

PUBLIC BUILDING COMMITTEE

Special Meeting Minutes

August 13, 2018

Subject to Approval

Chairman Ostop called the Special Meeting of the Public Building Committee to order at 7:02 p.m. on Monday, August 13, 2018, in the Board of Education Conference Room at 933 Hopmeadow Street, Simsbury, CT.

Present – Chairman Ostop, Messrs. Cortes, Salvatore, Kelly, and Walter. Mr. Dragulski joined the meeting at 7:03 p.m.

Excused – Mr. Derr was excused. Katherine Beal has resigned and new member, Michael Egan, is to be confirmed.

Guests – Messrs. LaClair and Shea. Also Kurt Lavaway from Colliers International

1. Approval of Project Invoices

Mr. Salvatore made a motion to approve payment to Independent Materials Testing Lab, Inc. for Invoice Number 3535-B in the amount of \$325.00 for concrete at the Simsbury Farms Pool. Mr. Dragulski seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Cortes made a motion to approve payment to Northeast Collaborative Architects for Invoice #7 in the amount of \$2,284.50 for Eno Hall renovations. Mr. Walter seconded the motion.

Mr. Shea advised this represents the last cycle and is the second of 2 invoices.

The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Cortes made a motion to approve payment to Northeast Collaborative Architects for Invoice #6 in the amount of \$2,178.75 for Eno Hall renovations. Mr. Walter seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Dragulski made a motion to approve payment to Nosal Builders, Inc. for Application No. 1 in the amount of \$64,746.30. Mr. Salvatore seconded the motion.

Mr. Shea indicated the Eno Memorial Hall Renovations project is going well and on schedule with completion expected in a couple of weeks, subject to receiving kitchen equipment.

The motion was passed unanimously.

2. Board of Selectmen Liaison Report – Cheryl Cook

While Ms. Cook was not present, Chairman Ostop advised following conversations with her agreement on the Committee's direction.

Mr. Dragulski made a motion to amend the August 13, 2018, Agenda to include an item for executive session to discuss matters related to Construction Manager Services for the Henry James Memorial School Project – Phase III. Mr. Cortes seconded the motion.

Mr. Walter asked procedurally if the Committee can amend the Agenda of a Special Meeting. Mr. Shea confirmed that FOI was consulted and the Special Meeting Agenda could be amended with a 2/3 of the Committee supporting the amendment of the agenda.

The motion was passed unanimously.

Chairman Ostop made a motion to go into executive session pursuant to CGS § 1-200(6) (B) to discuss matters related to Construction Manager Services for the Henry James Memorial School Project – Phase III and to allow Mr. Lavaway to attend. Mr. Dragulski seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Following executive session, the recorded portion of the meeting resumed at 7:50 p.m.

Mr. LaClair discussed raising particular questions during interviews. He commented positively on the proposals from Downes and Newfield and that Downes provided information on schedule/phasing. Regarding the RFP request for info on 5 projects, beginning guaranteed maximum price (GMP) and final GMP amount; original construction duration and actual construction duration; and the amount of CM contingency at the start and end of the project., he believed Newfield provided the least information of the 3 bidders, but Newfield was specific about services provided for each job. Chairman Ostop commented for all 3 bidders included their scope of work re pre-construction, project overview, manuals, special estimates, cash flow analysis, value engineering, he would want to assure they will qualify MBE and WBE contractors involved in the project.

Mr. Cortes made a motion that the Committee will interview two firms: Downes and Newfield. Mr. Kelly seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Salvatore made a motion to send a letter to PDS that they were not selected based on fee. Mr. Cortes seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Cortes made a motion to hold a special meeting on August 22, 2018, for interviews beginning with the first interview at 7:00 p.m. and the second interview at 8:00 p.m. Mr. Dragulski seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Salvatore made a motion to request proposals for an owner's representative/ project administrator to be advertised as soon as possible. Mr. Walter seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Cortes requested more clarification on how score cards will be used in this process. Kurt Lavaway of Colliers advised typically scoring documents information on how bidders were selected or not selected. For the interview, he indicated the Committee could or could not use the score card since there are only 2 firms. Chairman Ostop felt the score card could be used as a reference tool for members during the interview, although it is not required. Mr. Dragulski asked if the same questions will be asked of both firms. Chairman Ostop indicated it is open, but a number of questions could be developed to ask, e.g. number of projects of this type firm has

done, how many CM at risk projects, have you worked with high performance LEED green building standards, have you worked with commissioning services, value engineering, employees with experience on this type of project. Mr. Cortes commented that information is in their proposals. Mr. Dragulski said with respect to high performance commissioning they have to provide this information. Chairman Ostop added that questions can be asked for anything the Committee is uncomfortable with and the questioning should be open. Mr. Salvatore noted the importance of their team members' commitment to the project – is it 100% or will there be shared duties with another project. Chairman Ostop added the importance of onsite staff vs. staff once a week. Mr. LaClair commented in the interview process the need to confirm their thoughts on budget and schedule, which are part of the evaluation criteria the PBC approved. Mr. Lavaway indicated the questions is whether they feel the budget is sufficient based on the project scope and are they comfortable with the schedule as it is laid out. Chairman Ostop noted a requirement of CM at risk after they have looked at the architects timing to come up with a budget and schedule that may be less or more than the Committee has provided. Mr. Lavaway commented that the bidders were provided the schedule and came to the Committee and should say now if they can meet that schedule for September 2020. Chairman Ostop noted the Committee's past experience that something unknown may occur as it has on other projects, e.g. lead time for lights, kitchen equipment, etc. Mr. Salvatore added that can also affect the fee; Chairman Ostop noted they may benefit if they come in under bid or may lose if they go over bid, if there are no order changes. Mr. Lavaway noted the number in green on the price proposal summary is taken out of the \$16+ Million and that would reduce the amount for construction.

Mr. LaClair commented on the commissioning services requirement which the State grant process requires to be hired separately, but is part of this project. Chairman Ostop reviewed that following selection each month a budget item will be shown. Mr. LaClair asked if there is something for the high performance standards that requires a separate scope. Mr. Dragulski explained it does not and is within the design as shown on the State website, but there are points that must be achieved for high performance, and enhanced commissioning involves the commissioning agent reviewing the documents at the two remaining design phases. Mr. Lavaway confirmed that Colliers also performs commissioning work, but it cannot be done by Kaestle - Boos because an independent party is required under State high performance projects (if a project is over \$2 Million) and commissioning service are required. Mr. Salvatore indicated that should also soon be advertised.

Mr. LaClair has been working with Kaestle, Mr. Shea and Adam Kessler from the Town Engineer's office regarding geotechnical services and survey work and provided the Committee with a second estimate on page 3 of \$16,500. He noted the first survey proposal from Kaestle-Boos was \$8,500 and as shown on the last page worked around the footprints of the add-on square footage; following discussion with Town Planning multiple times, the second proposal includes required setbacks resulting in a total of \$25K as an allowance billable through Kaestle's contract. As the project must keep moving to meet the timeline, he wanted to advise the Committee since it is out of the range of Kaestle's original estimate of \$15,000 for survey work. Mr. LaClair believed this was the best estimate possible following multiple evaluations and scrutiny.

Chairman Ostop requested receiving the Minutes of tonight's meeting quickly and prior to the 8/22/18 meeting, which the Clerk agreed to and the Secretary committed to edit within 24 hours of receipt.

Mr. Dragulski asked if there are any other studies/surveys that Kaestle must perform that are not included in their estimate. Mr. LaClair responded a traffic report is needed at a cost of \$2,500 because the footprint has now expanded. Mr. Dragulski noted there are about 20-30 letters definitely required by the State, which is why a project administrator is needed.

4. Adjourn

Mr. Cortex made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:24 p.m. Mr. Kelly seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Prifti

Commission Clerk