

## **PUBLIC BUILDING COMMITTEE**

### **Regular Meeting Minutes**

**May 2, 2022**

*Subject to Approval*

Chairman Ostop called the Regular Meeting of the Public Building Committee to order at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, May 2, 2022, via Zoom.

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

Excused – Mr. Burns

Guests – Tom Roy, Simsbury Town Engineer; 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; for Arcadis – Jack Butkus, Business Development Manager, and for O&G – David Cravanzola; and for CES -Brian Hamel

No public audience comments.

Chairman Ostop acknowledged a very famous person in attendance, Tom Roy, who received an award from the American Public Works Association for Management having to do with how the Town handled COVID processes for all snowplow operations; this was the first such award for Simsbury.

*Chairman Ostop made a motion that the Public Building Committee expressed appreciation for and thanked Mr. Roy for all the public works he does for the*

*Town of Simsbury. Mr. Kelly seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.*

## **1. Minutes of the April 4, 2022, Regular Meeting Minutes**

*Mr. Dragulski made a motion to approve the April 4, 2022, Regular Meeting Minutes, as written. Mr. Egan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.*

## **2. Simsbury High School Roof Replacement Project**

### **a. Greenwood Pay Application #9**

*Mr. Kelly made a motion to approve payment to Greenwood Industries, Inc. for Application #9 in the amount of \$111,590.45. Mr. Salvatore seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.*

Mr. Jacunski noted a remaining balance of \$101,831.62 which is more than adequate to cover remaining punch list items.

### **b. Punch list**

Mr. Jacunski discussed the punch list reviewed and walked through with BOE reps with most completed and some outstanding items; they have completed #1 manufacturer's warranty along with #10 and #11; and 2 vendors were paid for damages caused during roofing; 5 items included replacement of a bad fan motor replaced and some mortar issues; added were: Nos. 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, and Mr. Casell, Project Mgr., assures him these items will be completed by the next PBC meeting to close out the project.

## **4. Latimer Lane Renovation**

### **a. Arcadis Monthly Report**

Mr. Butkus highlighted in Arcadis monthly written report: the schedule is on track and 1- month into the 3-month construction document preparation phase; the superintendent is working with BOF regarding supplemental funding in order to

return to OSCG for plan review; for professional services, he suggested in the short term thinking about procuring a Materials Testing and Inspection consultant in the next several months; progress is being made with the Environmental company which has provided a report on building materials and is gearing up for soil borings for Phase 2 site analysis being coordinated with the school; meeting with the design team and CM re overall project schedule and opportunities for an early bidding phase, which Mr. Cravanzola will highlight.

Mr. Cravanzola continued a series of investigations were performed over the past month inside/outside the building involving existing piping systems around the building concluding existing piping beneath slabs cannot be moved any further with too many unknowns, blockages, and inability to verify system integrity – he noted through value engineering potential savings were looked at but no solid numbers were placed on it and it can no longer be pursued. He continued that for investigative work completed for utilities inside/outside the building, that information was fed to the design team for evaluation/verification of existing documents.

Mr. Cravanzola continued re schedule volatility in procuring materials in a precon approach, they identified early packages of materials or scope of work they would release based upon 50% of construction documents, which Tecton could have ready in about a week, including key items: roofing given difficulties in procuring material and labor handoff at installation; switchboards with lead times currently about 1 year and panel boards; and potential ductile iron pipe PVC exchange. He noted it is key to meet with OSCGR to assure scope of work requirement clarity and typical PCR process approval and grant reimbursement eligibility; Mr. Hopkins confirmed the early package ready date discussed is May 27<sup>th</sup>. Regarding going out to bid, Mr. Butkus noted with documents available end May, they would need to do some estimating and come before PBC and BOE to approve the package before going to the State and that may require a special PBC meeting mid-June for plan approval in order to go out to bid beginning of July. Mr. Cravanzola indicated the early package would provide a 3 to 3 ½ month jump on procuring some key items; the schedule looks like Phase 1 is about 12-months, Phase 2 predominantly renovations 6 months, and Phase 3 the last 6 months of construction; without pre-purchase, the 3 ½ to 4 months once the project is bid would require leaving that gap of time at project start to allow time to procure materials; he confirmed it would be publicly competitively bid. He continued site work could begin with foundations and steel but hit delay at roofing – so beginning early would require paying people to be on the job longer as you wait for materials to arrive, so getting the early package out and making sure the design team

schedules around procurement to eliminate delays in acquiring long lead time material. He noted approval at last month's meeting of Tecton's proposal for pre-detailing of structural steel and believed it would similarly be of value to the project to do pre-detailing of concrete reinforcing steel, as once the contractor is on board, they would have to develop detailed drawings and go through approvals and given lead times it would gain 3-4 weeks. He advised today on another 310,000 sq. ft. project they are working on they received approval for added detailed steel services at \$25K and for this project estimated it could save \$7-15K for the scope of services. Mr. Wyszynski indicated it is similar to steel detailing if time is gained, noting it is not Tecton's structural engineer, but there will be cost in a traditional format or paying for it now and trimming some lead times, and in today's market they would be in favor of doing this and would coordinate the effort. Mr. Roy confirmed seeing material shortages even getting PVC pipe and detailing will be paid for through the contract or this method which would pick up some time. Mr. Salvatore agreed it made sense. Mr. Butkus suggested moving forward with this as part of the bid package for State approval not to exceed \$15K.

