

**Town of Watertown School
Building Committee
Three Elementary School Projects
Wednesday, September 21, 2022
via ZOOM 6:00p.m. – 7:00p.m.**

M I N U T E S

Committee Members Present: Mark Sideris (chair), John Portz (vice-chair), Vincent Piccirilli Heidi Perkins, Deanne Galdston, Kelly Kurlbaum, Lindsay Mosca, Steve Magoon, Paul Anastasi, James Kane, and Tom Tracy

Committee Members Absent: Leo Patterson

Others Present: Daren Sawyer, James Jordan, Andrew Cunneen and Nate Williams (Ai3 Architects); Vivian Varbedian, Thomas Finnegan, and Alana Forbes (OPM, Hill International), Christy Murphy and Timothy Bonfatti (Compass Project Management), Stacey Phelan

1. Call to Order: Chairman Mark Sideris called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. John Portz took a roll call of School Building Committee members present.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes – September 21, 2022

Chairman Sideris made a motion to approve the Elementary Meeting Minutes for August 17, 2022. Vincent Piccirilli motions to approve the Elementary school meeting minutes as written and John Portz seconded. All were in favor on a roll call vote.

3. Review / Approval of Elementary Schools Monthly Invoices, Ai3 Architects Amendment No. 9 & 10 and Lowell Change Order No.3

Vivian Varbedian presented and reviewed the Elementary schools August invoices.

August 2022 invoices are as follows w/total at \$2,972,417.84:

- Hill International – \$90,210.00
- Ai3 Architects (Basic Services) - \$37,140.46
- Ai3 Architects – (Extra Services) - \$4,155.78
- Ai3 Architects (Reimbursables Services) - \$60.00
- Brait Builders (Payment Req # 27) – \$504,009.44
- CTA Construction Managers (Payment Req #6) - \$2,304,309.26
- Ridgeline Energy Analytics - \$665.00
- UTS Invoices - \$7,993.75
- FF&E Invoices - \$18,734.23
- Colliers International - \$5,139.92

Chairman Sideris made a motion to approve the Elementary School projects invoices. Vincent Piccirilli motions to approve the Elementary school project invoices totally \$2,972,417.84. Steve Magoon seconded. All were in favor on a roll call vote.

Ai3 Architects Amendment No. 9 & 10 – Lowell Elementary School

Vivian Varbedian presented and reviewed Ai3 Architects amendments No. 9 and 10. The request for approval of Amendment No. 9 is for Ai3 Architect additional Civil Engineering services and related to fees for the Lowell Elementary based on request from DPW. Approval is to amend Ai3 Architect's contract by \$49,390.00.

Also, request the approval of Amendment No.10 for Ai3 Architect for additional structural engineering services and related fees for unforeseen structural concerns at the existing portion of the Lowell Elementary School.

Approval is to amend Ai3 Architect's contract by \$16,500.00.

The total approval to amend Ai3 Architect's contract is \$65,890.00.

Chairman Sideris wanted to motion the amendments separately. Chairman Sideris made a motion to approve Amendment No. 9. Vincent Piccirilli moves with John Portz and Tom Tracy seconded.

Chairman Sideris made a motion to approve Amendment No. 10. Vincent Piccirilli moves with Tom Tracy seconded. All were in favor on a roll call vote.

Change Order No. 3 – Lowell Elementary School

Vivian Varbedian presented and reviewed Lowell Elementary school Change Order No.3. There are a number of change orders items on the list. The total for Change Order No.3 is \$625,848.69. Thomas Finnegan highlighted on some of the change order items. The amendment on the drainage was design work after the bid time request by DPW which includes (3) PCOs which was broken into (3) areas. The areas are in front of the school on the hill, the tree trenches and several structures were added on the Lowell Street for additional drainage. These are PCO numbers 29 (Drainage Modification), 56R1 (Drainage Modifications – Water Quality Unit) and 71 (Drainage Modifications -Tree Trenches). A couple other PCOs such as 26R3 (Existing Underground Sanitary & Rain Leader Scoped Pipe Zone 1 & 2) under slab drainage piping had to be replaced. All underground piping per the specifications. The plumber had to go through and camera all the underground piping within the existing structure to make sure it was in good working order. Next, is the sub-flooring which is PCO# 40R2 (2nd Floor Existing Floor Substrate Build Up). This is to restore the sub-flooring before any flooring is done on the floors. The asbestos abatement was done on all the flooring. One layer of the sub-floors was ripped up and go back to place a new sub-layer that was clean. Vivian Varbedian stated that this is a cost to remove the 2nd floor. Another PCO for the 1st floor is being vented to hopefully present next month.

