**PUBLIC BUILDING COMMITTEE**

Special Meeting Minutes

July 11, 2022

*Subject to Approval*

Chairman Ostop called the Regular Meeting of the Public Building Committee to order at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, July 11, 2022, via Zoom.

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

Guests – Tom Roy, Simsbury Town Engineer; for Simsbury Public Schools – Andy O’Brien, Jason Casey, and Neil Sullivan, Assistant Superintendent; for Tecton - Jeffrey Wyszynski, Justin Hopkins; for Arcadis – Jack Butkus, Senior Program Manager, for O&G – David Cravanzola; and for CES -Brian Hamel

No public audience comments.

1. **Minutes of the June 27, 2022, Special Meeting**

***Mr. Dragulski made a motion to approve the June 27, 2022, Special Meeting Minutes, as written. Mr. Egan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

1. **Latimer Lane Renovation**
   1. Arcadis Report

Mr. Butkus reported good progress in June and confirmation the grant was issued and the priority list, but the State is running behind on issuing the actual grant commitment letter. He recalled in June the BOF gave the green light on up to an additional $1.3 Million with the caveat of going back to referendum to spend it; when this fact was presented to OSCGR they responded there is nothing they will do until everything is done reinforcing going out to bid to come up with a true number; and therefore, the State will not do an interim step and will wait for a formal request with a final confirmed number. He continued that value management efforts and bid alternates are being incorporated into the final set, pencils down from Tecton was last week and the estimates are the next step in the process. He noted professional services agreements for additional preconstruction services for O&G and Arcadis and additional 6 months construction duration for Tecton and Arcadis were provided for study in the June 27th special meeting but were not an action item and may be discussed tonight. He continued at the special meeting the procurement phase 100% documents were approved and meeting the schedule; TRC has provided the Phase 2 site analysis report, noting asphalt mixed in samples caused the finding of hydrocarbons but nothing requiring a Phase 3 remediation with Phase 2 incorporated as an information item in bid documents so the site contractor will know what they will encounter and possibly use it under parking areas and not incur the cost of removal offsite, or if taken offsite they will know what they are dealing with. He noted the June 29th plan review meeting for the procurement phase was held and they are waiting for the State letter and expect it early this week in order to go out to bid. He said the commissioning 50% review was issued to the design team for incorporation of those comments into the 100% followed by commissioning agent review of the 100% drawings to assure those comments were picked up. He said the other facts/facets can be studied as O&G and Tecton provide their reports. Chairman Ostop preferred to review the 3 proposals for Arcadis, Tecton, and O&G following the reports.

b, Tecton Report

Mr. Hopkins noted Mr. Hamel of CES was also present as part of the design team. He reported for the early procurement Phase 1 of 3, they had a meeting June 29th with OSCGR and Mr. Selmar asked for some items to be updated which they delivered on July 5th with a meeting that afternoon where Mr. Selmar appeared satisfied and indicated he would put the approval letter to bid in the queue and they are awaiting receipt of that letter. He continued the construction documents were complete at end/day Friday and have gone to the cost estimators at O&G as well as their PAX cost estimator and will also be used to obtain approval/signature from local authorities, e.g. building official, fire marshal, and health department; and contemporaneously as part of PCR approval, their signatures are needed for the drawings and project manual. He said they have also issued their REVIT model to O&G so they can begin 3rd party review clash analysis and developing bid packages, which are necessary as part of PCR coordination to list allowances, contingencies, and cost estimates in narrative to the State. He noted as part of Tecton and CES review, comments from Messrs. Dragulski and Egan were incorporated into construction documents.

1. O&G Report

Mr. Cravanzola reported the construction documents are printed and inhouse and they intend to have estimates done by July 25th when they will begin reconciliation with Tecton’s estimator in order to be ready for the meeting the following week. He noted their Superintendent Matt Olashefsky spent time last week with Mr. Luzietti re logistics and will have an onsite review with TRC now that they have the hazmat information to see how they dovetail with work on the existing school.

Chairman Ostop asked Mr. Butkus to go over the additional proposals for the 3 firms.

1. Arcadis Additional Services Request

Mr. Butkus began with Arcadis proposal using monthly costs noting their 6-month preconstruction effort ran to the end of March, and they are asking for April, May, and June as additional pre-construction phase at their standard flat rate of $13,750/month totaling $41,250; and for construction phase services, extending the negotiated contract lump sum for 18 months to 24 months at the flat rate of $12,318/month totaling $73,908 for an aggregate cost of $115,158.

