

TOWN OF NEWINGTON

TOWN HALL RENOVATIONS PROJECT BUILDING COMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

January 30, 2019

Town Hall Lower Level, Conference Room L101

RECEIVED FOR RECORD  
TOWN OF NEWINGTON, CT  
2019 FEB -4 PM 3:40

*Adam C. Harpie*  
Town Clerk

- I. Call to Order – Mr. Harpie called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.
- II. Roll Call – Members present: Joe Harpie, Chairperson; Beth DelBuono, Jim Marocchini, Rod Mortensen, Ed Murtha, and Don Woods (via speakerphone). Others present: Roy Zartarian, Mayor; Joe Desautel, Tom Romagnoli, and Frank Tomcak, Downes Construction Company; Tom Arcari and Kyle Baron, Quisenberry Arcari + Malik Architecture; Tanya Lane, Town Manager; Dave Langdon, Director of Facilities Management; Janet Murphy, Finance Director; and Jeff Baron, Director of Administrative Services.
- III. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes – Mr. Mortensen made a motion that the minutes of January 16, 2019 be approved as written. A second to the motion was made by Mr. Marocchini. The motion passed by a vote of 6 YES to 0 NO.
- IV. Public Participation – Mr. Mortensen read correspondence from John Bachand, 56 Maple Hill Avenue.
- V. Consider and Take Action on Value Management items – presented by Mr. Romagnoli. The Construction Manager has been working with the design team as they have been working through the value management process. Downes Construction has completed the scope review process, and a number of value management items have been identified. He will go through the list and present the numbers to the Committee. Downes Construction is still working within the timeframe of the schedule that was presented at the last meeting. The project construction currently stands at \$26,526,993, with no add alternate bid items included. The Owner's contingency is \$868,405. The Owner's soft costs are valued at \$2,577,000. There are value management items that have been reviewed previously, totaling a net deduct of \$1,099,038. There are three major credits that comprise about two-thirds of this net deduct. They are an alternate for leaving some of the foundations in place (\$430,000), changing the asbestos related shingle abatement sequence (\$100,000), and changes involving the foundation waterproofing moisture mitigation system (\$287,000). The rest of the reviewed value management items are related to mechanical systems and plumbing. The \$1,099,038 in credits is included in the number for the project. Pending value management items will be discussed this evening, and total a credit of \$97,037. Using these figures, the anticipated total project budget is \$28,776,323. The amount approved at referendum was \$28,818,358.

Mr. Romagnoli presented the Pending Value Management items one at time for the Building Committee's consideration. The first item was to revise the exterior masonry from cast stone to either EIFS (an Exterior Insulating Finishing System) or brick, or a combination of both, for a savings of \$50,000. The EIFS would look like cast stone but not last as long. Mr. Arcari said that he would prefer to stick with the product specified. Mr. Mortensen made a motion that the Committee eliminate the exterior masonry substitution from the project. A second to the motion was made by Ms. DelBuono. The motion passed by a vote of 6 YES to 0 NO. The second Pending Value Management item was to delete 3<sup>rd</sup> floor steel brick relieving angle, valued at \$2,900. This was supporting masonry, basically an extra lintel. Mr. Marocchini made a motion that the Committee accept the value management item of deleting the third floor steel brick relieving angle. A second to the motion was made by Mr. Mortensen. The motion passed by a vote of 6 YES to 0 NO. The next item was to revise the roof cover board to mechanical fastening in lieu of adhering, for a savings valued at \$8,000. This originally provided an added layer of protection. Mechanical fastening is not outside the normal construction technique. Mr. Mortensen made a motion that the Committee accept the revision to the roof cover board of mechanical fastening in lieu of adhering. A second to the motion was made by Mr. Murtha. The motion passed by a vote of 6 YES to 0 NO. The fourth Pending Value Management item was to add high abuse drywall to the Transition Academy, for an added cost of \$15,000. Mr. Marocchini made a motion that the Committee accept adding high abuse drywall to the Transition Academy. A second to the motion was made by Mr. Mortensen. Discussion: Mr. Arcari pointed out that inclusion of this item would make it eligible for partial State reimbursement. The motion passed by a vote of 6 YES to 0 NO.