Chairman Sideris made a motion to approve Change Order No.3. Tom Tracy moved with Steve Magoon seconded.

4. Executive Summary

Vivian Varbedian reviewed and presented the Executive Summary highlights for August 2022.

Cunniff Elementary school, the General contractor is currently working on landscape warranty items.

Regrading, loaming, and seeding is being done to the grass areas. Also, replacement of dead trees and plantings. Regarding collaboration and coordination with DPW on Warren Street, repaving is happening on one crosswalk with line painting the crosswalk on Warren Street as well.

Hosmer Elementary school, the playground area, the concrete sidewalks, and curbs are being worked on as well as the install of the playground equipment. The ballfields (pending approval of PCOs) drainage system will begin work as well as relocating the drainage for PV foundations.

Lowell Elementary school currently placing the concrete floors in Zone 2 addition. Also, start masonry bearing walls in Zone 1 addition. Removing windows in Zone 1, repairing sub-floors on Level 2, Zone 1, replacing roofing in Zone 1 and mechanical, electrical, plumbing and fire protection work is ongoing.

5. Elementary School Questions / Comments

Question 1 – Kelly Kurlbaum asked Tom Tracy if the amendments were vented against the project budget and if we are covered for what is in contingency due to other budget constraints?

Response – Tom Tracy stated "Yes".

Question 2 – Lindsay Mosca asked if the amendments were just for design features. Will this also result in

a bigger construction ask down the road for something else that needs to be done? What is this going to entail after design piece is done?

Response – Vivian Varbedian stated for the Lowell Elementary school that on the Amendments that these were request made during reviews and discussions with DPW that were necessary for the project. Yes, it might drive to additional construction related cost but not one that wasn't already anticipated or expected within the project budget. The 2nd item is for the unforeseen structural concerns that were found as it is expected with a renovation project versus a new build. This leads to some of the cost associated with it in construction as well as holding a higher amount for the Lowell Elementary school versus the Hosmer/Cunniff Elementary school considering those to be brand new construction.

Question 3 – Paul Anastasi asked if they would see the construction cost that Lindsay Mosca is asking about in the Change Order that we will see in the near future.

Response – Vivian Varbedian stated “Yes”. It can be highlighted when the time comes. As we have done in the past, change orders are typically reviewed and provided with a cover sheet. Sometimes the back-up is too large to place on the website. A link has been provided for today's presentation. All the presentation will have what the change order entails.

Question 4 – Kelly Kurlbaum had a couple questions that she wanted to ask. One is if any of the surveys of the existing conditions of the piping with cameras was done during the pre-construction phase? Also, did we not know that there were back pitch issues early on? Also, if there have been substantial landscaping revisions to cause the three PCOs resulting in a higher cost that is seen in these change orders? If the design hasn't change, why are making drainage modifications? Lastly, where is our bottom line? At the end of the day understanding what this cost is because a lot of this is not errors and omissions, it is owners adds. This is substantial. Did the Civil Engineer agree with all those recommendations? Kelly Kurlbaum mentioned to Vivian Varbedian that we should prepare for some very large change orders and seeing where we are in the project and what is ahead of us, do you feel comfortable that we have enough money left in those buckets to cover future unforeseen conditions.

