

PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE

Minutes – August 27, 2020

Present: Co-Chairs Michael Melnick and Elaine Jones, Craig Blake, Jennifer Pincus, and Nancy Rubenstein.. Also present: Select Board members Janie Dretler and William Schineller and Facilities Director William Barletta.

The ZOOM meeting hosted by Facilities Director William Barletta was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Co-Chair Elaine Jones. At the suggestion of PBC Liaison William Schneller that the meeting should be recorded and later shown on Sudbury TV, it was determined that the majority of members were in agreement that the meeting would be recorded.

Fairbank Community Center Project Speaking on behalf of the Permanent Building Committee (PBC), Mr. Blake prefaced the discussion praising the scope as a cooperative effort for which the Committee has no issues, further stating that the goal of the PBC is to try and determine to the best of the Committee's ability that the presented project construction budget is adequate to allow the project to be constructed as developed during the Feasibility Study completed by ICON.

In that regard, Mr. Blake presented three possible scenarios: 1) that the project, equal in scope to the Feasibility Study conceptual design, is designed and constructed under budget and on time; 2) it becomes evident that the design, resulting from a collaborative effort between the OPM, the Architect, the three user groups, and the Board of Selectmen, can't be constructed for the approved budget without asking for additional funds; or 3) obtain an agreement from all stakeholders to reduce the scope of the project from what was presented in the Feasibility Study in order to meet the Town approved budget. Mr. Blake expressed the hope that enough funds are available for contingencies.

Ms. Jones presented Mr. Shah's (PBC member) comments as he was unable to be present: "My concern is how this project is being presented at town meeting. It seems to promise a fixed project scope and building size for a fixed budget without making it clear that it is too early in conceptual pre-design to promise both. I think the town should either (a) vote on the budget while agreeing to flexibility in the scope and size of the project or (b) vote on the scope and size of the project with flexibility in the budget."

It was noted that the ICON feasibility study does not equate with a comprehensive design but rather is a consensus in program needs. In that context, Mr. Kraemer added that the site survey and soil testing have not taken place. Facilities Director Barletta expressed his opinion that the project represents a feasible size and is achievable. Mr. Barletta noted, and the group agreed, that the budget was developed by an independent estimator who is well regarded and experienced and who provided the Town the construction cost estimate for the Loring Parsonage Renovation project. Ms. Pincus added that the estimator has a good track record, but the estimate is based on square footage with costs similar to other towns based on blocking diagrams. Mr. Kraemer added that in his opinion the \$525/sq.ft. utilized for a large portion of the project was appropriate given the contingencies and COVID-19 considerations.

Mr. Blake led the ensuing discussion by means of budget evaluation of estimated construction and soft costs which are based on the percentage of construction costs (\$18M). Ms. Pincus noted that the trade costs are \$14M.

Relative to the pool, Mr. Barletta noted that the project includes a new membrane on the pool roof, an allowance for finishes, new locker rooms, siding, new tile work and replacement of the air handling filtration system. Mr. Melnick stated that he believed that the latter element was obtained as a result of a grant which Mr. Barletta agreed to look into. It was also noted that various evaluations were conducted over the years. As a Professional Structural Engineer, Mr. Porter noted that he would like to see a durable and robust exterior wall with the addition of insulation. As there have been no seismic evaluations, Mr. Porter opined that if the pool building did not become an integral attached part of the new building, the seismic code would not be triggered unless there was a structural issue. While he did not think that was the case, he noted that, if otherwise, there might be a potential \$100,000 in added costs. He also advised that the new building would not fall under the seismic code.

It was determined that site costs include parking and court reproduction, site lighting, septic system, and storm drainage. Mr. Barletta reported that in regard to water discharge from the pool, as the soil is good, the Board of Health has expressed no concerns with the use of a new dry well. There are no wetland issues and the straightening of the Fairbank/Hudson Road intersection is not part of the project.

Other items noted:

- An emergency generator is included in the project and moving costs are included in the FF&E budget;
- In regard to demolition of the existing building, while it is believed that asbestos abatement had been performed previously including floor tile and piping, \$10,000 is carried in the budget;
- In regard to audio visual funding adequacy, it was stated that AV funding for materials is adequate; some security is included for the pool, but more could be added;
- In regard to FF&E, the infrastructure for equipment is included and necessary furniture will also be purchased;
- Noise considerations were acknowledged by users in choosing high quality partitions for large areas instead of creating separate rooms;
- All electric heating proposed would be very efficient with less impact on the environment and would remove the complications and expense of duct work.

The larger questions centered on the budget contingencies presented. It was determined that: the Construction Cost, inclusive of demolition, site, and trade costs only, amounts to \$18,070,275; the estimating contingency component of 12% or \$2,168,433 is based on the Construction Cost; and the Construction Management Fee and Costs of \$2,577,62 represents 14% of the Construction Cost.. Mr. Melnick stated his belief that the Owner's contingency amount of \$2,315,800 based on a percentage of construction costs is adequate. Further questions arose as to

how the construction Management Fee and Costs of \$2,577,629 were derived. Mr. Schineller presented a question relative to the inclusion of trade costs in the different square footage costs presented.

It was noted that the budget was proposed in 2019 with an escalation amount relative to the mid-point of 2021. Clarification on what the mid-point was in reference to is required. Given that with the occurrence of COVID-19, we will have already delayed initial funding approval by about five months, it is critical information in determining impact, if substantial, on the project costs.

Discussion continued on the approximately \$750,000 set forth for OPM services which would include a Clerk of the Works during the construction period. This sum represents 3.2% of construction costs and was thought by PBC members to be too low based on references from OPM providers. The basis for the dollar amount was clarified to be for a part-time OPM for a 3- yr. duration and a Full-Time Clerk for the 18 months of construction.

As an option for Town Meeting consideration should the PBC conclude that the funds requested for Town Meeting approval are insufficient for the project, it was decided to request an opinion from Town Counsel as to whether the Town Meeting could consider funding of design funds only, i.e. change of scope and funding amount.

Town Hall Renovation Project PBC Project Manager Craig Blake informed the Committee that he had been approached by the Historical Districts Commission (HDC) Chair and the Town Planner to withdraw the Town Hall application for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) before the HDC without prejudice. The HDC Chair cited several reasons including that the proposed hearing schedule process could not be held adequately as the building is not open to the public and since several new members have been appointed, they are not familiar with the earlier aspects of the project presentations and discussions and would be unable to vote on the COA approval. Mr. Blake noted that such a withdrawal may impact the availability of funds as the project would essentially be starting over for approval. Ms. Jones will inform the Committee of the expenditures to date at a later meeting. At this time both the Architect and the OPM are on hold.

It was on motion by Mr. Blake, with four members in favor and one abstention, voted that the Permanent Building Committee, as agent for the Town, request the withdrawal of the application before the Historic Districts Commission involving the Town Hall project without prejudice.

Meeting Schedule The next virtual meeting of the PBC will be held on Wednesday, September 2, 2020, at 7 p.m. The meeting will include, but is not limited to, taking a position on 1) recording of meetings and 2) broadcasting of the recording as the first item followed the continuing Community Center budget and project discussion and consideration of making a PBC ATM statement.

Permanent Building Committee
Minutes – August 27, 2020
Page 4

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine L. Jones, Co-Chair
Permanent Building Committee