The next Pending Value Management item was to revise the linear metal ceilings from Armstrong to Rockfon, valued at a savings of \$15,110. This is for the ceiling in the main hallway, the grand entrance. It will look similar. The Project Architect did not really want to do this. The Committee could take the credit now and add the item back in to the project later, placing it on the list of Add Alternates for now. Mr. Mortensen made a motion that the Committee accept the proposed credit for revising the linear metal ceilings from Armstrong to Rockfon, and that the Committee look to add this item back into the project as an alternate at a later date. A second to the motion was made by Mr. Marocchini. Discussion: Mr. Harpie asked about the color. Mr. Arcari replied that it would have a wood look. The motion passed by a vote of 6 YES to 0 NO. The sixth Pending Value Management item was to deduct the vibration and sound packages from the roof top unit curbs, for a credit valued at \$10,429. The HVAC (heating, ventilating and air conditioning) units are internally isolated. Mr. Marocchini made a motion that the Committee accept the deduction of the vibration and sound packages from the roof top unit curbs. A second to the motion was made by Mr. Mortensen. The motion passed by a vote of 6 YES to 0 NO. The next Pending Value Management item was to eliminate the air flow stations at the energy recovery units, valued at a credit of \$13,598. The air flow stations monitor the air flow. Mr. Langdon added that they could be added into the system at a later date. Mr. Mortensen made a motion that the Committee accept the credit

to eliminate the air flow stations at the energy recovery units. A second to the motion was made by Ms. DelBuono. Discussion: Mr. Marocchini clarified that the Town would add the air flow monitors in later, not the Building Committee. The motion passed by a vote of 6 YES to 0 NO. The penultimate Pending Value Management item was to reduce the STC (Sound Transmission Class, which is derived from sound attenuation values) rating, which is the acoustic property of the folding partitions between the Town Council meeting room and the Helen Nelson Room. A reduction in the rating from STC 55 to STC 54 was valued at a credit of \$8,000. The design team also looked at reductions from STC 55 to STC 50, and from STC 50 to STC 45. A one point reduction was determined to be more acceptable than a five point reduction. There is also another meeting room between these two rooms. An STC 55 rating was in the bid. Mr. Marocchini made a motion that the Committee accept the reduction from STC 55 to STC 54 for the folding partitions identified. A second to the motion was made by Mr. Mortensen. The motion passed by a vote of 6 YES to 0 NO. The final Pending Value Management item was the deletion of twelve metal lockers, valued at a savings of \$4,000. These would be in the Community Center shower areas, both men's and women's. They could be done (added back in) later. Mr. Woods reminded the Committee that the goal is to have a functional locker room. He is against taking these out. Although they could be put back in at any time, he was skeptical that the cost to do so would be \$4,000. Mr. Mortensen added that the Building Committee and the Town need to keep in mind what the public using the building will think about not having locker space to put your clothes, etc. It may seem to be a small thing, but it is integral to a locker room. He agreed it should not be eliminated. Mr. Marocchini made a motion that the Committee not accept the deletion of twelve metal lockers from the project. A second to the motion was made by Mr. Mortensen. The motion passed by a vote of 6 YES to 0 NO.

Mr. Romagnoli then identified the cost of each Add Alternate item. Some values changed since the previous meeting. Add Alternate items are not currently in the project budget. Alternate 1, gymnasium expansion, \$413,437; Alternate 2, the basement, \$764,154; Alternate 3, the generator, a complete system, \$231,481; Alternate 4, kitchenettes, \$131,610; Alternate 5, spray foam insulation on the exterior wall, in lieu of batt insulation, \$120,409; Alternate 6, gymnasium equipment, \$174,330; Alternate 7, the Parks and Recreation kitchen, \$155,757; and Alternate 8, roof screens, \$388,525. The Add Alternate items generated extensive discussion by the Committee. Mr. Harpie asked how the gymnasium equipment in the Alternate was disseminated versus the base bid. Mr. Arcari stated that two full size high school courts do fit in the base bid but they are not lined that way. If only the base bid is approved, that will have to be clarified. Mr. Romagnoli, answering Mr. Harpie's question, determined that there were six basketball hoops in the base, and that the Add Alternate would include eight additional basketball hoop assemblies. There was a scoreboard in the base bid, as well as a wrestling component and a shot clock. Locations will have to be clarified. Mr. Harpie stated that regarding the gymnasium bump out, the drive was to improve seating capacity. Mr. Woods added that this was the best option for the Town. Mr. Harpie stated that all these items were important aesthetically. If you could find \$2.4 million, all these items were