***Mr. Salvatore made a motion to approve extending Arcadis pre-construction phase services at a rate of $13,750.00 per month for 3 months. Mr. Egan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

***Mr. Salvatore made a motion to approve extending Arcadis construction phase services at a rate of $12,318.00 per month for 6 months. Mr. Burns seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

1. Tecton Additional Services Request

Mr. Butkus noted Tecton’s request for construction phase services to increase from 18 to 24 months at a negotiated rate of $21,846/month totaling $131,076 for 6 months. Mr. Salvatore asked what is included. Mr. Butkus indicated it includes evaluations of work with field visits, monthly requisitions/submittals, reviewing change orders and carrying through to project completion. Mr. Hopkins added it is the total project team associated with Tecton, including: civil engineering, landscape, architect, structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and fire protection.

***Mr. Egan made a motion to accept the fee proposal for 6-months additional services from Tecton totaling $131,076.00. Mr. Salvatore seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

1. O&G Additional Services Request

Mr. Butkus indicated O&G’s proposal is for extended pre-construction services. Mr. Cravanzola discussed their proposal matrix breakout showing the updated schedule trajectory and proposed schedule providing the net difference, which is mainly added cost for himself as project executive and the pre-construction manager’s added time totaling $110,758.25 bringing the project through establishment of GMP in November of 2022 because the duration of construction for O&G remains 24 months. He indicated pre-construction is aggregated and billed at X dollars per month; he can provide for the months going forward a schedule of billings or take the revised balance and provide equal monthly billings; Mr. Butkus suggested the latter and it was agreed to eliminate the 25 cents. Mr. Salvatore asked what was the original pe-construction lump sum number; Mr. Cravanzola responded for 7 months it was $175,500 and included a $40K allowance, so $135,500 pre-con services; and 5 months would be added. Mr. Egan asked why some companies are adding 3 months and other 5 months. Mr. Butkus responded from Arcadis perspective, they were not technically contracted for bid phase services, but need to be here and agreed to go with the fees for pre-con until construction started with no additional billings, except for the additional 3 pre-con months; assuming July, August, September for bidding/evaluation of awards and will be mobilizing in November and transitioning field staff in, which is factored into their approach so you do not see additional months; and Tecton owned the design and bid phase so the only variation in Tecton’s proposal is the construction phase.

***Mr. Salvatore made a motion to accept the fee proposal for an additional 5 months of pre-construction services from O&G totaling $110,758.00 to be divided into equal monthly billings. Mr. Burns seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

1. Tecton Invoice #45238

***Mr. Salvatore made a motion to approve Tecton Invoice #45238 in the amount of $139,568.00. Mr. Burns seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

1. O&G Invoice #571716

***Mr. Egan made a motion to approve O&G Invoice #571716 dated 6/27/22 in the amount of $19,357.00. Mr. Burns seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

1. **Discussion**

Mr. Butkus noted the estimators are at work with a reconciliation meeting planned for 7/27 and it might be tight as they need to come back to PBC and BOE for permission to go to the State. He indicated it might be necessary to shift the August meeting to a later date. Mr. Egan requested having a week to review the 100% CDs and reconciled estimate before meeting. Mr. Butkus was concerned whether the 2nd or 3rd week works for a PBC quorum; Mr. Burns is not available the 2nd week; and Mr. Cravanzola is not available the 2nd week but Mr. Sedensky will attend. Mr. Butkus believed the 100% documents are now available and Mr. Hopkins will provide them; Mr. Butkus believed there are at least 2 weeks for O&G to produce the estimate and then reconciliation begins providing members 2 weeks at least for review.

Mr. Burns asked about the schedule for contractors to hold open bids; Mr. Butkus said if it was 9/1, how long would it take to hold the referendum is unknown. Mr. Burns added we cannot get the numbers until we know how long the bids are held open. Mr. Cravanzola thought the critical contracts would be moved along within the estimate realm so work can commence while the referendum is conducted. Mr. Burns indicated that is fine if the State agrees but if not authorized for FF&E, the Town will have an empty building. Mr. Cravanzola responded that following PCR the State will have to give approval to go to bid and typically that is bid and award unless there is an outlier of information where the State agrees to allow bidding while the necessary information is obtained, but O&G wants the work to begin this year with contracts issued for concrete, steel, MEP; they currently have been holding bids for 30-45 days and for critical contract bids would hold to that time, but for non-critical items the time to hold could vary, but they need to know the referendum timing to determine the correct basis and for special meetings to be held. Mr. Burns asked for the packages to go out who owns the referendum piece. Mr. Salvatore believed there would be early bid packages out and asked what is their schedule and also for base packages. Mr. Cravanzola indicated that the early procurement packages relate to the PCR and they are waiting for response from the State to bid which would likely be a 2-3 week period. Mr. Salvatore believed that would be 8/15 for the first packages and asked if the 2nd bid packages would come in mid-September. Mr. Butkus said Mr. Selmar is sending his August schedule with plan review in August and if out to bid September 1st, there would be a 3-week bid period and scope reviews to come back to PBC with a number. Mr. Salvatore believed bids would come in mid-August and held until November 1st. Mr. Butkus responded that early group of contracts is about $1.5 Million with the intent to issue the contracts as soon as they come in, then they go out with the full renovation large scope contracts, compute the projection and provide it to the BOF to start the clock moving. Mr. Salvatore commented it would likely go to referendum in early December; Chairman Ostop said they could instead instruct going ahead. Mr. Egan noted O&G having early bid package terms of 60 days and the project could have round 2 before awarding round 1. Mr. Cravanzola responded if the project waits 60 days that would hold up the work on those long lead items and will not benefit the early packages. Members discussed when the contracts would likely be awarded. Mr. Cravanzola added they are primarily material, except for the labor-intensive roofing package.

