

Sharon Standing Building Committee

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, March 5, 2024

SSBC Members

Matt Grosshandler, Chair -present	Mike B. Martin-present	Roger Thibault-present
Matt Baldassari, Vice Chair-present	Rick Rice -present	Colleen Tuck -present
Deborah Benjamin-present	Marty Richards -absent	Sara Winthrop -absent
Gordon Gladstone-present		

SSBC Attendees and Others

Julie Rowe – SBC – HS -present	Kevin Nigro – PMA – HS
Meg Dussault - SBC	Matt Gulino – PMA – HS
Emily Burke – Acting HS Principal, SBC	Chris Jankun – PMA
Peter OCain – Town Engineer	Chris Carroll – PMA
Tony Kopacz – SPS – HS	Eric Lowther – PMA
Timothy Chouinard – DPW & WTP Alt.	Chris Sharkey – Tappe – HS
Eric Hooper – Superintendent of DPW & WTP-present	Chris Blessen – Tappe – HS -present
Carolyn Weeks –LBC	Tim Ericson – Consigli – HS
Cheryl Weinstein – Lib joined at 6:47 PM	Chandler Rudert – Consigli –HS
LeeAnn Amend – Lib-present	Kyle Raposo – Consigli – HS
R. Drayton Fair – LLB – Lib	Mike Winters – Consigli – HS
Brian Valentine – LLB – Lib-present	Ryan O’Neil – Consigli
Ariana Pizzanelli LLB - Lib	Kristy Lyons – Consigli – HS
Mark Luzaitis CHA On-site rep CHA. - Lib	Jonathan Seibel – Consigli – HS-present
Casey Hochheimer -CHA – Lib	Allie Goldberg, Margaret McCarthy W&S -WTP-present
Joe Sullivan - CHA- Lib	Margaret McCarthy - W&S -WTP
Karl Walsh – MOCC – Lib	Alston Potts - Environmental Partners- WTP
Krystal Burrows – MOCC - Lib	Adam Kran - Environmental Partners- WTP
John Freer – MOCC - Lib	David Hurley, CHA, Project Manager -present-present
Chris Pimentel – Fin/Com LIB rep	Rob Terpstra – WTP – DPW Water Div. Sup. -present
Will Van Beckum- HS - Photography teacher	Kevin Weber – DPW -present

Open the meeting

The Chair noted that the meeting was being held remotely consistent with MA laws. There will be no public comment this evening. The meeting opened at 6:34 PM.

A. Administration

1. Minutes for review and approval from February 20, 2024 SSBC meeting. (Richards, Marin, Grosshandler were not present).

MOTION by Mr. Rice to approve the minutes of the February 20, 2024 meeting. Seconded by Ms. Tuck. Approved 6-0-2 (Tuck, Baldassari, Benjamin, Rice, Thibault, Gladstone—Aye; Martin, Grosshandler – Abstain).

2. Clarification in approved minutes from February 9, 2024 SSBC meeting.

Consider text below per Mr. Gladstone who finds the italicized phrases confusing and would find it clearer if in both instances the wording should stop after "...different on each project" since the five-person subcommittee is already defined as including the relevant architect:

- “1. The CO Subcommittee shall consist of a minimum of five (5) Members
2. If the SSBC is supervising one project, the committee will consist of the Representative, the Alternate [to that project], two "at large" Members of the SSBC and the appropriate project Architect
3. If the SSBC is supervising two projects, then the committee shall consist of both Representatives (one from each respective project), both Alternates one from each respective project), and the appropriate project Architect (*Note: the five-person subcommittee would be different on each project, ~~whereas the relevant architect would only have a seat on that specific project~~*)
4. If the SSBC is supervising three or more projects, then the committee shall consist of each Representative (one from each respective project), some assemblance of Alternates (to a maximum of four SSBC members) and the appropriate project Architect (*Note: the five-person subcommittee would be different on each project, ~~whereas the relevant architect would only have a seat on that specific project~~*)
5. An architect can serve on the committee only with respect to the project with which they are engaged.
6. The CO Subcommittee shall elect a chairperson who shall be responsible for scheduling, opening and closing meetings, and calling the roll for roll call votes.”

Mr. Grosshandler read the clarification into the record for amendment and incorporation into the meeting minutes.