important. The Town Manager asked if the police department was included in these figures. Mr. Romagnoli responded that the police department work is in the total GMP (Guaranteed Maximum Price for the project) amount. Mr. Langdon asked if the roof screen could be added in later. Mr. Romagnoli told him that all rough in components were in the Add Alternate number. Mr. Langdon advocated that the roof screen be kept in the project. Mr. Mortensen commented on the elevation of the proposed Town Hall, which will be on a dangerous section of Cedar Street. Without the roof screen, could you see the HVAC equipment from the parking lot? Mr. Arcari responded that it depended on the viewer's perspective. Mr. Langdon told the Committee that the VRF (Variable Refrigerant Flow) units are very tall and industrial looking. As they are part of the steel package, a decision on the roof screens would be needed soon. Mr. Romagnoli informed the Committee where it stood on a final number. With the Committee's votes to eliminate the \$50,000 and \$4,000 credits, the project is now over budget. Mr. Desautel stated that including Add Alternate items would add money to that number. Mr. Harpie stated that the Committee would need the Town Council's approval to exceed the \$28.8 million. He is looking to stay within the referendum amount, but the Committee can make recommendations to include items to make the project functional. It would be fairer to the whole process. He felt that the Building Committee could accept the Add Alternates and they would then go to the Town Council, stating why the Committee thinks they ought to be accepted and the most recent cost. The Town Council could include them or send the project back to the Building Committee. Mr. Marocchini state that the \$28.8million figure is the referendum authorization to borrow money for the project. The Town Council plucked out certain items. This is not a \$28.8 million project. The Committee should suggest Add Alternates to the Town Council that it feels is the right project. Mr. Harpie stated that the Committee should stay within the restrictions of the budget. It can still vote to accept or reject the Add Alternates. He is not purporting to stand in the way. The Committee could identify the Add Alternates that make the project more functional for the Town Council. If you look at the charter, Town Council permission and approval is needed. The Town Manager noted that there is a fatal flaw in this approach. The \$28.8 million doesn't include the basement. Mr. Harpie responded that the Town Council could send the project back to the Committee with authorization. Mr. Murtha stated that everyone knew that \$28.8 million wouldn't be enough money, but \$28.8 million is it.

Mr. Mortensen stated that he would like to hear from Ms. DelBuono, Mayor Zartarian, and the Town Manager. He felt that most of these Add Alternates were imperative for the project. Mr. Harpie read from the Town Charter/Code of Ordinances section on Project Building Committees. He felt the Committee can recommend but can't spend more money than the referendum allows. Mr. Mortensen said he would like other ideas on how the project goes forward. Where would the other money come from to include these imperative items? It is not in the Building Committee's purview, but he would like to know. Town Manager Lane stated that options for funding outside the referendum included the Capital Improvement Plan, incorporating money received from the State grant, and transfers. Ms. DelBuono stated that when the referendum passed, the things that were in the referendum should be included in the \$28.8 million. She wouldn't

