

Building & Grounds Committee Meeting

December 9, 2020

3:00 PM on Zoom

Present: Peter Sugar, Chair; Dennis Picker; Barbara Myles, Library Director

1. Minutes of November 30 meeting.

Dennis moved, and Peter seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the November 30 meeting.

Roll Call Vote: Yes=2; No=0

2. Discuss presentation to Community Preservation Committee about the parapet repair project.

A second cost estimate (\$394,287) for the parapet repair project was received from CHA.

The Peter reviewed it and found discrepancies between this cost estimate and the cost estimate we received from AM Fogarty (\$342,994). These discrepancies cannot be resolved without discussing them with the two firms. Here is a list of the discrepancies:

- a. AM Fogarty has a design contingency of 15% but Greg Sassaman (Simpson Gumpertz and Heger) and Peter do not think we need a design contingency. CHA's cost estimate does not include a design contingency.
- b. CHA's cost estimate does not include any permit costs while AM Fogarty's cost estimate does have a permit fee.
- c. CHA's cost estimate is for construction in spring 2021 and AM Fogarty's cost estimate is for fall 2021.
- d. CHA's cost estimate for demolition is higher than AM Fogarty's cost estimate for demolition.
- e. CHA's cost estimate for clean up is higher than AM Fogarty's cost estimate for cleanup.
- f. CHA's cost estimate for replacing roof tiles is higher than AM Fogarty's cost estimate for replacing roof tiles.
- g. Square footage estimates differ between the two companies for various types of work.
- h. Greg thinks the correct price is somewhere between the two cost estimates.
- i. Neither cost estimate has a construction contingency. Greg thinks it should be 10% but Peter thinks 10% is too high.

Our next step is for Greg to mark up the two cost estimates and send his mark ups to both firms. The best way to resolve the discrepancies is for the two firms to meet and discuss their differences. This meeting could cost approximately \$1,000 and cannot take place before our meeting with the Community Preservation Committee tomorrow evening. We can explain that the highest cost for the project is approximately \$485,000 (\$394,287 + 10% for a construction contingency + 2% for escalation to fall of 2021 + \$43,000 for SGH's fee for bidding and construction administration). At the Community Preservation Committee meeting tomorrow we will explain that we are trying to be accurate.

3. Discuss FY2022 maintenance budget documents to submit to the Capital Planning Committee.

Dennis discussed his draft proposal for the library's maintenance budget. It shows four buckets of maintenance costs.

- a. Recurring predictable annual expenses: This includes items such as inspections and service contracts.
- b. Unforeseen repairs (corrective maintenance): Since we do not know what will break next year, perhaps we should ask for a dollar amount for this category based on our historical experience.
- c. Annual spending on planned long-term maintenance that is not a separate capital expenditure: This includes planned spending to restore or replace aspects of the library building as a result of normal wear and tear as well as replacing infrastructure that needs to be replaced or repaired as it operates beyond the end of its predicted service life.
- d. Engineering fees and cost estimates: This includes expenses to investigate problems, document designs, and obtain cost estimates for work to be performed.

Bobbie suggested adding another category for unforeseen repairs that cost more than \$5,000 (the Capital Planning Committee's threshold for a capital expense) but the repair needs to be made right away, not in a future budget year.

It was agreed that we will not ask for more than \$50,000 for FY2022. Bobbie will follow up with Dan Pereira, Assistant Town Administrator, to find out if or when the Capital Planning Committee wants to meet with us again.

4. Discuss broken dry valve for dry pipe sprinkler system and next steps.
Professional Fire Systems will repair the dry valve for \$2,500. The other two companies (Carlyse Engineering and Norel Service Company) wanted to replace the broken FireLock NXT dry valve for approximately \$7,000.
5. Discuss broken fire pump status and next steps
The forensic engineer did not discover the reason why the fire pump's motor burned out and caught fire. This is a problem because just replacing the fire pump's motor will probably result in another fire in the future. Peter and Dennis asked Bobbie to get Dan involved to increase the pressure on the insurance company to wrap up their investigation and authorize repairs.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Myles
Library Director