

## **PUBLIC BUILDING COMMITTEE**

### **Regular Meeting Minutes**

**July 2, 2018**

*Subject to Approval*

Chairman Ostop called the Regular Meeting of the Public Building Committee to order at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, July 2, 2018 in the Board of Education Conference Room at 933 Hopmeadow Street, Simsbury, CT.

Present – Chairman Ostop, Messrs. Cortes, Salvatore, Kelly; and Walter; and at 7:05 p.m. Mrs. Beal joined the meeting.

Excused – Messrs. Dragulski and Derr

Guests – Messrs. LaClair and Shea

#### **1. Minutes – June 4, 2018 Meeting**

*Mr. Salvatore moved to accept the June 4, 2018 Minutes, as written. Mr. Kelly seconded the motion. The motion was passed with 4 in favor and Mr. Walter abstaining.*

#### **2. Board of Selectmen Liaison Report – Cheryl Cook**

Ms. Cook was not present and the report was held.

#### **3. Henry James Memorial School Project – Phase III**

- a. Architect's Fee and Scope of Work (not included in this packet to be distributed separately)
- c. Construction Manager at Risk Draft RFQ/RFP

Mr. LaClair reviewed that last week the packet was emailed to the Committee and tonight he handed out the Kaestle Boos revised Scope of Work and fee for PBC review. He provided his

and Mr. Shea's comments mainly about what is included with the fee and noting suggested exclusions from the traditional Scope of Work as shown from the bottom of page 1 to the top of page 2 in the 6/28/18 letter from Kaestle Boos detailing their Scope; the last 3 items would be hired separately for special inspections, testing, and hazardous material, which is customarily done. He indicated the fee breakout includes the \$957,500 base fee; allowances for the previous items mentioned; reimbursables, e.g. printing, mailings, application fees; and cost estimating for \$18K on page 6 because the Construction Manager at Risk Scope asks for multiple cost estimates so it was recommended in order to compare and insure there is enough for the professional cost estimator that Kaestle uses throughout that one phase. Mr. LaClair noted comments are focused on those 2 sections. He provided a copy of the submitted State grant form estimate of \$23,965,620 which could be modified. Chairman Ostop asked if a revised budget will be prepared where the \$950K includes \$957,500 and asked where the differences are. Mr. LaClair responded that the reimbursables of \$60K are similar to the \$70K allowance, with their fee a little higher than \$957,500. Chairman Ostop noted the contract would be for \$957,500 and \$70K, but looking at \$950K vs. \$957,500 where will the difference come from. Mr. LaClair responded it would be from soft costs and the State has asked for more detail and different grouping and the State cost worksheets do not directly correlate. Chairman Ostop indicated the \$70K would have to be approved by PBC tonight. Mr. LaClair did not believe PBC has formally approved the fee and now that there is more clarity he requested approval.

***Mr. Cortes moved to accept Kaestle Boos Associates, Inc.'s 6/28/18 proposal of \$957,500.00 as a base with an additional allowance of \$70,000.00. Mr. Walter seconded the motion.***

Chairman Ostop noted confusion regarding \$957K with the State vs. \$957,500.

***The motion was passed unanimously.***

Regarding whether the project includes the TV station in the new auditorium addition, Mr. LaClair clarified it was never in the budget.

Mr. LaClair continued that the AIA document will go to the Town Attorney with the Town Manager signing it.

#### **b. Construction Manager Selection Timeline**

Mr. LaClair noted the 6/28/18 Timeline for the combined RFQ/RFP process was provided in the meeting packet. Chairman Ostop commented the Timeline runs from June 18<sup>th</sup> to September 12<sup>th</sup> with the plan to discuss advertising today and to receive CM qualification responses by August 1<sup>st</sup> with review completed by August 13<sup>th</sup> – as the regular meeting is scheduled for August 6<sup>th</sup> he asked that under 7. New Business, members think about changing it to an August 13<sup>th</sup> Special

