

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting Minutes

April 4, 2022

Subject to Approval

Chairman Ostop called the Regular Meeting of the Public Building Committee to order at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 4, 2022, via Zoom.

Present – Chairman Ostop, Messrs. Derr, Burns, Egan, and Dragulski

Excused – Messrs. Kelly and Salvatore

Guests – Tom Roy, Simsbury Town Engineer; for Simsbury Public Schools – Andy O’Brien, Jason Casey, N. Sullivan, Assistant Superintendent, and Latimer Lane Principal Michael Luzietti; for Jacunski Humes – Al Jacunski; for Tecton - Jeffrey Wyszynski, Justin Hopkins; for Arcadis – Jack Butkus, Business Development Manager, and for O&G – David Cravanzola and Mark Sedensky; and for CES -Brian Hamel; and J. Tindall

No public audience comments.

1. Minutes of the March 21, 2022, Special Meeting Minutes

Mr. Dragulski made a motion to approve the March 21, 2022, Special Meeting Minutes, as written. Chairman Ostop seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

2. Simsbury High School Roof Replacement Project

Mr. Jacunski reported final change order #3 for the additional OSHA safety rails previously approved was processed. He also noted a credit for unused allowances of (\$11,684.89) which is \$22,994.89 for the railings and the credit for unused allowances of (\$11,310.00) and has been signed off by Greenwood and is with the BOE for signature. He continued installation of the additional approved fans is scheduled and has received a staging plan for the contractor who will start Tuesday, 4/12 and 4/13 to complete installation, weather permitting. He will then schedule an onsite meeting with the goal to close out the project at the next PBC meeting. Mr. Obrien commented he was looking forward to closing out the project.

3. Latimer Lane Renovation

a. Arcadis Monthly Report

Mr. Butkus noted there will be value management discussions tonight, including HVAC systems. He continued that in his monthly report the budget is unchanged and value management efforts continue; there is one professional service amendment tonight to hire a steel detailer as a Tecton sub; for the 90-day look ahead, they are restarting the design process for construction documents once resolution is reached on value management and the financial trajectory with about 3 months ahead to complete CDs before beginning bidding. Chairman Ostop indicated O&G needs to get bids first. Mr. Butkus confirmed that was true for final authorization; however, some interim action may be needed before going to the State for authorization to go to bid. Chairman Ostop reiterated the need for an actual bid number first and then go to the Town. Mr. Butkus was talking in context of the State Office of School Construction Grants and the need for their approval to go to bid. Mr. Derr commented that since this extreme price escalation has not been experienced in the past 25 years, State authorization is now needed to go out to bid with the potential of providing additional detailed documents; and members agreed.

Mr. Butkus continued that critical path items are value management, budget adjustment decisions, the State's grant commitment at the session ending 5/4; and completion of construction documents leading up to bids. He commented meetings with the design team and school continue and Tecton is moving along with progress behind the scenes. Chairman Ostop asked what date times to get before the State looks like. Mr. Butkus responded that once they know the VE and HVAC system to be designed and the team gets back to construction documents,

they are looking at 3+ months or early July to complete CDs and then have the State meeting

b. Tecton Report

Mr. Hopkins reported in the packet is a presentation summarizing value management and HVAC options. He continued from the previous discussion the \$3.2 Million variance for design development and identified scope changes and escalation of about \$3 Million. He discussed value management items considered low hanging fruit that do not influence curriculum or school space. He noted add alternates not included in the DDR estimate to protect the budget number. He indicated they are looking at additional add alternates, e.g., seat walls/benches, storage shed, and loading dock gate, with seat walls/benches part of the original package. He indicated additional value management with the delta to revise beyond the current chill beam system to VRF and boiler system is an additional \$32K, and 1000 sq. ft. footprint reduction of \$255K; these are suboptimal with the footprint impacting the curriculum space. Mr. Derr asked if the stage size would be an add alternate. Mr. Hopkins responded that add alternates are items easily bifurcated from the overall bid and a reduction in footprint building envelope gets muddy and would be a decision made to reduce project scope. Mr. Derr asked if the BOE has weighed in; Mr. Casey responded they want to keep the 1000 sq. ft. Mr. Dragulski asked if proposed add alternates of about \$440K are included in the current budget; Mr. Hopkins confirmed they are part of the current budget and design development package at \$3.24 Million over budget. Mr. Dragulski asked if the established alternates are in the DDR; Mr. Hopkins confirmed they are not. Mr. Dragulski asked if in the DDR there is full geothermal; Mr. Hopkins responded there is partial geothermal wellfield with an add alternate. Mr. Dragulski asked in the partial geothermal if there are 34 wells; Mr. Hamel responded yes, and for the hybrid system the multi-stack with chilled hot water and air source heat pump; Chairman Ostop noted that was agreed upon. Mr. Dragulski asked in the base bid if there are no heat pumps for the DOAS; Mr. Hamel responded there are air source heat pumps and the base bid was the hybrid option and they accidentally switched to 100% geothermal as the base, but hybrid is the base with add alternate full geothermal. Mr. Dragulski asked with hybrid as the base geothermal was just for the multi stack and air source heat pumps for the DOAS; Mr. Hamel confirmed that. Mr. Dragulski continued that if we go to VRF, it adds \$54K. Mr. Hopkins suggested going through the 3 options to clarify.