MOTION: by Mr. Rice to strike text after the word project to include “, whereas the relevant architect would only have a seat on that specific project”. Seconded by Benjamin. Approved 7-0-1((Tuck, Baldassari, Benjamin, Rice, Thibault, Martin, Grosshandler – Aye; Gladstone abstained).

B. Library Project

1. Project Schedule Update
 - Progress since last meeting
 - Steel framing in progress
 - 1st level supports and beams (east)
 - 1st level decking
 - 2nd level supports and beams (east)
 - 2nd level decking
 - Initial steel inspection
 - Upcoming activities/milestones
 - Structural steel deliveries
 - Steel framing
 - Steel detailing
 - Deck installation
 - Steel inspections
2. Topping Off Beam signature campaign will not include a ceremony, but 8’ beam will be delivered to old library for signing. Exact dates are not yet known but will be communicated. Beam will be located in the lower community room in the Library during Library hours.
3. PCCO #1 Discussion
 - PCO 003, PCO 006, PCO 008, PCO 009, PCO 013

Chair confirmed with Mr. Hurley that CHA and LLB reviewed and endorsed these PCCOs prior to presenting them to the CO Subcommittee and recommended approval. Details of the items listed on the PCOs provided.

Mr. Hurley explained the specifics of each PCCO. This included Rework of excavated footing grade on Grid Line 4, Plumbing Revisions, 3rd Party PLS Base Control Cost, Adjustment to Contract Time due to inclement weather during December 2023 and another for Adjustment of Contract time due to inclement weather during January 2024. Total 56,293.44

MOTION by Mr. Gladstone to approve PCCO #1 in the total amount of \$56,293.44. Seconded by Tuck. Unanimously approved 8-0-0 (Gladstone, Martin, Baldassari, Rice, Thibault, Tuck, Grosshandler, Benjamin). Weinstein, Richards, Winthrop not present.

Mr. Martin asked what the Eversource work order number was. Where does it stand in the process? Underground transformer or pad mount?

Steel expected to be completed in the third week of April 2024 including the steel deck per Mr. Hurley.

- Project Budget Update --Budget remains on target

C. High School Project – 6:47 PM

Mr. Nigro reported that lots of work was completed over the February school break. There will be a new list of what remains distributed.

Project Updates:

1) GMP Summary

a) Preconstruction Amount	\$431,885	
b) GMP Amendment #1 Amount	\$5,759,799	
c) GMP Amendment #2 Amount	\$16,835,409	
d) GMP Amendment #3 Amount (Pending)	\$98,517,546	
e) Total GMP Amount	\$121,544,639	
f) Approved Change Orders	\$3,065,826	(CO 1-45) (2.41%)
g) Current GMP Amount	\$124,062,949	

2) Change Orders Not Approved

a) Tentatively Approved	\$0	(Recommended by SSBC Change Com.)
b) Submitted Changes	\$304,875	(Under review by the Team)
c) Potential Changes	\$124,820	(Not yet submitted)
d) Total Not Approved	\$429,695	(sum of b & c)
e) Total Potential Changes (incl. tent. approved)	\$429,695	(sum of a, b & c; 0.039% of GMP)

3) CM Contingency

a) Beginning Amount	\$2,099,210	
b) Amount from Savings from Buyout	\$524,800	(Max. Per Contract)
c) Current Amount	\$2,624,010	
d) Requests Against Contingency		
i) Approved	\$1,706,555	
ii) Tentatively Approved	\$0	(Approved by the Team)

iii) Pending	\$232,164	(Potential & Submitted)
iv) Total Transfers	\$1,938,719	(92% of Starting Amount)
e) Current Anticipated Balance	\$685,291	(26.1% Remaining)

4) Allowances

f) Beginning Amount	\$2,040,000	
g) Amount from Savings from Buyout	\$1,573,446	(Note \$204,112 to Temp Gen Allowance)
h) Current Amount	\$3,613,446	
i) Requests Against Allowances		
i) Approved	\$837,187	
ii) Tentatively Approved	\$0	(Approved by the Team)
iii) Pending	\$15,921	(Potential & Submitted)
iv) Total Transfers	\$853,108	(43% of Starting Amount)
j) Current Anticipated Balance	\$2,760,338	(135% Remaining)

Allowances looked like \$2.7M will come back to the Town per Mr. Rudert.

