

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMITTEE
Regular Meeting Minutes
March 7, 2022
Subject to Approval

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

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

Excused – Mr. Kelly

Guests – For Simsbury Public Schools – Andy O’Brien, Jason Casey, and Latimer Lane Principal Michael Luzietti; for Jacunski Humes – Al Jacunski; for Tecton - Jeffrey Wyszynski, Justin Hopkins, Alison Frost, and Sean Hayes; for Arcadis – Jack Butkus, Business Development Manager, and for O&G – David Cravanzola and Mark Sedensky; and for CES -Brian Hamel

No public audience comments.

1. Minutes of the February 7, 2022, Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Salvatore made a motion to approve the February 7, 2022, Regular Meeting Minutes, as written. Mr. Dragulski seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

2. Board of Selectmen Liaison Report

Mr. Wellman noted an email regarding Tom Roy, Director of Public Works and the last BOS meeting reorganizing Public Works moving the Engineering Department to the Public Works Division and with the retirement of Jeff Shea the

plan to hire a Deputy Town Engineer reporting to Tom Roy. The Committee looks forward to working with Mr. Roy. Chairman Ostop noted Mr. Roy had another meeting to attend tonight and will be very involved with PBC and is very active and interesting and will provide a lot of knowledge and input.

3. SHS Re-roofing Project

Mr. Jacunski updated that: Greenwood Pay Application #8 below is for fans purchased and delivered to the subcontractor. He said installation of the fans and OSHA railings is scheduled for the week of April 11, weather permitting. He continued there is one more change order for \$22,994.89 less a credit of \$11,310 for unused allowances resulting in a last change order of \$11,684.89, which he will prepare for the next meeting. He said that is it on the balance and for the \$2,591,985 there is still a \$487,877 balance left. He will verify that all punch list items are done and hopes the project will be complete for the April/May meeting timeframe.

- a. Greenwood Pay Application #8

Mr. Egan made a motion to approve payment of Greenwood Pay Application #8 in the amount of \$25,544.50 for work completed. Mr. Dragulski seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

4. Latimer Lane Renovation

Chairman Ostop noted the 1/23 letter covering everything from the UKS attorney is now part of the record and Minutes package.

Mr. Burns, at the Committee's request, drafted a letter provided to members with a section removed on advice of counsel. Chairman Ostop requested Mr. Burns provide a copy of the letter to the clerk for the Minutes record.

Chairman Ostop made a motion that Mr. Burns draft letter, as revised, become part of the Minutes record. Mr. Salvatore seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously.

a. Arcadis Monthly Report

Mr. Butkus reviewed highlights of Arcadis Monthly Report: the TRC Environmental team are active onsite and beginning their investigation; there is currently no movement from the State, the project is still on the Priority List to go to the Legislature in May.

Chairman Ostop asked if Mr. Butkus had any proposals given what is going on with school projects. Mr. Butkus responded the process is much more thorough than the last 5 years with in depth discussion and Tecton did a great job with the application there are no issues regarding eligibility.

Mr. Casey advised that live streaming of this meeting did not start and he was reinitiating.

Mr. Butkus continued with the Monthly Report highlights: the CMs contract is still being negotiated with the Attorney and he was drawn into a meeting with the Deputy Town Manager, Attorney, and Director of Public Works last week and he is presenting some language to O&G for incorporation into the contract and there are some changes regarding insurance requirements, which he will look at in more detail; for professional services, the design team is discussing the potential of having the detailing of the steel or shop drawings done as part of the bid set – they have had very good results in previous projects and discussions with the structural engineer of record indicate they have also had good results and given extended market lead times currently, it allows 1) bidders to be more exact in what they are bidding on because everything is detailed already, and 2) it expedites the shop drawing approval process, which is 98% done, when going out to bid and it expedites steel arrival onsite. He said the detailing consultant would work through Tecton, but the proposal was not received in time to be part of the meeting packet, but they have found it to be of great benefit and what the detailer was paid vs. the steel contractor charge, in addition to tighter bids, turned out to be cheaper through the consultant. Mr. Salvatore asked who verifies field measures. Mr. Butkus responded there may be some critical field points to be verified; Mr. Egan agreed there can be a difference from shop drawings with a need to verify but not to double cover. Mr. Cravanzola explained the detailing is done to the point where the last bit of engineering of the connections are done by the trades, the contractor is typically a bolt up shop or weld up shop where details are final tweaked, but on past projects for pre-detailing even with the tighter schedule, they make sure the steel is there by the time foundations are done.