Meeting in order to shortlist the CMs; on August 14<sup>th</sup> the shortlisted firms are notified; a walkthrough on August 20<sup>th</sup>; shortlist interviews conducted at the September 5<sup>th</sup> meeting and selection made; on September 6<sup>th</sup> the selected CM would be recommended to the Town Manager; and the CM contract set up by September 13<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Salvatore will not be available on September 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. LaClair introduced Kurt Lavaway of Colliers who worked with him and Mr. Shea to present to PBC this template, which is similar to other schools Colliers has worked with and modified AIA documents provided to the Town Attorney for review and expected to be shortly finalized and included in the RFQ package. Chairman Ostop requested that first the RFQ ad should be decided on; Mr. LaClair noted it was not in the package. Mr. Lavaway indicated the Timeline is condensed for a combined RFQ/RFP. Chairman Ostop noted the importance of what is stated on the cover sheet and discussed PBC's decision process; Mr. LaClair believed he understood PBC's concerns. Next Chairman Ostop looked at the draft Request for Statement of Qualification and Proposal for Construction Manager at Risk reviewing the Table of Contents and discussing how detailed the fee proposal should be. Mr. Lavaway responded that the CMs will provide their qualifications, a written project proposal for PBC evaluation, and a fee proposal in a separate envelope; following PBC review and scoring, Colliers can plug in the fee to their leveling sheet to enable PBC's decision. Mr. LaClair clarified that questions from CMs would come to the PBC through Mr. LaClair, not Colliers, but between meetings they assist in answering logistics questions, not decisions that PBC makes.

Mr. Lavaway noted that State statute does not require selecting the lowest fee, but rather the most qualified CM; the scoring allows PBC to have data to back up its decision in the event questions arise during the public audit reimbursement process. He noted that, as PBC discussed, following review of potentially 15 responses to the ad, by Statute PBC is then required to select no more than 4 to interview. Chairman Ostop noted that it depends on the number of initial responses received to the ad, as the time can be extended if needed; therefore, PBC would like to get the ad out soon. Colliers will have a streamlined process in place to move things along. Mr. Cortes noted he will be at a conference in Boston on August 13<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Lavaway said ideally the RFQ/RFP responses would be received on August 1<sup>st</sup> with copies available for review on the Town website on August 2<sup>nd</sup>. Mr. LaClair asked for Timeline clarification as to whether the walkthrough the week of July 20th should take place before proposals are submitted, and if they can get it out before July 16<sup>th</sup>, it would expedite that; the Committee agreed with further discussion of dates under New Business.

Mr. Lavaway handed out a sample rating sheet for an RFQ with all the criteria in 2 pages and the scoring system listing firms on the left and total score for each on the right, which are then ranked. A second sample document showed the proposals with the fees to be ranked and provided to PBC on decision day showing the 4 shortlisted firms. Mr. Lavaway indicated this comprehensively aligns with Connecticut's requirements and suggested the Rocky Hill Chairman is willing to discuss their recent process experience. He suggested considering discussion of fees

in Executive Session. Mr. Lavaway offered that scoring from 0 to 30 can be changed if PBC wishes and suggested keeping the total of 100. The Committee discussed the importance/ranking of criteria deciding on: 1) past performance 30; 2) key personnel 30; 3) team experience in CT 15; 4) experience with projects of similar size 10; 5) current workload 5; 6) proximity to the project 5; and 7) litigation history 5. Mr. Lavaway asked for PBC's criteria for the RFP and suggested PBC would want to hear from the CMs regarding their thoughts on budget feasibility/timing in the selection process with the first criteria at 30 and then 20, 20, 10, 10, 10. Mr. Salvatore asked for clarification on a CM at Risk where what they control is the scope but not the budget. Mr. Lavaway responded they need approval to adjust the scope with every decision made by PBC before the RFQ/RFP is put on the street. He continued that PBC receives a GMP (Guaranteed Maximum Price) which compiles general conditions and markups in their proposals and trade costs, except for several clarification/inclusion sheets for what they do/do not have in their bid – what they do not have in the bid is PBC's risk; CMs will put in allowances to be reviewed along the way for items not in the documents. The way Colliers manages projects is to identify during design phases the alternates and their prices that may potentially fit in. Chairman Ostop indicated the key issue is the final number; Mr. Lavaway responded a lot of language has been added to maintain control. Mr. Lavaway clarified that PBC makes the final CM selection, and the project budget total is \$23.9 Million and the CM construction piece is \$16.8 Million, which would be in there. Chairman Ostop asked whether the \$23.9 Million needs to be in or just the total construction budget of \$16.8 Million under C. Project Schedule in the Requests for Qualifications and Proposal document. Mr. Lavaway indicated the number filed with the State includes construction costs for the auditorium of \$16.8 Million (14.2 Million and about \$2.4 Million) and the remainder soft costs. The Committee did not see the need to put in the total project budget amount, but rather only the construction budget; Mr. Lavaway said that typically CMs will ask what the total project budget is and the Committee said to wait until they ask. Mr. Lavaway noted on Schedule 2 they picked from C. under Eligible Costs - Construction (fully eligible) and under Limited Eligible Costs – Eligible Auditorium Seating Area and the amount under Ineligible Costs, which are all on PBC, add up to \$16.8 Million; usually the construction portion ranges from 25-33% of the project total and this project is around a comfortable 30% and is what is filed with the State. Chairman Ostop confirmed the Committee's decision that Mr. Lavaway use the \$16.8 Million amount and to keep track of who asks.

