



**TOWN OF DARIEN
HHR BUILDING COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING
WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 2023
6:00 PM**

Participants:

Sarah Neumann
Patrick Hayes
Chris Price
Paul Harding
Jill McCammon
Jameson Riley
David Martin
Tom Harris

Alan Addley, DPS Superintendent
Monica McNally, First Selectman
Kevin Munrett, DPS
Dave Cravanzola, O&G/APC
Lorell Purcell, O&G/APC
Paula Bleakley, Holmes Principal
Gail Kennedy, Royle Parent Rep
Erik Kaeyer, KG&D
Tom Walsh, O&G/APC

Minutes

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes from meeting on June 7, 2023

Meeting called to order at 6:02.

Sarah made a motion, Jill seconded it. All voted in favor.

2. Public Comment*

None.

3. Chair's Report

Bids came in at higher than expected for Hindley and Royle. Lorell will review.

Some bids that came in higher were for major and accounted for much negative variance. Team reviews and then comes up with the gross maximum price.

Low participation for bids.'

4. Report on Hindley and Royle Bids and Scope Review by O&G/APC; Discussion on Bids and Scope Review

- Busy time of year for some trades. Some were involved earlier and then did not submit bids. Bidders had heard there was low participation. Trying to find out why some did not bid. Could be that the time necessary to put the bid together may have been such that

some could not respond. New builds are attracting more attention. The complex, phased while occupied projects are difficult and do not draw as much attention. Can't compare this to Ox Ridge.

- Low response to some larger trades. Concrete, drywall, Fire Protection, Plumbing and HVAC only received one bid each on Hindley.
- Some companies do not submit if they do not think they may be successful or have done work with before, or are familiar. Dealing with the State as well as phasing can be difficult with sub-contractors. Not getting the highest quality bidders. For context, O&G/APC has had recent projects that were newer were more in line with estimates and had multiple bidders.
- Having this as three separate projects can dissuade some from applying if they are concerned they would only get one.
- Inflation may go down. When would we re-bid?
- Tricky and challenging projects.
- This may be an anomaly due to lack of demand, timing, busy market, and this is a complex project with three occupied buildings. Not necessarily something that might be repeated.
- As far as options go, wetaking the bids and calculate what the net shortfall is from budget and estimate and go to the BOS and BOF to ask for the money to award the contracts to try to stay somewhat on schedule. we could modify the project design - value engineer - to bring the budget down. Less attractive in town. Another idea is to get the Holmes numbers tomorrow and look at net shortfall and think about re-bidding the projects. When would that happen? Shift the timing to accommodate a later start.
- Is inflation an issue here? Would have affected all the bids. Not sure if we re-bid, it would achieve anything and might raise the dollars further. We need to further examine why this occurred. What is the problem? Symptom is low bidders.
- Is schedule a driver of this, or the work product? We need to evaluate. Do not believe that all low bidders would not give us a work product. Some bidders would require more babysitting. The upper echelon of companies are not going to go for this project.
- We need to evaluate what the schools need and what changes in the timeline would do to the schools.
- We need to examine why we only received one bid on some packages?
- What is the best time to re-bid? Fall or new year? Pros and cons? Would we end up in a worse situation? Do we need to re-submit to the State to get different approvals?
- State looks at cost per square footage - what does this do to our reimbursement formula?
- Meeting with State to go over the bids. We will need to re-submit if we change the scope. Just need to start construction within 2 years of the grant. If the budget goes up, the reimbursement percentages remain. The town would have to establish we can cover the entirety of the costs.
- We have an accelerated construction schedule with 22 weeks of 6 day work-weeks that was in the bids, in order to stay on target with the schedule.
- Hindley and Royle were bid together, and Holmes was separate - delayed to give the bidders a better chance. However, if one is low on one and not lowest on another, they would only win one. Can we bid all three together? Yes - could be more attractive and they would not lose one if they were to win the other two. The contracts would be separate.

- Not sure if the sub-contractors want all three. We would have to determine if that would increase our response. Would they want and be able to handle all three?
- Bidders could bid on both Hindley and Royle, or individually. We should look at the ways to construct the bids to possibly increase response. Some may be unable to do three roofs at once, for example. From a construction sequence, all are simultaneous.
- For the schools - would be better to defer to value engineering/re-design of project. De-scoping the project would not be ideal and not our aim. Portables, classroom size, MEP, etc. were the confines of the project. We want our schools to reflect what we want. Not a solution to start with now.
- Value engineering can end up with sub-optimal results
- Schools may need to change and be ready to use the portables that were not planning on being used at start of school.
- Need to look at timing - what would be optimal for the sub-contractors?
- May need to look at shifting to see what could be done - should we look at new construction portion first? If we don't bid until fall, we could do that. If we wait until January, we would not start until at least next Spring, but could get more done next summer. Need to create swing space.
- Safety of students, and educational impact will be primary to create the best schedules for the construction.

5. Review of Soft Costs

Not enough info right now - will look at later.

6. Upcoming important dates

Will be looking to meet on July 19 and July 26.

Thank you to O&G/APC for the additional work to evaluate this.

7. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn by Jill, seconded by Patrick. All voted in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm.