

Minutes of the Special Building Commission Meeting

Tuesday, January 26, 2021

Remote Meeting via Zoom

6:00 p.m.

In Attendance: Janet Fierman, Ken Kaplan, George Cole, Nathan Peck, Karen Breslawski, Building Commission; Tony Guigli, Project Administrator; Dan Bennett, Building Commissioner; Charles Simmons, Director of Public Buildings; Jim Rogers, Jen Carlson, Lynn Stapleton, Matt Casey, Adam Keane, LeftField Staff; Philip Gray, Jonathan Levi, Jonathan Levi Architects (JLA) Staff; Walt Kincaid, Linda Callahan, Joe McCoy, Paul Ruggiero, Gilbane staff; Dominick Puniello, GGD Staff; Helen Charlupski, Susan Wolf-Ditkoff, School Committee; Matt Gillis, School Department; Carla Benka, Advisory Committee; Members of the public.

Meeting Minutes

Discussion took place on the minutes and it was decided that some edits needed to be made and that a vote would take place at the next Building Commission Meeting.

Driscoll School Project

G. Cole was present for the discussion but had to excuse himself from the meeting at 6:57 pm for personal reasons.

J. Rogers appeared before the Building Commission to discuss the budget, the schedule and the geothermal add alternate. Building Commission asked the group for the status on the budget due to past experience on other projects of not having a timely or inclusive GMP and ending up being essentially a cost-plus project. They would not like to experience that again and are reluctant to start a project again without full pricing.

J. Rogers reviewed the different options for the schedule of the project, made recommendations and asked for Building Commissions guidance. He reviewed the 90% CD versus the 100% DD Estimate Comparison. The total current estimated costs before add alternates is \$92,734,224, which is on budget and includes a fossil free scope. It is projected that there is not enough room in the budget for geothermal wells as an alternative to the base project, with an estimated cost of \$2.7M. He explained the 100% DD Estimate. At the time it was projected there would be the funds to capture geothermal wells. However, since then, the subcontractor costs have gone up \$4.2M. This happened due to Earthwork, Exterior Improvements and Utilities with site work being the major increase. In addition, another increase was General Conditions and General Requirements at \$916,166 due to learning more about the project and meeting with Town stakeholders; things came in better focus and various compromises were made. Building Commission inquired as to the status of the bidding process. Sitework bidding was released early and an addendum was made and they have received three bids. Gilbane is reviewing all and they are confident one of the bids is consistent with the numbers they are carrying in the 90% CD Estimate. They have bids out on both concrete and

steel and expect pricing back on February 15, 2021. The rest of the bid packages will be issued on February 15, 2021, with bids due on March 15, 2021. The sitework is more complicated than other components of this project. Other trades are a lot more predictable. Building Commission asked about the mandate for a geothermal system. It was explained that Town Meeting voted that the project be fossil free, meaning no gas line to the buildings, but it was not specifically for geothermal. S. Wolf-Ditkoff further explained that there was discussion at Town Meeting about having a fossil fuel free school but it was not specific that it had to be geothermal. Nevertheless there is an expectation for it by some in the community.

J. McCoy explained the 90% CD Estimate versus the Previous DD Estimate on the project. He explained the 60% to 90% CD and the support of excavation was bigger than they expected and that is the reason for the \$632,529 increase. The costs for excavation, and offsite disposal went up after conversations with subcontractors. There were other factors that contributed to the increase in General Conditions and General Requirements such as Traffic Control/Police details, Fire Watch Details, moisture mitigation, dust monitoring, and vibration monitoring and open/close sidewalks (jersey barriers) for a total delta of \$916,050. A. Keane explained fire watch details requirements were more atypical. T. Guigli mentioned that during the Ridley School Project they were surprised by the fire watch and police detail expenses so he encouraged the group to investigate these issues thoroughly for the Driscoll project.

Building Commission explained due to the market, having estimates and experience from other building projects they are less likely to proceed without knowing how much the project is going to cost. J. Rogers and the group understand the Building Commissions concerns and they explained some options. Building Commission asked how confident they are in all the rest of the filed subs, steel and concrete, etc. J. McCoy said in other projects they were able to make significant savings. He is concerned the most with where the market is for concrete, millwork, carpentry trades and drywall. Steel commodity prices have increased recently. The group is trying to come up with a potential strategy. The question before the Building Commission is if they should proceed with construction based on incomplete cost information on the job or do they wait until the cost information is supported by actual bids and then proceed. And what is the cost benefit ratio between starting early or waiting for the bids. M. Casey presented four Sitework Subcontractor Release Options that explains the schedule and options for buyout. Discussion on the four options and the GMP took place.

Sitework Subcontractor Release options

Option	Pricing Milestone	Percent bought out	Sitework Release date*	Mobilize **	VE Bulletin needed	TCO / Substantial Completion of New Driscoll	Occupy New Driscoll	Field Complete (save a month to delete geothermal)	Time TCO -Move in
1	Leveled Site bids	12%	1/26/2021	3/1/2021	7/1/2021	5/1/2023	9/1/2023	5/1/2024	4 months
2	Concrete, Steel bids	26%	2/15/2021	3/29/2021	7/29/2021	5/29/2023	9/1/2023	5/1/2024	3 months
3	Filed Sub bids+ major subs	69%	3/15/2021	4/26/2021	8/26/2021	6/26/2023	9/1/2023	5/1/2024	2 months
4	All Sub bids	95%	4/15/2021	5/27/2021	9/27/2021	7/27/2023	9/1/2023	5/1/2024	1 month

* Release date assumes special building commission meeting

** Assume 6 weeks from building commission approval to mobilize - based on a notice to proceed right away to get the sub going. Concurrently we would get approval from school committee and select board for the contract amendment

The original schedule cushion from TCO to occupy the school was 2 months.

