

**REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 17
PUBLIC BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING
May 10, 2017**

A meeting of the Regional School District 17 Public Building Committee was held on May 10, 2017 in the Central Office Board Room.

Members Present: Tom Hogarty, Chairman; Sue Twachtman, Bob Braren, Bill Leahy, Colleen Fitzpatrick, Eric Couture, Joanne Nesti, Karen Perry

Also in Attendance: Mike Distefano, Director of Facilities; Rob Albert, Facilities Lead; Doug Rogers, CREC Construction Services Division; Michael Faenza, CREC Construction Services Division; Bill Silver, Silver, Petrucelli and Associates; Heather Carta, Imperial Roofing; Tom Rodrigue, Imperial Roofing; Bruce Raulukaitis, Jr., Imperial Roofing; John McConville, Silktown Roofing; Chuck Arnold, Silktown Roofing; Tim Schwink, Silktown Roofing;

Members Absent: Lizz Milardo

Call to Order/Opening of Meeting: Committee Chairman Tom Hogarty called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

The Committee received presentations from the two roofing companies that were the low bidders on the project as a follow-up to their proposals submitted on May 3, 2017.

Each company provided details regarding materials, manufacturers, sub-contractors, schedules, weather impact, and the number of workers to be used on the project. Committee members were given the opportunity to ask the same series of 23 questions of each firm and to note their answers on a form provided by CREC.

Following the presentations and interviews, the Committee entered into its discussion regarding the pros and cons of each firm.

Mr. Hogarty reported on his examination of evaluation documents of each firm provided by the State Department of Administrative Services.

The numbers relate to 8 jobs and are as follows:

Overall Score (out of 100):

Silktown 92.5 Imperial 87.5

Number of Superior Ratings:

Silktown 12.6 Imperial 5.25

“10” Rating in Most Categories:

Silktown 13.25 Imperial 8.5

In addition, Mr. Hogarty reported that Silktown’s bid provided an impressively detailed resume of its key players. Imperial’s resume section was not as detailed.

Silktown has three times the number of employees that Imperial has.

Silktown lists five projects of more than two million dollars and two projects of more than three million dollars. Imperial lists one project at more than three million dollars, and its projects appear to be considerably smaller in scope than Silktown’s.

Mr. Hogarty reported that he found Silktown to be more experienced, more professional and more familiar with the requirements of this project. In addition, he noted Silktown’s assurance of a dedicated safety officer on-site, weekly inspections, the company’s ownership of its own equipment (lifts, cranes, dumpsters, etc.) and the details of the printed material presented to the Committee prior to the firm’s presentation. In addition, Mr. Hogarty reported that Imperial lost track of the scheduling of this scope meeting and seemed inadequately prepared. He recommended the selection of Silktown.

Mr. Silver said that neither contractor has been found to be disqualifiable. There was nothing technically wrong in either of their bids. But he added that Silkton was more prepared and offered a presentation that is never seen in the pre-award process. He suggested that the project would run very smoothly with Silkton and would run smoothly with Imperial. Consideration must be given to school district rules regarding the choice of low bidder. The choice will not have to be explained to the State Office of School Construction Grants, but the agency may wish to know why the choice was made. The decision would not affect state reimbursement. The losing bidder could challenge the decision, but it was felt that RSD 17 could withstand a legal challenge to its policy. However, litigation could result in pausing the award and the project. Mr. Silver pointed out that these are all subjective opinions.

Mr. Hogarty then asked each Committee member to express a preference for one of the firms and explain the reasons why.

Mr. Leahy: Silkton. Mathematically the DAS evaluation numbers show a significant result. The company appears to have done more large projects. It is obvious that neither firm is disqualifiable, since each was invited to this scope review meeting.

Ms. Fitzpatrick: Silkton. The company provided the Committee with knowledgeable and thorough analysis. It demonstrated that it has thought about the job, dealt with inclement weather concerns, interior cleanup and site cleanup. Silkton also appeared to give greater consideration to staffing levels and answered questions with detailed responses. More comfortable with the job Silkton would do.