5) Requisitions (thru Req 45 for Jan 2024)

a) Total Completed to Date	\$119,276,564	(95.7%)
b) Retainage Withheld	\$608,165	(-)
c) Total Due to Date	\$118,558,552	
d) Total Paid to Date	\$117,793,182	
e) Total Current Payment Request	\$109,846	(Pencil Req #45)

6) Schedule

- a. Cross Walk Pedestals have been installed – per CCD 054 on 3/4/24. Awaiting the newer wiring to complete the installation.
- b. Generator installed week of 2/20. Remaining wiring still needs to be pulled to generator.
- c. Millwork change work @ cafeteria scheduled for second shift this week.

2. Punchlist

- a. 26 Punch List Items
 - i. Remaining Items to be addressed during first week of the planting season.

True punchlist left is landscaping and exterior. Will mobilize in mid-April to complete the work.

Blower door test was favorable. Exceeded standards but not the original ambitious goal. Changes in place for blower test have been reversed, any issues were resolved and the school is back to condition prior to the test.

Mr. Nigro asked about spring work with Vinagro. There is a section of drain line that collapsed near the softball field. Will also make some changes related to drainage.

7) Milestone Tracking

MILESTONE	ORIGINAL DATE	ANTICIPATED/ACTUAL	CFB	CFP
Complete Foundations	4/20/2021	4/30/2021	-10	0
Structural Steel Complete	7/20/2021	7/21/2021	-1	0
Building Weathertight	11/1/2021	11/19/2021	-18	0
Substantial Completion (Building)	6/29/2022	8/25/2022	-53	0
Substantial Completion (phase 3)	8/1/2023	8/25/2023	0	0

8) Items to Review

1. Change Orders and School Requests
 - a. CR355 Dark Room cooling pricing update

Dark Room was included as part of project and space is fed by a large exhaust fan that pulls a lot of air out. The make-up air unit for this space was designed with a heating coil, but not a cooling coil. So, temps in dark room in warmer weather (September, May, June) reach the upper 90s. Prices here are to install inline cooling unit.

Two dark room classes offered along with the digital classes per Mr. Will Van Beckum, SHS Art Teacher,

Mr. Grosshandler gathers that there is a sizeable exhaust system, so make-up air needs to be cooled to balance the room. Mr. Rice wondered if instead of 100% of supply from make-up air unit can air be pulled from a space?

Mr. Blessen said the Mechanical team put together this proposal. Member wondered now that the cost is known is there an alternative that may only approach the shoulder season:

What about a spot cooler? It will compete with the hot air coming in and not able to compete with the difference in air temps and amount of air. Can there be an on/off switch so that it will not always be on? Architect suggested occupancy rather than on/off would be better. Look at fan controls to be able to dial back the operation. Is there another way to add cooling?

Member asked whether any other high schools providing darkroom services like this. Not sure we can recommend that we spend the money here. Architect said no regarding other dark rooms in other new HS projects they have built, adding this is the only one to survive the build design process.

Member said it is not a question of A/C in darkrooms it is whether they have an occupiable dark room, and this one is not currently occupiable.

Our job is not to establish the program but to make sure SSBC enforces the program that the proponent has selected in the most durable, cost effective, fiscally responsible way possible. If we were to say a dark room was not necessary, that was 4-5 years ago and not in hindsight now. SSBC can look for fiscally prudent ways but does not have authority to eliminate the dark room per the chair's view.

Mr. Gladstone expressed being appalled at the price tag for the retrofit needed for the dark room and added that he was not sure \$168K change order falls under fiduciary responsibility on one side or the other. Mr. Gladstone does think it is appropriate to raise the question of whether SSBC members as representatives of the Town should recommend investing the \$168k in this kind of a venture.

Ms. Rowe, School Committee Rep. to the SSBC, said the photography and digital photography are some of the most popular art classes. Ms. Rowe is very sensitive to the extra costs, but she hoped we could find something to keep this going and stated several reasons why.