Mr. Hamel continued the current hybrid system budget has 34 geothermal wells serving the multi stack heating/cooling units in the mechanical room and provides hot and chilled water to all building chill beams; the condenser water with the geothermal would just serve the multi stack and for all ventilation building areas for the DOAs and air handling units would just utilize air source heat pumps. He said the boilers in this base option would serve as backup units to keep generator size from 200 kw to 400 kw size.

Mr. Hamel said HVAC option A would entirely delete the geothermal system, eliminating multi stack units, utilize building boilers and air-cooled chiller outside for chilled water with divisions in the mechanical room allowing for future addition of multi stack with the chill beams. Mr. Hopkins added option A would deduct \$854,892 from the current design budget.

Mr. Hamel continued that option B would completely change the system with no geothermal and no chill beams to a completely VRF system, which would eliminate the air cool chillers and all chilled beams and replace all the chilled water with VRF (variable refrigerant flow) units in each room providing heat/cooling around the building through refrigerant piping and air source heat pumps on the roof; they would utilize the existing boilers and provide radiant heating ceiling panels around the occupied building; this would slightly reduce the mechanical room, but they would add plumbing equipment, fire protection, water heaters, etc. He said this option would deduct \$887K from the budget and the difference between options A and B is \$32K. He recommended staying with the chill beam system which allows carrying geothermal as a hybrid option in the future; the VRF option would make that very difficult and costly; the VRF system would require a fan in every room with noise while beam units have no fans and would run quieter. Chairman Ostop asked if BOE has looked at this; Mr. Casey confirmed it had and option A was preferred.

Mr. Egan commented for option B that it is one method, but does not maximize the system; there should be no reason for the hot water system which goes against the intent of switching to VRF and going to VRF will pick up a lot of time in the schedule, but this shows it at about the same cost as chill beam, but VRF should eliminate the whole hot water system. Mr. Hamel commented that the boiler system is already paid for, and compressors would be run at high rpms and burn out faster; VRF is more beneficial to an office building, but compressor technology

is not there for a school. Mr. Egan noted they did not want the boilers replaced for that reason and with VRF you don't need boilers and can eliminate natural gas as a fuel source. Mr. Roy asked if there is an operational cost difference between the 2 systems. Mr. Hamel responded with VRF units in every room and each with fans and filters to change will be more costly, while chill beams have no moving parts. Mr. Hopkins commented that not only does chill beam provide the option to connect to geothermal in the future, but maintenance is reduced; Mr. Hamel believed that was true. Mr. Dragulski agreed with Mr. Egan and expected option B to provide more savings not additional \$52K costs; Mr. Hamel said it is a reduction of \$32K. Mr. Hopkins noted it is a nominal improvement because they are putting in radiant heat. Mr. Dragulski commented they are not using the full boiler capacity. Mr. Burns asked why the school is less suited for VRF; Mr. Hamel responded it is a much bigger building and load on the compressors. Mr. Burns asked if the compressors could be upsized to share load; Mr. Hamel said you would be buying additional units. Mr. Burns asked if you oversized the system and wiped out the entire hot water system, it would benefit the budget; Mr. Hamel responded the boiler plant already exists to benefit the project with only piping added. Mr. Wyszynski asked about the cost of the perimeter radiation for VRF; it was about \$150K. Mr. Wyszynski asked about VRF vs. chill beam in the proposed phasing plan for the existing building; they did not see any great timeframe difference, but mainly doing away with geothermal is reduced constraint on the construction site by not putting wells in. Mr. Butkus noted the cost of the hot water radiant would be offset about \$150K and just relying on VRF for heating would increase the generator size at an additional \$90+K and also adding compressors is another cost to the \$150K delta. Chairman Ostop noted the project consultants provide the best option recommendation for the budget. Mr. Derr commented these are mini splits in each room and whether the technology has been proven for extreme cold winter weather and will they work at 10 below zero, which is actual recent experience in this area; even though mini splits have been improved with climate change a backup hot water system may be required to run the building. Mr. Hamel agreed that the capacity lost at lower temperatures de-rates the equipment a lot. Mr. Hopkins noted the effort to keep ceilings exposed and provided some images of both chill beam units in classrooms and VRF; Mr. Hamel noted with VRF the piping is back in the corridor and was not in favor of going with VRF. Mr. Dragulski asked if the project stays with chill beams, how much mechanical room is in the 2200 sq. ft. basement with 2 condensing boilers and a couple of pumps; Mr. Hamel responded there is room; Mr. Dragulski asked if the basement can accommodate the mechanical room, rather than the main floor

given the 1000 sq. ft. loss of space on the main floor. Mr. Wyszynski responded they will look into utilizing the basement space. Mr. Dragulski commented about 60-70 sq. ft. for fire protection and for water about 50 sq. ft.; Mr. Wyszynski confirmed they will investigate.