Ms. Nesti: Silkton. Gave a more professional presentation, provided a more complete answer to concerns about the solar array being placed on the roof. Silkton appears to have given the job a great deal of consideration already and has thought it through.

Ms. Twachtman: Silktown. Pro-actively mentioned roof areas GTU, detailed the particulars of the warranty. It is significant that Mr. McConville uses EPDM on his own buildings and was able to elaborate on seams. It was also significant that the company was more forthcoming about past litigation.

Mr. Couture: Both companies would do a fine job and would finish on time. Leaning toward Silktown based on details the firm provided and the general attention to detail. They had considered items and planned ahead. Imperial also did that, but to a lesser extent than Silktown. Imperial's problems tonight may have stemmed from their top executive not being present. That could have affected the quality of their presentation.

Mr. Braren: Leaning toward Silktown. The comfort level appears better with Silktown. They were better prepared. Appreciated their candor about Firestone vs. Carlisle...Mr. McConville seems to know every area of the roof like the back of his hand..if there were problems, Silktown appears more capable of dealing with them. Also significant that Mr. McConville will serve as an on-site manager.

Ms. Perry: Silktown. DAS reports were a significant factor. More professional and more thoroughly prepared. It shows a level of consideration, deliberation and ownership of the project. It reflects well on their ability to manage the project.

With a consensus being reached, the Committee will make its recommendation to the Board of Education at its next meeting on May 16, 2017. It is expected that the contract will be awarded no later than May 19, 2017.

Other Agenda Items:

Mr. Rogers responded to several action items that were discussed with Paul Drummey, CREC Project Manager, at the Committee's previous meeting on April 26th.

1. Mr. Drummey was asked to consult with Eversource and request that the company make a site visit to explore new lighting technologies. In addition, he was asked to consult with DTC to assure that the company clarifies the scope of work on the lighting project, specifically interior lighting. *He will set this up after the roof kickoff meeting is completed and the roofing project is underway.*
2. Mr. Drummey was also asked to verify for the Committee that RSD 17 is not responsible for legal fees connected to the lighting RFP or to any other related overall future project addenda. *RSD 17 is not responsible for any attorneys' fees as was discussed with Mr. Drummey at a recent meeting.*
3. Mr. Drummey was asked to consult with Silver, Petrucelli about the EPDM seams and the impact, if any, on the solar project. Additionally, he was asked to identify the top three manufacturers of EPDM roofing and inquire about their warranties relating to solar applications. In a letter to CREC, Ken Linsley of Silver, Petrucelli writes: "The 'peel and stick' seamed membrane has been in use most recently in the past five years. We encourage its use because it eliminates the potential of 'human error' that previous methods entail with the application of primers and glues." As for the solar application, Mr. Linsley writes, "Per our specifications, Firestone Building Products is our basis of design, with Carlisle listed as second in our spec. I spoke with Toby McGuire (Firestone Roofing Technical Support)...he says that solar panels and associated ballasted sleds will not void the warranty as long as the contractor installs a 'slip sheet' or an additional loose piece of EPDM membrane beneath the solar panels sleds. The other approach is the installation of roof walkway pads beneath the solar sleds. He stated that this also will not

impact the warranty. If any EPDM seams were to have solar panel sleds land on them, an additional five-inch seam tape must be applied over the seam to maintain the warranty.”

4. Mr. Drummey was asked to verify the availability of tapered insulation. *Per Mr. Linsley's letter, there is no shortage in the market.*
5. Mr. Drummey was asked to determine the additional cost of expansion tank removal in the HKHS boiler room. *This will be discussed with DTC during CREC's visit to their office.*
6. Mr. Drummey was asked to construct a master copy of the binder of project-related documents to be copied and distributed to Committee members. *Master Copy has been completed. Mr. Hogarty is reviewing it.*

The Committee discussed possible re-use of the stone ballast to be removed from the existing high school roof. Mr. Rogers said he would consult with Fuss & O'Neill about the environmental safety of the material and report back to the Committee.

Adjournment: *Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.*