vote for things above the \$28.8 million that were in the referendum. Ms. Lane stated that the Town Council may reduce or modify the scope of the project if funds are insufficient. Mr. Marocchini felt that the Committee can present to the Town Council the project that it wants to have. Mr. Harpie suggested that the Committee members run through the Add Alternates and vote on what the Committee wants to include. Mr. Marocchini responded, rather than offering an opinion, why not send all of them to the Town Council? Mr. Harpie replied that everybody has their own opinion. He is not looking to create a problem for the Town Council. The Committee could direct the Construction Manager to prepare a GMP under \$28.8 million and then attach other items that would enhance the project. He wants the process to move forward. Mr. Desautel stated that Downes Construction would provide a GMP that was under budget with an amendment to the GMP for the Add Alternates. The Town Council would decide on the Add Alternates. Downes Construction would then revise the GMP with the Add Alternates that the Town Council elected to adopt. His firm can't write contracts until the Add Alternates are decided. He would to correct a statement made earlier. The Downes Construction budget was within two percent of the bid amount; the estimate was not wrong. Mr. Romagnoli added that Downes Construction will provide a GMP with a transmittal (Exhibit) with the Add Alternates.

Mr. Desautel asked for consensus from the Committee on which Add Alternates it recommends to the Town Council. Mr. Woods felt the Committee should prioritize the Add Alternates. Mr. Harpie agreed. Mr. Woods added that the Committee should have a number to add to the project to make it functional. Mr. Mortensen stated that some members of the public will say that the Committee is spending more, others will see that the Committee did its best to keep the price down. Ms. DelBuono asked what in the original referendum. She did not feel the gym expansion was in the original referendum. Add Alternates 2 (the basement) and 7 (the kitchen in Parks and Recreation) were in the referendum. The Town Manager read the project description from the referendum question brochure. Chairperson Harpie suggested the Committee walk through the Add Alternates and determine their priority listing. No expansion to the gymnasium would make the gym limited as to its functionality. Mr. Marocchini felt that the list as whole is worth doing now. He would like to see all the Add Alternates included. Mr. Mortensen said he was skeptical of some Add Alternates originally. He agrees with the gym bump out and the basement wholeheartedly. Maybe not the kitchenettes. He would pass all the Add Alternates on. Mr. Murtha also said that he likes them all, but then asked where the Committee was going to get the money. Just to assign a number, he couldn't do it. He didn't wish to prioritize. Ms. DelBuono stated that she wouldn't prioritize either. She leaned towards the items that were in the referendum. Maybe not the kitchen items. She won't vote for anything over \$28.8 million. She had a hard time with all of it. Mr. Harpie concluded discussion of the Add Alternate items by stating that in the GMP proposal that Downes Construction presents to the Committee the Add Alternates would be an Exhibit, and that is how it would be transmitted to the Town Council. At the time of the referendum there was no thought of getting reimbursement from the State.

Mr. Romagnoli continued his presentation by discussing the High Risk items. The first item was removal of contaminated soils. There is currently 1,500 tons of contaminated soil in the project cost. It was originally stated at 6,000 tons, then adjusted to 5,000 tons. That is why it is on the High Risk list. Mr. Romagnoli was asked to re-validate if 1,500 tons is too low. Mr. Romagnoli informed the Committee that an Addendum Number 5 had been issued to the trades. We don't know what the number should be. It could be another Add Alternate item. The old Junior High School location has contaminated soil and asbestos containing adhesive tile. It is not part of the mass excavation. Mr. Arcari concluded discussion on this item by stating that it had been discussed at length. We don't know what is there. Some of this is a guess. The project has an Owner's Contingency. Why artificially inflate the total cost of the project? Go in with a lower presumption and then use contingency if necessary. The next High Risk item was acceptance of the basement Add Alternate and potential water table issues. The water table, per the geotechnical report, is at 67 feet; Add Alternate 2 is at an elevation of roughly 64 feet. The remaining High Risk items were the connections of the footing drains to the storm water system by the use of ejector pumps, winter conditions/enclosures, and finalizing the owner soft costs and contingency.

Mr. Romagnoli then spoke about the schedule. The schedule was amended to add the DEEP (Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection) Permit Process and submittal of the Building Permit. The DEEP Permit Application is in process. The waterproofing system will be known when the Town accepts the building project. A sump pump and ejector pit is included in the project. The rest of the schedule stays status quo. As to mobilization, Downes Construction expects to start abatement of the current Town Hall Transition Academy wing on March 27<sup>th</sup>. They need to have fencing and signage up, to have a pre-installation meeting with the Town, and a temporary partition on the Town Hall side to separate the Transition Academy wing. Downes Construction doesn't need the DEEP Permit to begin abatement. The Town Manager stated that the revised safety plan needs to be filed with the fire and police departments at the time of mobilization.