***Mr. Derr made a motion to approve contracting for rebar pre-detailing of concrete reinforcing steel in an amount not to exceed \$15,000.00. Mr. Egan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

#### b. Tecton Report

Mr. Hopkins reported: they are about 30% through construction documentation and continue with Simsbury Public School meetings and Principal Luzietti; focus meetings to review audio visual technology and security requirements; in person meetings re materials/finishes review with faculty; consultant coordination weekly meetings continue to assure incorporation of alternates and value management items discussed; at the next meeting they anticipate having a full official list of ordering of alternates for review/approval of PBC; and they are coordinating with RAM drafting steel detailer selected at the last PBC meeting. He noted Mr. Casey has been involved in all these meetings. He confirmed the list will be ready in 30 days and Mr. Butkus confirmed approval is required in June. Chairman Ostop noted the next meeting is schedule for June 6<sup>th</sup> on Zoom.

Chairman Ostop invited comments from Mr. Wellman who responded tonight's update is very helpful.

Mr. Dragulski asked to discuss layouts, including eliminating the mechanical room on the main floor and using 2000 sq. ft. in the basement. Mr. Hamel said they are working on that with fire protection and plumbing services in the basement and some pumps, but also with some chill water pumps upstairs to reduce length of piping runs, the heater chiller given tight access, and leaving taps for future use. Mr. Dragulski asked about having only sinks in the classroom and not bubblers. Mr. Hopkins indicated they are centralizing those in classroom wing nodes, but not in each classroom. Mr. Dragulski believed they wanted them in the classrooms, especially in the kindergarten area; Mr. Hopkins will discuss further with Principal Luzietti, who then commented most kids carry bottles with them and having the centralized fountains has worked well while also providing a motor break for kids. Mr. Luzietti believed bubblers are in close proximity to both cafeteria entrances; Mr. Hopkins will note locations in the next floorplan update. Mr. Dragulski asked about the chimney for the boilers; Mr. Hamel said there is no chimney, and they will reroute flues through the roof; Mr. Hopkins said it is across the hall in a storage closet near the cafeteria. Mr. Egan asked if the flues to the boilers just installed would be changed; Mr. Hamel said where the flues come out is where a portion of the building is coming out and the boiler warranty would not be affected.

c. Tecton Invoice #44998

***Mr. Derr made a motion to approve payment to Tecton for Invoice #44998 in the amount of \$139,567.00. Mr. Kelly seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

d. O&G Invoice #554946

***Mr. Salvatore made a motion to approve payment to O&G of Invoice #554946 in the amount of \$27,307.00. Mr. Kelly seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

e. TRC Invoice #526287

***Mr. Kelly made a motion to approve payment to TRC for Invoice #526287 in the amount of \$12,227.50. Mr. Derr seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.***

Mr. Salvatore asked how the schedule has been affected regarding O&G and Arcadis costs. Mr. Butkus responded a longer design duration was experienced with an add service at some point with about \$1.3 Million after approval last month of value engineering. He said they have not calculated the extended periods and now that a more consistent schedule track has developed they should be able to put that together in the next month; for the overall schedule, a number of weeks were invested getting a handle on costs and the opportunity to do an early package did not add up to kickstart this spring, and the early procurement packages are the least worse scenario now, given no early start. Mr. Salvatore asked about the number of extra months. Mr. Butkus said with Arcadis they figured 6 months of design phase from when hired, with July 1st for 100% construction document completion; they were asked for 18 months of construction which is now 24. Mr. Salvatore asked about O&G's schedule. Mr. Cravanzola responded their contract is based on 24 months of construction and while waiting for materials to not extend beyond that, but there would be an extension of pre-construction services from 7 months duration to a few months longer. Mr. Derr said this is helpful and it would be good to have a rough cost/month for each design team member to put some numbers to the extension of time and he believed 24 months is an aggressive schedule for O&G and it would be good by the month to know costs for additional services.

Mr. Egan asked for the reason for the slip in the design period, which he believed was only a month based on conflict of interest. Mr. Hopkins responded that the change was from beginning March to beginning April with 3 months bringing the budget into line with establishment of alternates and answering design questions from an overage of about \$5 Million to currently about \$1+ Million. Mr. Butkus was looking at the date they were hired, what they were told to carry, and completion of documents at the proposal phase resulting for his contract in 3 months. Mr. Salvatore noted there was a plan to have drawings in March, which was not realistic. Chairman Ostop added that also involved the BOE and it was a difficult start.

## **5. Other**

## **6. Old Business**

None.

## **7. New Business**

Chairman Ostop restated the next meeting is scheduled for June 6<sup>th</sup> at 7 p.m. on Zoom.

## 8. Adjourn

*Mr. Kelly made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:40 p.m. Mr. Dragulski seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.*

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Prifti

Commission Clerk