have to work with Tecton for some materials selections to get them in the timeframe needed.

Mr. Derr asked for the supply chain if a plan could be created to deliver/warehouse critical materials in order to stay on track. Mr. Cravanzola responded that could be done and for lead time and acquisition, they could allow for billing of offsite storage if they fill out the UCC filing, bill of sale, and insurance for transfer of title. He noted the Latimer site is tight for warehousing and finding an onsite warehouse for materials to be delivered should be incorporated into logistics planning to assure a conditioned/secure space. He was less concerned from a lead time standpoint about some materials, but for key materials the best lead time is currently not good enough to stay on the current schedule, including roofing within the first 5-6 months. Chairman Ostop commented that could be a major problem. Mr. Cravanzola agreed that warehousing materials is a necessary discussion. Mr. Derr noted that all creative possibilities and associated costs need to be considered for this possibly ongoing issue for the next couple of years.

Chairman Ostop noted acceptance of Arcadis report.

b. Arcadis Invoice #34255039 & 34265039

Mr. Egan made a motion to approve payment of Arcadis October Invoice #34255039 in the amount of \$13,750.00. Mr. Salvatore seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Derr made a motion to approve payment of Arcadis December Invoice #34265039 in the amount of \$13,750.00. Mr. Egan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Chairman Ostop requested Mr. Butkus continue in the meeting.

c. Tecton Report

Mr. Hopkins noted Tecton provided an update to PBC last week and went over major highlights: for work completed the packet draft traffic impact study is now final and will be submitted for regulatory application; Mr. Butkus already reviewed the 2022 school building project priority list issuance; for work in progress, SLR is developing the updated site plan package for regulatory submission, and updating their report based on recent consultant coordination on Monday; there is potential the Conservation and Inlands/Wetlands Commission application will be an administrative review with SLR forwarding this week completed drawings to the responsible party and they should know the result next week; then they would proceed with the Design Review Board and Zoning Commission on the 1st and 3rd Mondays of each month identifying 2/1 for the initial hearing – they will contact DRB informally re the review course and potential for an informal meeting prior to submission. He continued for building floor plan development, they have met with Simsbury Public Schools, including a food service equipment review meeting prior to the holidays where they received constructive feedback and will provide Principal Luzietti that update this week for review with his team. He noted a BOE update in mid-December with a question about the size of the basketball court/gym which is being sized with striping to junior high or middle school size to maintain a 3-point line for community usage but a little narrower than high school size; and 2-3 rows of bleacher seating provided. He said weekly consultant coordination meetings are held on Monday afternoons and the commissioning kickoff meeting will follow next Monday's meeting; for cost estimate coordination, he indicated they should be receiving this week their cost estimate for review to be prepared for reconciliation with the CMs cost estimate.

Mr. Hopkins continued a number of meetings have been held with Principal Luzietti, other reps from Simsbury Public Schools, O&G, and Arcadis re phasing and sequencing; in December they went through a high level diagram of how they as architects could move through the building and sequence construction and now that the CM is on board it is important to get feedback re durations; they have established criteria for Latimer operation: 22 classrooms, 2 special education spaces, 1 art room, 1 instrumental room, and maintaining the staged gym and cafeteria; where they thought about breaking off additions to start at the same time, but after feedback from O&G, they are looking at the gym and cafeteria addition working sequentially through the building in a north to south direction and they are

working on durations. He noted a very productive virtual meeting with about 40 Latimer faculty yesterday where they provided their high-level presentation and floorplans and answered questions/concerns; they will have a similar meeting next Monday 1/10 with the PTO and the community. He noted also on this call to answer questions are Jeff Wyszynski, Mike Cegan and Cynthia Jensen from Richter and Cegan, and Brian Hamel from CES.

Chairman Ostop invited questions.

Mr. Egan was concerned about the phasing, sequencing, and cost estimates as it was PBC's understanding that would be used to drive MEP design and before PBC has anything to act on or provide feedback, it will be close to design development and that opportunity will be lost. Mr. Hopkins responded they are holding as part of the design the geothermal alternate and are setting up the potential design development package continuing to carry the geothermal field as an alternate so they can make that decision at the conclusion of their design development estimate with some reciprocity in terms of feedback showing PBC where they are in the cost estimate and getting input to ultimately incorporate into construction documents after design development. Mr. Hamel added the basic building design will not change from chilled beam, including internal units, so if they have to react later on to high budgets they can go in the direction of changing actual plant, which will be carried as an alternate. Mr. Egan asked if that would change from chilled beam to VRF based on coordination. Mr. Hamel said it would not and it would always be chilled beam.