Mr. Butkus continued the 90-day schedule requires a broader discussion of what is happening in the market and design progress and conversations with the school,

but basically design development is concluded and the documents have gone to both the Tecton estimator and O&G estimator for pricing, and reconciling those numbers is relatively close so they can start with follow up MEP meetings this week. He said that even though the estimates are close to each other, they are not as close to the budget as they would like and analyses are being done by both estimators. He talked with Mr. Cravanzola today and got O&G's perspective of where the dollars are and a summary from Tecton's estimator regarding what has happened in the construction market and to the project direction since submittal of the grant application, with a very big piece what is happening in the construction market given the escalation of prices, especially piping, wire, and mechanical equipment, and a scope creep element of what the Clean Energy Task Force is recommending of things not initially budgeted into the project at grant application time with a spread in costs on the MEP side. Chairman Ostop asked if the MEP requirements are required. Mr. Butkus responded it is the direction the Committee would like to go in based on the Clean Energy Task Force and whether the project makes the building closer to net zero ready or to go to a more conventional MEP system and bring the dollars back out. He did not know if they would have a suggestion to absorb all of the value engineering costs to compensate for what is happening in the market – a certain number of classrooms are needed and O&G is actively creating a list of items for savings to consider.

Chairman Ostop noted it should be known quickly if the project is going over budget to go back to the BOE and BOF to request additional funding in order to pay O&G, etc. as that is a budget that must be lived with from start to finish: Mr. Wellman was in agreement. Mr. Butkus indicated that given the technical discussions and that information needs to be presented to the Committee for timely action, they requested going to 2 meetings per month beginning in March. Chairman Ostop agreed to discuss that further.

Mr. Dragulski asked about the delta. Mr. Butkus responded for the HVAC system cost system increase based on scope increase with earthwork for geothermal wells and markup comes in at just over \$2.5 Million as the delta. Mr. Cravanzola added they continue to revise it through reconciliation, but today the overall system is \$7.3 Million over. Mr. Dragulski commented that is 20%. Mr. Salvatore asked what the number is for construction costs. Mr. Cravanzola indicated that includes proposed GMP value with contingencies and would be \$38 Million even and the budget is \$30,700,000, but it is not 100% reconciled yet. Mr. Salvatore asked about the amount of contingency included based on the current inflation rate. Mr. Cravanzola responded they are still showing 6.5%/year and at the start of bid date it was 2.17% and all the trade costs absorb escalation to date or include premiums to date. Mr. Butkus added there is still design development to full CDs

contingency of 6% on top of the 2.17% escalation number with some expectation of growth factored in. Chairman Ostrop asked if they would have more solid numbers by the 3/21 meeting and asked that they provide members with the actual budget numbers before the meeting. Mr. Egan asked further about the 2 drivers of inflation and scope creep being driven by the Clean Energy Task Force. Mr. Butkus said that scope creep is the largest line item. Mr. Egan recalled this was always intended to be a net zero building and the only delta not budgeted in was PV. Mr. Butkus asked the design team to respond.

Mr. Wyszynski indicated at the time of grant application, zero was in the budget for the Clean Energy Task Force as they had not yet met with them and there was therefore no referendum adjustment, but they came back and presented geothermal options, which Mr. Hamel can add detail to, but he believed a hybrid geothermal system was presented and put into the DD documents as an entire geothermal system where reconciliation needs to be looked at. Mr. Wyszynski added they did not contemplate in the budget anything proposed by the Clean Energy Task Force, but they were trying to come up with a system for a greener building, e.g. the hybrid geothermal system, but they still need to have a meeting regarding mechanical systems to understand why that is \$2.3 Million. Mr. Hamel added there are 2 base system designs, one for 100% geothermal if funding is available, a hybrid geothermal system, and the backup base system of chiller, condensing coils if prices are out of control and they can always react to design control. Mr. Butkus noted that one element of scope increase is that at present the design looks at the roofing system on the building and the finding that features of the existing roof, even though not that old, do not meet existing building code requirements for insulation. He said on average the roof is well insulated, but the roof was replaced when the State required ½ inch per/foot per slope, and if they could pursue a code mod that this is a good roof that doesn't need to be cut up and still has life in it and get the warranty holder to show them a plan for how to enhance what is there to extend/renew the warranty for 20 years at job completion, that is an element worth \$1 Million. Mr. Burns wanted to understand the significance of going for a net zero building and having non-code compliant roof insulation and being able to put PV on an antiquated roof later. Mr. Butkus was looking at what could be done to the roof and renew the 20-year warranty. Mr. Cravanzola noted that insulation was 17 ½ inches at the perimeter and ½ inch at the drains. Mr. Burns said that is less good and there is a reason averaging is not allowed, but before proceeding on this path he would like to know the consequences. Mr. Butkus agreed and noted the code was written and then modified to conform to the ½ inch slope at the drains, but because of what CT did by statute at the time you have excessive insulation everywhere but the drains, and they need to do the analysis on average to see if it is

good or better than what they would build today, and before that conversation find out if they can get the warranty extended for 20 years – without that, all bets are off. He said if they are successful on both with the net relative insulation and warranty or doing a roof installation and topcoat on what is there and getting a 20-year warranty on the topcoat, that could save about \$1 Million. Mr. Egan asked if the current budget includes the roof duct passage system and fewer numbers of ERVs. Mr. Butkus confirmed that none of the budget overage applies to pipes and ducts for ERVs. Mr. Egan asked what the wells are worth. Mr. Cravanzola believed it was about \$500K and Mr. Butkus believed it was about \$800K for ½ well fields and further discussion is required.