***Mr. Kelly made a motion to move forward with this form. Mr. Walter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

Mr. Lavaway confirmed he would update the scoring sheet which will be provided to PBC when the proposals are evaluated with the forms filled in by hand, scanned, and provided to him in preparation for review on the 14<sup>th</sup>.

Chairman Ostop noted that the SCTV project remains open on the Agenda.

**4. Simsbury Farms Pool improvements – Phase 2**

a. Monthly Cost Control Report

Mr. Shea confirmed the budget is down to a small contingency of about \$7K and \$20K for bonds that have not yet been sold. Chairman Ostop noted a remaining budget of about \$53K which has not been expended yet. Mr. Shea believed this work would be closed out by the September meeting.

b. Pay Application #10 – Construction Services of New England, Inc.

Mr. Shea reported the draft payment request in the package is being pulled back pending receipt of a revised request from the contractor.

**5. Eno Memorial Hall Renovations**

a. Monthly Cost Control Report

Mr. Shea reported that construction began today.

b. Valley Electric Invoice 2018-3063

Mr. Shea noted this work was done in advance of construction to move freezers so they are not in the way and remain in operation.

***Mr. Salvatore made a motion to approve payment to Valley Electric for Invoice 2018-3063 in the amount of \$409.00. Mr. Cortes seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

c. Mystic Air Quality Consultants, Inc. Invoice #48610

Mr. Shea indicated this work was for lead paint testing on additional kitchen cabinets and is within the authorized \$1600 budget.

***Mr. Cortes made a motion to approve payment to Mystic Air Quality Consultants, Inc. dated 6/21/2018 for Invoice #48610 in the amount of \$300.00. Mrs. Beal seconded the motion.***

Mr. Shea confirmed this would be the final payment to Mystic and Staff are in the process of obtaining prices for lead encapsulation from other companies, including NOSAL, as lead paint removal was eliminated from the budget.

***The motion passed unanimously.***

Mr. Shea added they are in the process of repackaging to rebid for the acoustical sound panels and should have a report for the Committee at the September meeting; they will call bidders and welcomed any names from PBC.

## **6. Old Business**

Chairman Ostop confirmed that as the Committee requested, a letter was sent by Mr. LaClair to the Board of Finance that \$165,927 may be coming back.

## **7. New Business**

***Mr. Walter made a motion to cancel the Regular Meeting on 8/6/18 and to hold a Special Meeting on 8/13/18. Mr. Salvatore seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

Mr. Shea confirmed he would notify the Town Clerk of the change.

Chairman Ostop noted the Henry James renovation project walkthrough would be changed to the week of July 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Mr. LaClair reviewed the tentative interview dates for end-September and the Committee decided not to make a change at this time. Mr. Cortes will be out of town 9/12, 13 and 14.

**10.    Adjourn**

*Mr. Kelly made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:18 p.m. Mr. Salvatore seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.*

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Prifti

Commission Clerk