Mr. Rudert is not sure why the cooling element did not make it into the documents. His guess is it was a cost-saving measure because a make-up air unit does require a large cooling demand as compared to other buildings. Mr. Rudert is not sure if it was value engineered out, an oversight while sizing cooling equipment for the building, or something that was discussed at the time. Mr. Blessen asked engineer that question today and engineer said they do not often do cooling in

spaces like these when they build schools. Up until a few years ago cooling or not cooling was a question mark for schools. Architect guessed that they may not have had a history of building dark rooms, so cooling may have been an oversight.

Mr. Grosshandler wondered if this would end up being a summer project and be implemented next year? Unlikely to schedule over April vacation per Mr. Rudert, so a summer activity to work on regular schedule hours.

Chair asked for options to be considered and to have a plan by Fall 2024.

A good number of students per Mr. Van Beckum have a hard time with the technology that is in front of them every day. This course gives them a break and a hands-on experience from an educational standpoint.

Mr. Blessen will look into next steps and report back to the committee.

D. DPW – Water Treatment Project – 7:29 PM

1. Summary of 100% Design Review meeting held on 02/29/24
 - Reviewed Scope and Process related equipment.
 - Reviewed pilot program for PFAS program
2. Prequalification Schedule
 - Contractor list of SOQs Received

Task	Date
SOQs due at Town Hall	Thursday, 02/29/24, 11am
Evaluation Subcommittee Kick-off Meeting	Wednesday, 03/06/24, 11am – Eval Subcommittee Meeting
Finalize Scoring	Friday, 03/15/24, 11am - OAC meeting
Present Scores to SSBC	Tuesday, 03/19/24 - SSBC meeting

Mr. Hooper updated the committee regarding the first ZBA meeting. Neighbor's chief concerns were screening and safety during construction period. Safety on Tree Lane was one item discussed. Plantings/screening were covered too. ZBA meeting on 3/20 to present what Mr. Hooper expects will work.

3. Summary of Project Funding

Funding Sources	
Funding Source	Value
EPA	\$3,452,972.00
SRF (IUP 2023)	\$15,000,000.00
SRF (IUP 2024)	\$10,000,000.00
ARPA*	\$5,543,483.00
Totals	\$33,996,455.00
Estimated Construction Costs	

Contract #1 - Off-Site Water Mains	\$4,527,225.00
Contract #2 - Treatment Building	\$23,717,087.00
Totals	\$28,244,312.00
W&S OPM Contract Value	\$ 996,000.00
EP CA Contract Value**	TBD

*ARPA – money shown is the originally available value. This has been modified but unclear on final value. Should have more information in upcoming months.

** Woodard & Curran integration contract will be under Environmental Partners CA contract. EP Contract is currently being drafted.

Regarding funding sources, Mr. Hooper anticipated a reallocation of ARPA (grant) monies to increase Sharon when other Towns are not able to complete the requirements to receive their money. SRF are loans at 0% not grants. Request for Ms. Goldberg to make the table a bit clearer and then show a line of the cost to the Town. EPA money is a grant. A line that says cost to Sharon would make this clearer.

Chair requested soft costs – design team, police detail, etc. -- because there is a bigger budget, be earmarked here too. Chair would like more comprehensive sources and uses, contingencies, line items.

Ms. Goldberg will talk to EP and clarify sources and uses included in what is committed and what is allowances along with contingencies and line items per Chair. Mr. Hooper noted that they can charge the water mains and bill to SRF for a loan at 0%, rather than town bond via Water Department.

Mr. Thibault requested a second table, a total project cost table.

Mr. Rice mentioned that mitigation discussions with neighbors and point of contact concerns should roll into the bid documents. And also, people need to know who to call if there is a problem and that has usually been OPM in a 149 project. Conservation agent has been available to discuss plantings and screenings, but neighbors are going to need to know whom to call. Front-end discussions need to roll into the project contracts, be direct on what will and will not be included in the project. Off-site mitigation can be really challenging for a town, legal ramifications.

Member asked about follow-up on LLB architect voting at CO meetings. Chair said where subcommittee does not vote to approve but rather to endorse a change order to the SSBC, and it is in their role to provide feedback on proposed change orders, that role is consistent with both their contract and in good standing with effects associated with them.

E. Topics the Chair would like to discuss not known 48 hours in advance

F. Adjournment

MOTION: absent any objection the chair assumed unanimous consent to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 7:56 PM.