Response - Thomas Finnegan stated “Yes” that the surveys were done. He informed Kelly that it wasn't done during the design phase or design development phase. It was done when the contractor came onboard. It was expected that when the fire sub-plumbing contractor would have to do that ahead of time. Thomas Finnegan explained that the design did change. This project was designed the same time as Hosmer and Cunniff Elementary school. The project was shelved then put back out to bid. It was then reviewed after the bid date with DPW. There may have been changes in regulations. Vertex had to do a thorough review of all the Civil drawings and make the necessary changes moving forward. Kelly Kurlbaum thinks that it sounds like a escalation cost issue and not a design change issue. Vivian Varbedian states that it is a little bit of both only because there are some escalations parts to it because the project had been shelved. Some of it is requirements that modifications had to be made to it. With DPW new leadership and having a different perspective looking at the drawings and what is required of them as a standard to make the modifications to meet which does become a change in design. Kelly Kurlbaum is highly scrutinizing these numbers and does not want to fall out with DPW but how much of this is nice to have because DPW knows that we will cover the cost. Have we scrutinized this number? Six hundred thousand dollar change order is not small. Vivian Varbedian agreed with Kelly Kurlbaum that it is substantial especially coming off Hosmer and Cunniff Elementary school where some of the change orders were a lot smaller given the fact that they are brand new construction. We have anticipated change orders of this magnitude since Lowell Elementary school project is a renovation. Agreed, some of it are a little bit of adds due to modifications and design based on conversations and review with DPW. For example, PCO #40R2 was completely an unforeseen, the sub-floors which is one of the larger numbers on this change order. Kelly Kurlbaum was a little frustrated that DPW was involved early then the rules change. Chairman Sideris states that there is a new DPW Superintendent, and his review of the plans didn't meet his view of what needs to be there. Steve Magoon stated to more of Kelly's point that these were niceties that DPW

just needed to be done. They had some legitimate concerns about the storm water and asked some valid questions which resulted in Ai3 Architects having to do some additional designs. In this case, Steve Magoon doesn't believe the Civil Engineer said, "You don't really have to do that". This wasn't the case at all with Lowell ES. How much of that is change in ordinance requirements and new DPW Superintendent versus what was assumed. He believes there is a legitimate conversation about some of those aspects, but he is comfortable going forward with this and thinks what DPW ask for is appropriate. Vivian Varbedian states for example with Hosmer and Cunniff Elementary School, there was a hold closer to a 3% change order contingency given the fact that these were new construction projects. The Lowell project, we anticipated a higher change order rate knowing that it is a renovation and knowing the age of the building, we anticipated and held 10% construction contingency.

Question 5 – Steve Magoon asked about the ballfields at Hosmer Elementary school. He is surprised that this is still pending. He thought that the design question on the drainage for the ballfields was moved forward. What is still pending? Part of the reason I raise this as a concern is because when we were discussing the design and the emphasizes, we are putting on a timely response from the city regarding the need to get the sod planted in order to get it growing before the winter months, we resolved it. If we are waiting on a PCO, we clearly will not make this growing season for the fall for the grass. This is not good, and I am not sure what the answer is.

Response – Vivian Varbedian stated that the design of the ballfield is but there is still a cost implication as far as the construction and that is one that we will bring forward for approval. We have been meeting with Brait Builders (Hosmer General Contractor) as well as WL French working on getting the information. This has not come on a timely manner to present at tonight's meeting for that reason it was not part of tonight's change order. Thomas Finnegan explained that the ballfield drainage PCO was vented this week and signed off from Vertex and Traverse with Tom's review. He believes it is ready to go. Brait Builders and WL French will move forward on it fairly quickly maybe as early as next week on some direction from the construction team and follow up with the change order. The other item is the added PV Foundation. We have to relocate drainage piping that was already installed previously by the parking lot. It has been a difficult time negotiating that PCO with WL French and Brait Builders. It has been to the point, that a CCD (Construction Change Directive) was issues yesterday directing to do it on time and material. This work should also start next week. Within a week, you should see some activity on both the ballfield and where the new additional PVs are going along the Boylston Street parking lot. The intent is still to get the sod in this year. It will be tight, agreed but the intent is to still get it done. Chairman Sideris states if this is something that needs approval of this committee, he can schedule a meeting anytime next week if need be because to Steve Magoon point, we are counting on this being down and ready so it can rest. He will talk to Vivian Varbedian as we move forward as everyone understand this is a priority. Vivian Varbedian states that most likely the 1st week of October when the High School has their primary SBC meeting maybe we can join them to bring forward one or two change orders that need to get approved.

6. Sustainability Subcommittee Update

John Protz informed all that most of the time for the Sustainability meeting was spent on the High School. Regarding Lowell Elementary school, drawings of the Solar Arrays were looked at but didn't have enough discussion on it because it was at the end of the meeting. It is on track on what was proposed.

7. End of Elementary School Project Business Meeting

Chairman Sideris ended the Elementary School Project Business meeting at 6:34 pm.