Mr. Burns asked who is responsible for timing of the referendum package. Chairman Ostop and Mr. Roy confirmed it would go through the BOE who goes to the BOF who goes to the BOS and pressure can be applied to begin moving once the numbers are known and the BOE can push even harder. Mr. Salvatore believed the balance of contracts would be awarded in late December at the earliest. Mr. Burns asked if there would be shovels in the ground this year; Mr. Salvatore responded that depends if the site contract is awarded; Mr. Egan indicated it would be awarded mid to late October in Phase 3. Mr. Casey asked if the BOE has to ask the BOS to take this up or can PBC make that request; Mr. Roy believed the request can be made directly and will put together a schedule aiming for the November vote and make sure the parallel paths come together and get back to the Committee on what information is needed and when. Mr. Salvatore suggested putting together a schedule of dates at the next meeting. Mr. Burns recalled this could not get on the November ballot and Mr. Butkus confirmed that; Mr. Roy will get confirmation of that; Mr. Burns confirmed it would not likely be on the ballot as referendums are not part of an election, but they could hold a simultaneous referendum ballot that day; Mr. Butkus will work with Mr. Roy to confirm that; Mr. Roy will work on the bid packages requiring action relative to the referendum; Mr. Burns wanted to assure having all of the bid package numbers for the referendum, including for geothermal; Mr. Cravanzola said geothermal is included and identified as a bid alternate.

Mr. Dragulski discussed the services and that there would not be more additional services; Mr. Cravanzola confirmed that, unless something unusual extends the project; Mr. Dragulski was concerned about having funding to award contract bids; Mr. Cravanzola commented if PBC prior to passing the referendum could award contracts up to $15-20 Million in Phase 2 the trajectory can be maintained, unless it is not possible; Chairman Ostop believed it is possible, but beyond that items would be added to the package. Mr. Salvatore asked if BOF has agreed contracts can be awarded prior to the referendum; Chairman Ostop indicated there is funding approved; Mr. Dragulski noted that not all funding is approved and the members believed it must be clarified; Mr. Cravanzola indicated then the referendum would have to be first and the bids cannot be taken; Mr. Egan asked if the State didn’t require going the other way and Mr. Butkus indicated the State incremental grant support will not be revised until the bids are in hand and gave the example of another municipality going ahead with a project apportioning cash to the construction line, then got approval for the increment and have now gone to the State, and Simsbury is authorized to spend up to the current referendum value and if the amount over budget is proportional with costs for line items shifted now and the budget backfilled via the 2nd referendum with the early release of contracts a much smaller percentage and with the referendum results known, possibly on election day, is the best case scenario. Mr. Cravanzola noted it is not a small amount of the project that would have to be released before the referendum to keep the project on a 24-month track. Mr. Egan understood that the BOF wrote a letter to the State with terms; Mr. Butkus indicated the letter showed the ability to pay but the State wants the real number in hand and the Town’s letter is not invalidated but Bond Counsel at a BOS meeting noted the referendum passed allows for spending only that amount until the 2nd referendum goes through. Mr. Egan asked if BOS or BOF is okay with starting the project in that event if that does not guarantee a completed project and advise PBC. Mr. Roy explained 1) the referendum was for the maximum value to be spent for the project before going back to referendum; and 2) he believed projects can be bid but not awarded prior to approval of the 2nd referendum, if it is necessary. Chairman Ostop agreed that has to be determined and asked Mr. Roy to find out from the Town Attorney and that it be a high priority. Mr. Burns commented that the escalation costs just approved would be going up further. Chairman Ostop reviewed that Mr. Roy will investigate.

Mr. Cravanzola noted the estimate will be not available for review until 7/27 and members discussed moving the regular meeting to August 8th. Mr. Egan confirmed the time for review is adequate.

1. **Meeting Date**

***Mr. Dragulski made a motion to hold the next PBC regular meeting on Monday, August 8th at 7 p.m. via Zoom, but can be changed if needed. Mr. Salvatore seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

Mr. Burns is not available on that date.

1. **Adjourn**

***Chairman Ostop made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:57 p.m.***

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Prifti

Commission Clerk