RECEIVED TOWN CLERK BELMONT, MA

BELMONT MIDDLE and HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

October 23, 2019 Homer Building Gallery 7:30 AM

2019 NOV 18 PM 2: 59

Meeting #85

Committee Members Attending:

Chair Lovallo; Members John Phelan, Mike McAllister, Pat Brusch, Bob McLaughlin, Joe DeStefano, Joel Mooney, Diane Miller, Chris Messer, Emma Thurston, Jamie Shea, Steve Dorrance, Ellen Schreiber, Jon Marshall

From Daedalus: Tom Gatzunis, Shane Nolan

From Perkins+Will: Brooke Trivas, Richard Kuhn, Vital Albuquerque (and David Warner)

From Skanska: Michael Loring

BMHSBC Members Absent: Patrice Garvin, Tom Caputo, Kate Bowen

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 a.m. by Chair Lovallo. He reviewed (and adjusted) the agenda and then turned to the first item.

II. Next Building Committee Meetings

Tuesday	Nov. 5, 2019	6:30 p.m.	Wellington School Cafeteria
Thursday	Nov. 21, 2019	7:30 a.m.	Homer Building, 3rd Floor
Wednesday	Dec. 11, 2019	7:30 a.m.	Homer Building, 3rd Floor

III. Minutes of Previous Meetings

Mr. Mooney moved: To approve the Minutes of 10/10/19. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. Artificial Turf Field Bid Scope Review

Mr. Warner explained that the turf discussion today is only focused on what to show in the bid documents for the fill material. Recent Committee and community discussions suggested that the Building Committee should consider a fill material that is not crumb rubber, which is currently the basis of design.

Mr. Warner then referenced a Boston Globe article dealing with PFAS chemicals (non-stick agent) that have been found in turf fibers. However, PFAS will not be used in Belmont. Chair Lovallo noted that an overall decision regarding artificial turf versus natural grass will not be made today; in fact, such a decision is not required for approximately one year.

Mr. Warner discussed the turf bid memo distributed by Mr. McLaughlin. He reviewed the following turf infill alternate materials:

- Brockfill a new wood product mixed with sand (used in Somerville)
- Coated crumb rubber the coating may reduce the release of chemicals
- Waste shoe material (Nike Green) infill made from the soles of old sneakers
- Walnut shells allergens are claimed to have been removed; this is coarse material
- Cork often blended with coconut (i.e., "corconut") to make a better product; is very light
- Coconut fiber can form a hard crust in cold weather (may render the field to feel like concrete, which could exceed the safe thresholds)
- Acrylic-coated sand only manufactured in Texas and is expensive to ship; will only last for one life cycle of the field
- EPDM/TPE both are expensive and offer little advantage over crumb rubber

The Proprietary Bid process was briefly discussed, however, Chair Lovallo asked the Committee to hold off on this topic until later in the agenda.

Committee Comments

Ms. Shea suggested that the organic infill materials be carefully looked at as they perform well and are not expensive. Mr. Mooney noted that, while Brockfill is a new material, the company that makes Brockfill is well established (via the manufacturing of shock pads). He noted that many would like a turf field because of the many hours of use the field will receive. He suggested pursuing a turf field with an organic infill. Ms. Miller agreed that it makes sense to explore the organic infill. She asked about the life-cycle of the organic products and the mechanism for replacing the coated sand. She then asked about the longevity of the organic infill materials. Mr. DeStefano raised a concern about the freezing potential of Brockfill and the playability in the winter. Mr. Warner explained the process by which these materials freeze and thaw. Superintendent Phelan agreed that exploring a material that is not crumb rubber makes sense, given the community concerns.

Chair Lovallo summarized the options: turf field with crumb rubber infill, turf field with an organic infill, and natural grass. Mr. McLaughlin noted that the price of Brockfill could go up in the next few years as the product gets more prominent. He added that, while it makes sense to explore an organic infill, evidence-based data suggesting that crumb rubber is harmful/dangerous does not exist.

Audience Member Comments

Ms. Erin Lubien asked if the Committee will compare the organic infill maintenance (disinfecting and fluffing) costs and maintenance needs. Mr. Marshall explained what happens with the current fields. Mr. Warner explained the brooming and grooming process, infill detoxing, as well as the replenishing of infill.

Ms. Lubien asked why natural grass was not being considered (given that the School Committee expressed a desire for natural grass). Chair Lovallo said that 90% of the area will be natural grass and the field will likely be artificial turf with organic infill, which the School Committee was OK with. In any case, grass has not been ruled out.