Mr. Hopkins continued with the proposed value management and the \$32K in the VRF system, it would bring the variance down to about \$1.1 Million and they still have about 5% design contingency; the members commented positively on that direction. Mr. Derr asked for option A or B as an add alternate for A how would the pricing work. Mr. Hopkins said they typically do not design 2 mechanical systems and A would be the base with the add alternate geothermal wellfield. Mr. Burns clarified that chill beam A as the base bid with geothermal wells as the add alternate connected at a later time or budget allowing. Mr. Derr understood the base is using the existing boilers and having a separate building chiller without mini split problems and added the 1000 sq. ft. should not be deleted as decided by the BOE, which changes the numbers by \$288K. Mr. Dragulski commented if they reduce the main floor mechanical room size, it will benefit the budget.

Mr. Hopkins concluded that at the last meeting they presented simultaneously at Zoning and are now through all regulatory agencies, except for fire and building officials. He noted Conservation Commission and Design Review Board are approved and they held their meeting with OSCGR on 3/22.

Mr. Derr asked for verification they are investigating the operating windows for each and every classroom; Mr. Wyszynski verified that for the minutes. Mr. Burns asked about moving from concrete to gravel areas; Mr. Hopkins believed they could massage the extent of pavement, including areas south and west of the building and they will review it with school staff. Mr. Burns was concerned about maintenance costs of gravel; Mr. Hopkins responded there is a budget effect with more impervious surface needing less underground stormwater storage chambers. Mr. Dragulski asked if there is enough flow to indicate no need for a fire pump; Mr. Hamel confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Wyszynski updated they are scanning existing stormwater and sanitary pipe conditions and will report back at the next meeting; Mr. Sedensky verified that it was both. Mr. Hopkins noted any economy would be in addition to today's numbers.

c. Tecton Proposal

Mr. Hopkins indicated economy in providing steel detailing of building superstructure as part of bid documents; bid by a steel detailer which are then included in shop drawings and bid documents; as previously discussed with PBC, providing all information by bid day reduces the time bid takes; Mr. Butkus confirmed previous success in getting a better price and potential lower costs than what contractors pay to get shop drawings done. Mr. Wyszynski clarified the \$42,500 would be for a consultant to Tecton; Mr. Butkus confirmed it would be a Tecton change order and added cost; Mr. Burns understood it is not reflected formally at this time; Mr. Butkus said it is spent today on the fee line and not tomorrow on the construction line and is a cost shift rather than a cost increase.

Mr. Burns made a motion to approve a change order allowing Tecton to subcontract with a steel detailing consultant at a proposed cost of \$42,500.00. Mr. Derr seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Burns asked about the direction for sending the cost differential to BOF. Chairman Ostop indicated a final BOE budget is needed before going to BOF. Mr. Casey indicated they are waiting for the State response regarding the \$1.3 Million difference and if they do not allow it, they have to demonstrate before going to bid that the \$1.3 Million is covered showing the Town has the credit at BOF and then when the bids come in look at actual pricing.

Mr. Derr made a motion that PBC provide the design team with a clear statement accepting their recommendations for proposed value management savings, including going with Option A. Specifically added would be the 6 proposed value management items between DDR and PCR totaling a change of \$1,438,648.00; 4 established alternates: partial to full geothermal wellfield, classroom flooring, increasing emergency generator, and add exterior canopies at entrances; 3 proposed add alternates that could be incorporated prior to VCR: revised exterior seat walls/benches, revised storage shed, and revised loading dock gate; and 2 additional value management items: revise HVAC to VRF boiler system is not being pursued; and reduce building footprint by 1000 sq. ft. is not being pursued. PBC expects the design team to pursue eliminating the first-floor mechanical room and use that additional space for the stage to save a potential additional \$250,000.00. Mr. Burns seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Burns asked if while waiting for the State response, is there something to be done to show the Town's credit; Mr. Casey indicated the previous motion takes care of that.

d. Arcadis Invoice #34289371

Mr. Egan made a motion to approve payment of Arcadis March Invoice #34289371 in the amount of \$13,750.00. Mr. Dragulski seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

e. Tecton Invoice #44907

Mr. Egan made a motion to approve payment of Tecton Invoice #44907 dated 3/31/22 in the amount of \$103,245.00. Mr. Burns seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

f. O&G Invoice # 548173

Mr. Burns made a motion to approve payment of O&G Invoice #548173 for preconstruction services for January through March in the amount of \$58,071.00. Mr. Derr seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. Other

5. Old Business

None.

6. New Business

Mr. Hopkins believed there was considerable work to do preparing for the next meeting in May, and then for May to June to have 2 meetings a month.

Chairman Ostop made a motion confirming the next meeting will be May 2nd at 7 p.m. via Zoom. Mr. Derr seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Burns commented for the budget and given the extended schedule and service from the design and construction team, that when there are revised documents, that the committee see them as soon as possible.

7. Adjourn

Mr. Derr made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:01 p.m. Mr. Dragulski seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Prifti

Commission Clerk