- VI. Any Other Business Pertinent to the Committee – the Committee agreed to meet again on the following Wednesday, February 6th. Mr. Jeff Baron notified the Committee that a purchase order had been issued to the industrial hygienist firm, EnviroMed, out of the soft cost budget, for \$14,960, to cover the hazardous materials testing and inspection of the Transition Academy wing of the current Town Hall.
- VII. Public Participation – Chris Miner, 119 Revere Drive, spoke on funding, the bigger picture and the Add Alternates. John Bachand, 56 Maple Hill Avenue, spoke on funding, the Add Alternate items, and the process.
- VIII. Comments by Committee Members – Responding to Mr. Bachand's letter during the first public participation, Mr. Harpie stated that the Committee did review value engineering items at earlier stages of design. There were changes to the third floor design. All parties came together to move the project forward and to resolve any differences about the third

floor design. Value management has been looked at in detail. The scope of work was looked at by the trades now that the project is in the bid phase. That is what the Committee is receiving from Downes Construction this evening. The design team was also plugged in. He appreciates the comments of Mr. Bachand. There have been efforts by the Town Manager, the Construction Manager, and the design team through the entire process, to be fair.

Following the second public participation, Mr. Harpie stated that he doesn't ever remember Downes Construction telling the Building Committee they couldn't build the building for the referendum amount. Mr. Mortensen concluded by stating that he was leaving the meeting feeling very heartened. He felt that John Bachand hit the nail on the head. All Add Alternates are important to the project. The Committee needs to keep the project going. He is heartened to have Mr. Bachand's support for the Add Alternates. Mr. Mortensen wants the people in Town to say that the Committee did a good job and the building fits what we need.

IX. Adjournment – the meeting adjourned at 7:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

*Jeff Baron*

Jeff Baron,  
Director of Administrative Services

Please read into the record during first round of public participation at the 1/30/2019 town hall project building committee meeting.

John Bachand

56 Maple Hill Ave

Building committee members, thank you for your service. As you are all well aware, I have been critical and skeptical of this project from day one, now we find ourselves at the zero hour and I'm afraid some of which I was concerned about has indeed effected the overall situation. I am not going to rehash the past though. What I am concerned now about, is how you as a committee have been recklessly forced between a rock and a hard place in terms of being pressured into making critical final decisions in a such narrow window of time. In some cases without all the information necessary to make any responsible decision at all, let alone the right one.

I do not know how this meeting will start off, I would suggest strongly the Downes reveals the numbers they have on the total cost of the project with all the Value Added Management items included as originally specified before any of the Value Added Management items discussions takes place. The language in the agenda that refers to draft GMP might mean this is how the meeting will proceed. I hope so, not to do so would be like working in the dark. In fact, in my opinion that's what has been occurring... you should have had those rough numbers right along, at least since the last meeting, so you would understand what you had to work with going into this meeting.

I understand that there is another side to the issue, which says anything that could be saved should be, regardless of the final number. In this case though, without exception, every one of the VAM items is a downgrade of quality from the originally specified, so essentially, we are playing a game of cat and mouse, or Russian roulette if you will.... with the final specs and draft GMP. This is a costly inefficient use of your time, and an unnecessary distraction at such a critical juncture. This does not bode well I'm afraid for the prospects of a favorable outcome on the final product. The idea that you would have all this wrapped up by the next meeting is totally unrealistic, considering you first must address the cumbersome add alternates, with the demanding basement alternate issue alone unfortunately, but rightfully, taking on a life of its own.

So I do not envy you, I think it's unfair that the building committee should find itself in such a tough spot, especially since much the problem can ultimately not be attributed to your committee ...

In closing I am not sure what to recommend, except to warn, as any reasonable person would, about the pitfalls of making important decisions under duress or in haste. I'll say good luck for now, though it almost seems dire.

Regards, John Bachand, 1/30/2019