Mr. Dragulski noted there are several million dollars short and that will not be made up by HVAC. Mr. Butkus indicated that in the next 2 weeks discussions and reconciliation will be very important. Mr. Dragulski commented it would be major surgery. Mr. Egan wanted to assure specific understanding of the drivers. Chairman Ostop indicated that would be possible with a more detailed budget.

The members agreed on the need for more meetings.

b. Tecton Report

Mr. Hopkins indicated they have been working on cost estimate reconciliation over the last couple of weeks. He advised for site plan development that a favorable recommendation was received tonight from the Design Review Board as another checkmark in the regulatory process. He said due to public notice lapse in the Courant the meeting with the Zoning Commission is now scheduled for 3/21. He said SOR is coordinating the DEEP stormwater permit for construction activities and SHPO has no historic properties affected and is included in the notice provided. He said they continue meeting with Simsbury Public Schools and Principal Luzietti regarding floor plan reviews, and there are standing Wednesday meetings to discuss food service, media center, security technology, access control, and finish/paint coordination. He said they anticipate having a pre-detailing of steel proposal from Paul Prothro from RAM Drafting for the next meeting. He said they have an OSCGR design development review meeting on 3/22. They reviewed last Friday with Principal Luzietti O&Gs phasing plans for the project in 3 phases of 24-month duration. Chairman Ostop indicated that more detail is needed regarding the budget first.

c. Arcadis Invoice #34284316

Mr. Egan made a motion to approve payment of Arcadis Invoice #34284316 in the amount of \$13,750.00. Mr. Burns seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

d. Tecton Invoice #44815

Mr. Burns made a motion to approve payment of Tecton Invoice #44815 dated 3/2/22 for the period 2/1/22 to 2/28/22 in the amount of \$103,378.26. Mr. Egan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

e. Sustainable Engineering Solutions Invoices #3394 & 3420

Mr. Salvatore made a motion to approve payment of Sustainable Engineering Solutions, LLC Invoice #3420 in the amount of \$2,000.00. Mr. Egan seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Salvatore made a motion to approve payment of Sustainable Engineering Solutions, LLC Invoice #3394 in the amount of \$3,000.00. Mr. Egan seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

5. Other

Mr. Egan commented that the budget is pretty far off and whether requesting more funds is an option. Chairman Ostop responded that more money would be requested with Mr. Casey going back to the Town. Mr. Salvatore asked if based on the budget being over should there be an early pursuit of steel. Mr. Butkus responded it would now be put out to bid in one phase. Mr. Dragulski asked if the project has been approved by the Town for budget would the Town have to go back to the State. Mr. Butkus said the Town at least has to approve the additional dollars before going to the State for approval. Chairman Ostop noted that the BOF has to approve additional budget which is needed for the next meeting. Mr. Salvatore asked about the effect on the schedule. Mr. Butkus responded that it affects the start schedule until this issue is resolved; the intent was CDs completed in May, going to the State, and then out to bid, but this is a measurable setback until cured. Mr. Dragulski asked how the additional funds affect the various fees.

Mr. Butkus said Arcadis fixed fee was based on duration and as the schedule changes there would be fee discussion, and also under O&G's general conditions which originally respected an 18-month construction period required taking larger bites out of the building unless trailers were provided for swing space, which may be better for the budget and school as well. Mr. Egan recalled this was discussed extensively for the 24-month schedule to keep costs down when the architect was brought on board; Chairman Ostop added the project has changed considerably and is now almost triple in size. Mr. Salvatore asked if the budget includes extended duration. Mr. Egan commented there is not one aspect better for the Town; Mr. Burns agreed and felt this was foreseeable and wanted to see the reasons for the dramatic shift.

6. Old Business

None.

7. New Business

The next meeting will be on 3/21 via Zoom. Mr. Salvatore will be away. Members requested receipt of documents early; Mr. Hopkins noted they are required to provide materials to the Town by Thursday afternoon prior to a meeting.

Mr. Dragulski made a motion to accept holding the next meeting on Monday, 3/21/22 at 7 p.m. via Zoom. Mr. Egan seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

8. Adjourn

Chairman Ostop made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:51 p.m. Mr. Salvatore seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Prifti

Commission Clerk