Motion Regarding Artificial Turf

Chair Lovallo summarized that the Committee's consensus is to move forward with artificial turf with an organic infill.

Mr. McLaughlin moved: To pursue artificial turf with an organic infill. The motion passed unanimously.

V. Brick Selection Review and Approval

Mr. Albuquerque reviewed the array of brick panels/materials/flashings. The Committee provided feedback on the different brick panels. Joints were briefly discussed. The Committee agreed that the darkest brick panel was not desirable. Ms. Brusch does not like the vertical flash. Panels B and D were eliminated; Panels A and C will be revisited.

Mr. Albuquerque suggested that the Masonry on the lower level be reviewed at an upcoming meeting.

VI. Proprietary Bid Review

Ms. Trivas explained the Proprietary Bid Review process (see handout), which involves six items. The reason for the request of these items needs to be clear. The six items include:

- 1. Stage Lighting
- 2. Lighting Controls
- 3. Network Switch Electronics
- 4. Wireless Access Points and Controllers
- 5. School Guard Glass
- 6. FERO Break-away Fire Release Connector

Mr. Dorrance suggested adding another two items to the Proprietary List:

- 7. software (BMS)
- 8. access control security system

Chair Lovallo said that these two items can be added to the list as numbers 7 and 8.

Ms. Brusch moved: To approve the eight Proprietary List items. The motion passed unanimously.

VII. Bid Alternate List

Chair Lovallo distributed a list. He explained that this list is simply a subset of the Value Engineering list from September, parsed out to identify large-cost items that were either 1) taken as scope reductions or 2) not taken as acceptable Value Engineering items. The items are ones that can be added or removed without significant impact to the design documents. This list is not in itself the "bid alternate" list, but rather serves as a list of items to help the discussion toward a bid alternate list. Items to the left of the "neutral cost line" represent items that can be added back if there is a budget surplus at bid time, if so desired; items to the right of the "neutral cost line" can be removed if there is a budget deficit at bid time.

This approach is "bid protection" - i.e., an effort to help keep the project on budget. If bids come in

lower than anticipated, Chair Lovallo explained, there may be money to add other items back in. Such items are called "add alternates." The items would be numbered in priority order, and that order would be adhered to. Mr. Loring explained why "add alternates" are more effective.

Bid Alternate Discussion

Bid protection, file sub-bids, the deduct list, and the add alternate list were briefly explored. Ms. Schreiber asked about the process for winnowing the list down. Mr. Loring made some winnowing suggestions.

[Lisa left at 9:45.]

Some items on the list are not filed sub-bid (trade bids), so they do not need to follow the statutory bidding requirements and can simply be carried as an add alternate without being in the formal bid alternate list. Examples of this are sitework and the artificial rugby field. Other items have already been assigned to a bidder and cost alternates can be addressed outside of bidding, as in the case of operable windows with the curtainwall subcontractor. Still others on the list, notably the PV panels on the roof or scope west of Harris Field, will not be bid in January and will be held off for over a year, so that scope does not fall into the bid alternate list.

Chair Lovallo explained that, by eliminating those items that are not relevant to our current bid scope, we can focus on the remaining items that can be considered as bid alternates. Chair Lovallo also questioned how much bid protection value the Committee should consider during this bid alternate effort. He explained that the current value of construction costs already out totals approximately \$64M. If you subtract that value from the \$237M, and then reduce that further by the PV and west of Harris Field values, you arrive at a total expected bid value early next year of \$169M. Thus, if the Committee wants to consider 2% of the bid value in bid protection add alternates, that value would have to total \$3.4M.

Chair Lovallo explained that the final decision on the bid alternate list would be made likely at the November 21st meeting, and no formal decision needs to occur at today's meeting. He asked the Committee to review this list in consideration of that future discussion.

VIII. Budget Update and Approvals

Chair Lovallo noted that this topic will be discussed at the November 5th meeting.

IX. Comments from Belmont Residents

There were none.

X. Other/New Business

There was none.

XI. Related Meeting Documents

- 1. Artificial Turf Field Bid Scope Review Memo (Mr. McLaughlin)
- 2. Proprietary Bid Items (Perkins & Will)

3. Bid Alternate List

XII. Adjournment

The meeting ended at 9:55 a.m. by Mr. McLaughlin.

Respectfully submitted by:

Lisa Gibalerio

Approved:

Chris Messer, Secretary

Date

FINAL