VE Timeline (if needed)

Start	Complete Selection of items	Complete Drawings
3/15/2021	4/15/2021	7/15/2021

Start process at receipt of filed sub bids, 3/15

1 month to come up with VE selections, price them, and have the town approve them (could be light on time)

3 months to re-do the drawings (assuming no change in square footage)

This timeline works for all but the Option 1, start following Leveled site bids. For option 1 we would have to start the VE process at the time of concrete and steel bids.

J. Rogers recommends options 1, 2 or 3. Building Commission believes in options 3 and 4 because cost is more important than schedule, given that all four options result in a school start in September 2023. They would like cost certainty with a complete and comprehensive GMP, as there is some risk involved with filed sub bids and other project buy-out. It was discussed that bids could be held for 30 – 60 days but it depends what was put in the bid documents; LF to investigate further. As to the schedule options, J. Rogers believes that any of them would work with the team on the project, even as an earlier start would be optimal.

T. Guigli asked about the payback period of electrical utility costs. P. Gray explained the Lifecycle Cost Analysis for a Base Bid HVAC System versus a Ground Source Ad Alt.

Base Bid HVAC System vs Ground Source Add Alt

Design Development - 8/18/20

	Construction Cost	Elec Cost / Year	Maint Cost/Year	Capital Replacement Cost / Year	Combined Annual Expenses	Ground Source Simple Payback Period-Years*
Base Bid	\$8,155,000	\$196,000	\$66,000	\$61,267	\$323,267	
Ground Source	\$10,045,000	\$148,000	\$63,000	\$26,000	\$237,000	22
Delta	\$1,890,000	-\$48,000	-\$3,000	-\$35,267	-\$86,267	

90% CD with Bid Input - 1/21/21

	Construction Cost	Elec Cost / Year	Maint Cost/Year	Capital Replacement Cost / Year	Combined Annual Expenses	Ground Source Simple Payback Period-Years*
Base Bid	\$9,950,000	\$196,000	\$66,000	\$61,267	\$323,267	
Ground Source	\$12,667,000	\$148,000	\$63,000	\$26,000	\$237,000	31
Delta	\$2,717,000	-\$48,000	-\$3,000	-\$35,267	-\$86,267	

*Simple payback does not factor in escalation, inflation, and interest rates

T. Guigli recommended that JLA share this updated information with Heather Hamilton and Nancy Heller of the Select Board and recommended they share the HVAC presentation with the Building Commission at their next meeting.

Building Commission expressed their appreciation for all the hard work that has been put in to this building project so far.

S. Wolf-Ditkoff commented that the Schools top concerns are cost certainty, having a geothermal discussion and payback period is important. Also, more open space for outside area in the Spring is important due to the pandemic so students can have lunch outside, more playground time, etc.

Old and New Business

T. Guigli provided a status on the Putterham Library Toilet Renovations. The project is complete. The budget was \$150,000 and the project came under budget. The expenses, including design, were approximately \$110,000. He presented Change Order # 1 for Vintage Properties in the amount of \$764 for an increase in tile material cost and for masonry work to cover holes in the walls and for a small keying credit.

Motion made by J. Fierman to approve Change Order # 1 for Vintage Properties for \$764 for the Putterham Library Toilet Renovation.

Aye: Kaplan, Breslawski, Peck, Fierman

By Roll Call Vote Approved.

T. Guigli presented the Final Pay Requisition # 4 in the amount of \$8,831.25 to Vintage Properties. The Architect has approved the payment.

Motion made by N. Peck to approve Final Pay Requisition # 4 to Vintage Properties for \$8,831.25 for the Putterham Library Toilet Renovation.

Aye: Kaplan, Breslawski, Peck, Fierman

By Roll Call Vote Approved.

C. Simmons presented invoices for Embree Elevators for approval. The invoices are for Elevator upgrades at the Senior Center and the Soule Recreation Center. These invoices are partial payments and they will continue to do work. The expected time frame to complete this project will be four to six weeks and funds are available for this work to be complete.

Motion made by J. Fierman to approve the invoices for Embree Elevator in the amount of \$100,992 for elevator upgrades at the Senior Center and Soule Recreation Center.

Aye: Kaplan, Breslawski, Peck, Fierman

By Roll Call Vote Approved.

T. Guigli presented an invoice from Road Safe Traffic Systems for the High School project in the amount of \$29,557.95. It is approved by R. Masak and is for 63 water barriers on Route 9 which was requested as a safety measure by the School Department for children who travel on route 9 on the way to the high school.

Motion made by N. Peck to approve the invoice to Road Safe Traffic Systems in the amount of \$25,557.95 for water barriers

Aye: Kaplan, Breslawski, Peck, Fierman

By Roll Call Vote Approved.

Motion made by N. Peck to give the Chair as the authority to sign on behalf of all the Building Commission members any invoices, amendments, change orders, contracts or any other documents approved at the meeting by a roll call vote.

Aye: Kaplan, Breslawski, Peck, Fierman

By Roll Call Vote Approved.

Meeting adjourned at 7:18 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Beth McDonald.