

Joint Building Committee Meeting

December 14th, 2015

CTC Conference Room

4:00 pm

- 1. Call to Order:** Bolduc called the meeting to order and the following members were present: Bolduc, Gibson, Dumont and Messier. Also present was Andy Lucier, Jeni Mosca, Marie D'Agostino, Ingrid Nichols, Chris Salomon, Sharon Lampros, Katelyn Carrington, Joe Campbell, and Lori Lane.
- 2. Approval Of Minutes:** A motion made by Messier seconded by Gibson to approve the minutes from November 16th 2015. VOTE: Motion passed, unanimously. Marty Dumont abstained because he was not in attendance at the last meeting.
- 3. Cost Proposal:** Supt. Mosca stated that the hope was to bring the numbers tonight but they are still working on the mechanical pieces and Banwell needs time to get back to North Branch so the hope is to get them at the January 11th meeting. Gibson asked if this is going to affect timelines. Nichols stated no.
- 4. Engineering Review:** Supt. Mosca stated that the engineers are here tonight to give an update. Nichols stated that these are the engineers for mechanical and electrical, Steve Markowitz and Hank Geary from Allied Engineering.

Electrical: The existing electrical service and main distribution switchboard shall remain and shall be re-used. The existing branch circuit panels will remain and be re-used. They will supplement with additional branch circuit panels as necessary. The lighting will be re-used to the extent as feasible. The fixtures will be moved to suit the new floor plan. Gibson asked if everything will carry us in regard to power demand. Geary stated yes. He stated that the electrical on the panel boards only has five years left in anticipated useful life and they presented a cost proposal as an alternate to replace and today they have chosen not to do that. Nichols stated that we will carry it as an alternate and can make the decision once we get the bids in. Messier stated that it is not going to look good if we have to replace it five years from now.

Mechanical: They will have the same approach, they looked at the equipment that they could re-use they will upgrade the ventilation with energy recovery units and some air conditioning will be added for engineering. They will go the ductless air conditioning approach. They discussed eliminating the connection to the boiler at the high school. It would lessen the load on the hydronic system. If it has to be hydronic system heating there is a small boiler plant in this building. That plant has 5-7 years of potential life. If this went on based on hydronics on that plant and that goes you are in for a \$100,000 expense. The equipment would be more efficient about 70-80% with the newer one and this would be 60%. The cost is fairly comparable to hydronic but the energy use is a savings of 25%. They will do some calculating and look at going with that approach and discuss it with the team. It is not a major switch. Bolduc stated that it would be separate heating from the high school. He likes that approach. Messier stated that he agrees with the separate meter. Bolduc asked if that will require a change in the plans. Nichols stated a little and they will show them next time. Markowitz stated that there may be one of two small rooftop units added but everything will have efficiency in mind. Gibson asked if it would be better to start with individual service for this side. Markowitz stated that if this size has capacity from that point to this building we have to know if there is enough pressure so we will talk to the utilities. Bolduc stated that he is glad they talked about heating because it was one of his concerns and if we can separate that would be great. Dumont stated that he hopes they are getting a price on a roof. Nichols stated we are. Messier stated that if we need to put roof top units is it going to reflect the change. Campbell stated that we took all that into account.
- 5. Civil Engineer Approval:** Nichols stated that Cris sent an email describing the limited scope to three engineers and they got proposals from two of them. Tighe & Bond is a local firm but they came in high at \$22,550. The second proposal was from TFMoran and they are doing the structural design and they

gave you a price break that is why the fee came in less at \$9,800. Bolduc stated that the work is both equal but one is working for us already. D'Agostino stated that she did call Tighe and Bond to see if they could change their proposal and they said that they couldn't. Nichols stated that she would recommend that you do it on an hourly basis not to exceed that amount because it may not reach that amount. Bolduc stated that in the proposal it says something about someone else's plan depending on it. Nichols stated that the survey was done by another engineer so they don't want to be held responsible if there is a mistake in those plans. D'Agostino stated that the fee is \$9800 plus reimbursables. Bolduc stated that the proposal doesn't say anything about hourly so do we have to have another document that says that. Nichols stated that knowing them they will be fine with that. A motion made by Messier seconded by Dumont to accept the proposal from TFM to reflect an hourly rate not to exceed \$9,800 plus miscellaneous reimbursables that are reasonable and customary not to exceed 10%. VOTE: Motion passed, unanimously.

6. Other: Supt. Mosca stated that she handed out the capital budget overview committee letter for final funding. Bolduc stated that we have seen the conceptual design but there is nothing like taking a walk and say this is what we are doing, it is much easier to visualize if we can see it and asked if anyone is interested in doing something like that. D'Agostino stated that she wanted to inform the JBC that they have been working with North Branch and the attorney to finalize the agreement. She stated that in the RFP it did not ask for additional cost for change orders and the response also had no language indicating any change order fee. North Branch has requested that they would like to include for every change order that they get 2.5% of the GMP beyond what's stated. She stated that both the attorney and I felt that it needs to have approval from the JBC. Dumont asked if it was 2.5% of the total. D'Agostino stated 2.5% of the change order. She stated that there were two questions asked at the interviews what happens if there is savings and the response was the majority goes back to the owner and the second question is what happens if you go over the GMP and the response was that the firm would eat it. She stated that she wants the JBC to be aware that nowhere in the RFP does it state any additional fees for change orders. She stated that the contract will be on hold until we get the approval from the JBC. Messier stated that 2.5% is not bad. Gibson stated that he doesn't have a lot of experience with this and asked at what point are we talking change orders. When we do the initial cost out and we have 6.3 million to work with and it comes in at 6 million there is 300,000 to play with, is it considered a change order at that point. Nichols stated anything that is not on the drawings. She stated that she agrees that 2.5% is a fair fee but we have to remember that \$6.5 million is all we have, we can't go above that. Bolduc stated that if there is additional does North Branch go out to bid for that or do they come up with the price. Campbell stated that if you want to add an additional cabinet, there is already \$250,000 worth of case work and they already had a sub on board they would go to him with the request and they would price it out. It is all open book so they would show the prices to you and they would make a fee on top of that cost. He stated that there may be a scenario where North Branch will come up with the cost but 9 out of 10 times it is sub-contractor based. Bolduc stated that the only problem he has is that it wasn't in the proposal when we selected North Branch. Campbell stated that in the RFP was a contract and we did request a number of changes and this is a specific example of where there were blanks in the contract that we have to fill in. One of those blanks was a fee on change orders. Messier stated that typically in a project it is 6% for change orders and they chose not to do that. A motion made by Dumont seconded by Messier to include a 2.5% fee for change orders. VOTE: Motion passed, unanimously. Supt. Mosca stated that the agenda items for the meeting on January 11th will be update on the cost, revised plans, civil plans and schedule update.

7. Next Meeting Dates: The next meeting is January 11 2016 at 4:00pm at the CTC First Floor conference room.

8. Adjournment: A motion made by Dumont seconded by Messier to adjourn. VOTE: Motion passed,

unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 4:45pm.

Katie Krauss
JBC Recording Secretary

Pending Board Approval