



Project: Kate Furbish Elementary School

Date: May 13, 2020

Attendees: Sarah Singer, William Thompson, Jeanne Doughty, Arthur Pierce, Philip Dionne, Kelly Wentworth, Paul Perzanoski, Steve Ciembroniewicz, Nathan Hintze, Mandy Merrill, Matthew Pitzer (CHA Architecture) and Ben Winschel (CHA Architecture).

Purpose: Building Committee Meeting

These notes were taken by Ben Winschel to the best of his ability. If there are any oversights, please notify CHA Architecture within three (3) working days.

Topic	Agenda/Notes	Action
	1. The Building Committee meeting was called to order by the Chair at 5:06 PM.	
	2. Minutes from the February meeting were accepted.	
Construction Update	3. Matt gave an update on the construction progress. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Most of the subcontractors have concluded their work at this time. b. Roofers are working on detailing work including drip edges and misc. roof metal. c. Corrugated metal panels and fiber cement panels are mostly complete except for a few small areas. d. Masonry is complete. e. Site contractor has not remobilized yet after demobilizing in the fall. They are expected to be back on site soon. f. Sheet flooring is being installed in the main corridors. Carpet installation remains. g. Painting and ceilings are in progress. h. Mechanical and electrical start up is in progress. i. Misc. items such as the operable partition, stage curtains, OT/PT swing support, etc. remain. Mostly one-off items which are delayed due to out of state vendors and COVID. j. Matt walked through photos of the construction progress and gave an update on the recent tour. 	

<p>Payment Req.</p>	<p>4. Payment requisition update for Feb, March and April.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. February requisition was \$990,730.14. 85.68% complete. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Change order #10 was processed with a value of \$17,684.22. b. March requisition was \$650,718.60. 88.93% complete. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Change order 11 was processed with a value of \$1,056.64. c. April requisition was \$611,976.94. 91.66% complete. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Change order 12 was processed with a value of \$34,546.00. 	
	<p>5. Proposed change orders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. There are currently 10 open PCOs with a combined total value of approx. \$15,000. b. In addition to the 10 PCOs above there is a PCO for \$44,000 associated with the Discovery Classroom. This includes utility work that would be executed by the current site contractor and run to the location of the classroom. Intent is to install any utilities under paving to avoid rework later. The proposed price is approx. 3X what would be expected for this scope of work. c. CHA received an estimate for the generator pricing at \$179,140.84. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sarah expressed that the estimate is significantly higher than what was installed at HBS and asked whether this is due to it being an automatic generator. ii. Matt explained that the generator installed at HBS was approx. \$50-60k and is also a gas generator. The HBS generator does not have the automatic switch gear that this generator would have. The pricing for this generator also includes a transformer. The electrical subcontractor's markup and Ledgewood's markup account for approx. \$30-40k of the proposed cost. iii. Phil recommended that we do not accept the PCO for the generator and proceed with the building as currently designed with a manual hookup for a portable generator. iv. Some discussion occurred amongst committee members around whether the cost of the generator was worth the investment. v. The committee unanimously voted to not proceed with the generator. vi. Matt and Scott to work with electrical engineer on alternative options for a generator. 	

	<p>d. Remaining contingency is \$509,201. This is before any of the items listed above.</p>	
	<p>6. Kelly Wentworth gave an update on the project budget.</p>	
<p>Commissioning Agent Selection</p>	<p>7. Matt presented the four proposals (CHA, Cx, RFS, Sparhawk) that were received for the commissioning agent and explained the services that they will be providing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. They will be present for testing and balancing of the systems and will monitor the building systems over the course of 1 year. b. The generator was part of the commissioning proposal, so CHA will need to investigate what the savings would be without that included. c. Cx Associates were the lowest proposal and were selected. 	
<p>AV Proposals</p>	<p>8. Matt presented the three proposals that were received from ProAV, Connectivity Point and Headlight.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The lowest bid is from ProAV at \$307,779. The budget for the AV system is \$292,368. Savings were seen in other areas of the technology budget, so we are still on budget for that line item. CHA would recommend ProAV based on recommendations given by the school's technology consultant, John Tabb. b. A vote was taken to approve the bid. There was unanimous approval to accept ProAv's bid. 	
<p>Playground Bids</p>	<p>9. Bids were presented by the playground committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 3 bids were received for the playground (Three Stone, Linkel, and Seabreeze). Three Stone Landscape LLC was the apparent low bidder at 242,169. They came highly recommended by Sashie. Playground committee will work to resolve the budget discrepancies. b. Phil believes that the bid should not be accepted given the substantial difference in the prices presented. c. Sean explained that Sashie has worked with all three of the landscaping companies. The price difference likely comes from varying comfort levels with natural playscapes and the cost for installation of equipment. d. Jean made a motion to accept the bid. The vote was tied and therefore was not accepted. 	
<p>Discovery Classroom Bids</p>	<p>10. Matt presented the bids for the Discovery Classroom.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Bids were received approx. 3 weeks ago, and 5 contractors bid the project. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Doten's Construction came in with the lowest bid at \$445,000. c. CHA has been in conversation with Doten's on whether the project can be value engineered to come in on budget. Matt noted that this could also potentially include the \$44,000 for the civil work that would be added into Ledgewood's scope. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. One of the biggest ways to save cost would be to remove the bathroom. This has a potential impact of \$30,000. This estimate does not include the utility work that would be removed that is associated with the bathroom. Savings could also be achieved through revising the siding material and removing the glass film. ii. Jean felt that a bathroom in this space is critical and would negatively impact the use of the space if it was removed. iii. Phil feels that it has been under budget since the start, and more funding is required to complete the project. iv. The committee in general feels that the bathroom is necessary, and they are not willing to remove it. v. Phil recommends that the committee acts quickly on this since the site contractor will be starting this work soon. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Billy motioned to move forward with the plumbing through Ledgewood. Unanimous approval from the committee. 	
<p>Monument Sign</p>	<p>11. Matt presented CHA's recommendation for the new location of the monument sign.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The sign was previously located at the new bus entry, and this sign has been removed from the project as it previously existed. b. CHA feels strongly that the monument sign should be placed at the end of Charles Court at the parent drop off. c. Art asked whether there was another purpose allocated for that space. Matt explained that this was originally planned for snow retention and will work with the civil engineer on an alternative location for snow retention. d. Billy asked whether the sign is visible from Jordan Avenue. Matt does not believe it would be. e. Committee members expressed unanimous support for locating the sign at the end of Charles Court. 	

Subcommittee Reports	12. The subcommittees had not met, and no reports were given.	
Next Meeting	13. A date was not set for the next building committee meeting.	
	14. Meeting adjourned at 6:35 pm.	