

Public Building Commission
Regular Meeting: 1/9/17
Location: Branford Fire Headquarters
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

RECEIVED

2017 JAN 18 A 8:52

TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
BRANFORD, CONNECTICUT

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 pm by Chairman Peter Banca.

Building Committee Members Present:

Peter Banca
James Killelea
Leonard Tamsin, Jr.
Robin Goeler
Robert Barnett
John O'Connor
Katie Greco

Other Attendees:

Hamlet Hernandez, Superintendent
Michael Krause, BOE Representative
Jamie Cosgrove, First Selectman
Scott Pellman, Colliers International
Charles Warrington, Colliers International
Michael LoSasso, Antinozzi Associates
Paul Antinozzi, Antinozzi Associates
Robert Darr, Fusco Corporation

Approval of Prior Minutes:

Motion to approve the previous meeting minutes by James Killelea. Motion was second by John O'Connor. Motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments / Communications:

Bill Horn – 246 Pleasant Point Road – Wanted to ask a question, how much consideration are you giving to renewable energy? I would appreciate efforts to reduce operating costs and address concerns of climate change. I have installed solar panels on my house and am hoping to have it paid off in 10 to 20 years. If geothermal is a consideration, the expense is drilling the wells that will be there for years and is an investment that will continue to pay for itself.

Response – Paul Antinozzi, the design team is very aware of making the building as efficient as possible including State requirements of High Performance Guidelines. The project will basically meet LEED Silver equivalent with an emphasis on energy conservation. The building has to be designed to meet the CT High Performance Guidelines including indoor air quality. The budget for the project currently does not allow for the inclusion of renewable energy systems, the project is currently looking at value management considerations to bring the project within the allocated budget.

Walsh project update - Colliers: Mr. Warrington reported on the following:

- Since the last time the building committee met the design team, estimators and Colliers have gone through a process of reviewing and pricing the schematic design documents. The two estimates were reviewed and reconciled looking at quantities, scope, establishing design intent to produce the reconciled estimate that is being presented this evening. At the schematic phase, there are a lot of assumptions made so a higher contingency is carried that will be reduced as the project progresses.
- The form of the estimate was presented that showed all of the trade costs in the CSI format. The control budget is 70.1 million dollars and that is the target when evaluating the budget. Two columns represent the revised budgets from the estimators with a third column showing the reconciled budget. The numbers in the yellow area represent the estimated renovation costs and the blue is the estimate for the building addition. Sub trade costs are shown at the bottom of the estimate including the design and pricing contingency which is 10%. The project is currently tracking at 73.3 million dollars, approx.. 4% over budget, these numbers are pre-value engineering. There is a list of recommended value management suggestions that were developed with the design team, colliers and the estimators to bring the project back in line with the budget. The recommendations that for the most part do not effect program. The total VE list is approximately 3.4 million dollars. The VE items will be reviewed with the committee this evening and if all of the recommendations are accepted the project will be approximately .4% under budget.

Question by Len Tamsin – What did you carry for environmental issues.

Response – A 2.3-million-dollar allowance is being carried.

Question Michael Krause – The budget does not reflect the entire budget of 88.2 million.

Response – The 70.1 million does not include Fees and soft costs, the project is on budget with the soft costs.

- VE items were reviewed including graphics of each item produced by the design team, there was a list of 21 items that were compiled, three were not recommended for acceptance. Committee acceptance of VE item is noted after each number.
 1. Yes - Concrete walkway reduction
 2. No - Eliminate North West parking lot milling and overlay - (not recommended by team, committee accepted recommendation of not taking this VE item)
 3. Yes - Eliminate East parking lot
 4. Yes - Increase structural bays in recessed areas to reduce steel weights
 5. Yes - Reduce roof railings
 6. Partial Yes - Reduce roof screens by 50% (change to a 25% reduction)
 7. Yes - Substitute masonry in lieu of phenolic panels at south recess
 8. Yes - Delete imprinting of phenolic panels – (Add Alternate, could be a percentage of imprinted areas in the future)

9. Yes - Delete metal battens at rain screens, work with Fusco on an alternate system to maintain the look.
10. Yes - Replace rain screen soffits with metal panels at loading dock service area
11. Yes - Use EPDM .090 in lieu of modified bitumen roofing
12. No - Delete skylights and light wells - (not recommended by team - committee accepted recommendation of not taking this VE item)
13. Yes - Reduce laminated glass canopies by 50%
14. No - Re-use 8 exterior entrance doors - (not recommended by team - committee accepted recommendation of not taking this VE item)
15. Partial Yes - Substitute fixed walls in lieu of vertical folding Skyfold partitions – (keep 7th grade in the project along with 8th grade)
16. Yes - Substitute horizontal folding door in lieu of Skyfold at project room – (recommended to modify into one large room, possibly use movable furniture)
17. Yes - Delete wood wainscot at central corridor – (Add Alternate)
18. Yes - Substitute linear lay in ceiling tiles for wood plank on 3rd floor circulation ceiling – (possibly use a more linear ceiling tile)
19. Yes - Substitute VCT in lieu of Vinyl Flooring (look at higher grade VCT in Cafeteria)
20. No - Delete replacement of scoreboards, backstops and gym divider – maintain existing
21. Yes - Delete Photovoltaic system

Question Len T – Everything outside of the property line is not reimbursable?

Response – Yes, utilities etc. would not be reimbursed over the property line. Currently the water line is a single run to the building that splits off for domestic and fire service, this will be reviewed by the design team with the utility co.

Question Len T – Have you looked at storm water detention?

Response – believes that all water will go to detention areas and will not contribute additional flow to the current storm system.

Question Len T – Will the project use granite curbing?

Response – Granit is very expensive and is not included in the project budget. Remote parking areas may not have any curb. The estimated cost to change to 10,000 lf of granite would be approx... \$120,000.

Motion to approve VE list with the changes or acceptances noted above, Motion by James Killelea to approve VE list, seconded by John O'Connor, approved unanimously.

Walsh project update - Antinozzi: Mr. Antinozzi presented the following:

- Mike LoSasso is now a partner of the firm and was congratulated by the commission.

Walsh project update - Fusco: Mr. Darr presented the following:

- The schedule is showing a 29-month duration, the original schedule was 26-months. The early enabling package is not possible due to abatement coordination and building demolition.

Approval of Invoices

Antinozzi invoice #3 for 95% of the Schematic Design 117,781.50, Motion to approve the invoice by John O'Connor Motion was second by Len Tamsin. Motion passed unanimously.

A financial summary is needed monthly prior to the consideration of any bills.

The next scheduled meeting will take place on February 13, 2017 at 7:00 pm at the Fire house

Meeting adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

Submitted by Peter Banca