Mr. Derr asked about design which affects building mechanicals and if windows that could be opened should be installed in the school given the COVID situation; fresh air is a health and safety issue with the public likely shocked that most windows in schools cannot be opened. He believed the project should be as creative as possible with as many options as possible even if facilities personnel open/close windows for outside fresh air. Mr. Hamel noted all roof units are bringing in 100% outside air, but it is not really an option with chilled beam design as they are susceptible to humidity levels and a window opened on a hot day would cause those chilled beams to condense causing water issues. He said they have provided options before with sensors on the windows shutting down units for that room so they don't experience condensation, but with chill beams it doesn't work to have operable windows and may also be a safety concern. Mr. Wyszynski added from a safety and aesthetic perspective most schools in the last decade have

not included operable windows, and if they are included have sensors to assure control but could be discussed for smaller units and would likely be at a premium. Mr. O'Brien noted as a single-story building, they like to have some windows for egress and asked that it be included from a safety standpoint.

Mr. Egan asked for an update on what mechanicals would go in the roof doghouse. Mr. Hamel responded they are not advising on that plan and are working on rooftop unit layouts based on phasing with smaller units spread out on the building to reduce ductwork size and reduce/eliminate the doghouse on the roof. Mr. Wyszynski commented that looking at the phasing and sequencing counterclockwise with input from O&G, it made more sense to use smaller DOAs with fresh air in building quadrants reducing ductwork size making it more manageable to get most of it inside the building. Mr. Dragulski asked to see sketches/ diagrams of what is proposed for mechanical systems, e.g., pipes, ductwork, etc. as design development will be too late. Mr. Egan was concerned there is no practical way to run the new hot and chilled water piping while keeping the old hot water piping in plant running through a multi-phased construction. Mr. Egan also commented that smaller DOAs units come with a great cost premium which needs to be considered. Mr. Hamel responded there may be some more upfront costs with more units, but the shorter the duct runs the smaller the fans with less static pressure pushing on duct work with more energy savings in the long run. Mr. Wyszynski noted they have some building drawings with schematic layouts and will share them with PBC to receive input.

Mr. Dragulski asked about the location of geothermal well fields, e.g., in the back or on the side in the parking lot with the mechanical room remaining in the front/middle of the building and PBC's need to understand the proposal and help. Mr. Wyszynski advised they have made some improvement modifications to where the mechanical rooms are and will put a diagram package together for PBC feedback. Mr. Egan commented the multi-stack lead time will likely be the longest for the project.

d. Tecton Invoice #44636

Mr. Derr made a motion to approve payment of Tecton Invoice #44636 dated 12/28/21 for the period 12/2 to 12/28/21 in the amount of \$36,566.00. Mr. Egan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

At 7:40 p.m. Mr. Salvatore made a motion to enter Executive Session. Mr. Cortes seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

At 7:50 p.m. Mr. Cortes made a motion to exit Executive Session. Mr. Egan seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously.

Mr. Dragulski commented PBC needs more information from the design team with schematics and time is running out with construction documents due the beginning of May; CM or not, PBC needs construction documents to see what we are doing. Mr. Butkus asked what is the typical way of working, e.g., subcommittee? Mr. Dragulski responded in the past PBC has received drawings to look at and noted the PowerPoint presentation in December. Mr. Butkus responded that as Mr. Wyszynski committed tonight, they will get that information to PBC. Mr. Egan discussed the MEP Subcommittee kickoff meeting and no follow up with the plan to use cost estimate and coordination feedback, and yet they are no further along with drawings or cost estimates. Mr. Egan said you do not need to wait for PBC monthly meetings and members can be invited to project meetings. Mr. Dragulski commented that expediting the project process is the issue. Members discussed potential meeting dates deciding on February 7th via Zoom; Mr. Egan is not available on that date. Mr. Shea will assure Committee members are provided electronic copies of drawings.

5. Other

None.

6. Old Business

None.

7. New Business

The next meeting will be on 2/7 via Zoom.

8. Adjourn

Mr. Salvatore made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m. Mr. Egan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Prifti

Commission Clerk