HILLCREST MIDDEL SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE

MEETING AGENDA – MARCH 31, 2026, AT 7:00 PM

LOCATION: TRUMBULL TOWN HALL
5866 MAIN STREET
TRUMBULL, CT 06611
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS

i. CALL TO ORDER
ii. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
iii. ROLL CALL
iv. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MARCH 10, 2025
v. PUBLIC COMMENT
vi. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF INVOICES
vii. NEW BUSINESS
    1. ARCHITECT'S PROJECT UPDATE – TSKP
    2. OPM'S PROJECT UPDATE – ARCADIS
    3. CONSTRUCTION MANAGER UPDATE - BISMARK
    4. DATE OF NEXT MEETING
    5. ACTIONS / APPROVAL OF BUILDING COMMITTEE - IF REQUIRED
viii. ADJOURNMENT

Hillcrest Middle School
Building Committee

TOWN OF TRUMBULL
CONNECTICUT

Town Hall
5866 Main Street
Trumbull, Connecticut 06611

Hillcrest Middle School Building Committee
February 10, 2026
7:00 pm
Council Chambers, Trumbull Town Hall

Present: Joseph Costa, Andrew Lubin, Jeff Alterman, Bill Mecca, John Morello, J.C. Cinelli and Ann Sather

Absent: Bob Gerbert and Fran Basbagill

Also Present: Robert Tencza, Arcadis; Gregory Raucci, Bismark Construction; Michael Scott, TSKP; Randall Luther, TSKP; Kevin Bova, Purchasing Director; Town Attorney James Nugent; David Lerner, Regional Director, Multivista and Dan McInerney, President of the Fairfield County Building Trades and Business Manager for International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 488

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm followed by Roll Call and the Pledge of Allegiance.

Past Minutes
Motion was made by Mr. Lubin to approve the minutes of January 13, 2026 as written; seconded by Ms. Sather. Motion was approved unanimously.

Public Comment
Mr. Alterman gave a shout out to the Hillcrest Girls Basketball team who are in a position to win a fourth straight championship on Thursday.

Review and Approval of Invoices
Mr. Tencza presented the following invoices for approval. He noted Arcadis approved invoices for Bismark, SES and TSKP and the Arcadis invoice was approved by Mr. Dion.

1. Bismark Construction Invoice #3 in the amount of $41,970.00 – **motion made by Mr. Lubin to approve, seconded by Ms. Sather. Approved unanimously.**
2. Sustainable Engineering Solutions Invoice #5697 in the amount of $9,800.00 – **motion made by Mr. Lubin to approve, seconded by Mr. Mecca. Approved unanimously.**
3. Arcadis Invoice #36103600 in the amount of $15,400.00 – **motion made by Mr. Lubin to approve, seconded by Ms. Sather. Approved unanimously.**

4. TSKP Invoice #250501-8 in the amount of $298,000.00 – **motion made by Mr. Lubin to approve, seconded by Ms. Sather. Approved unanimously.**

New Business

Architect's Project Update – Mr. Scott reported they have concluded the process with Inland Wetlands and are now working on CDs. The team has all been mobilized and updates will be given as the project develops.

(Costa) – going through Inland Wetlands process - submission and approvals. (Scott) – Inland Wetlands gave approval and everything should be clear of all Town land use departments. The State Traffic submission is moving along. (Lubin) – any appeals. (Scott) – nothing much in the project impacting the wetlands. Spoke with the educators to see what opportunities there might be on site to supplement their overall science curriculum and working on this option.
(Sather) – a question was posed to her regarding the size/proportion/sustainability of the dishwasher being considered. (Scott) – requested she reach to them for specifics.
(Morello) – after dealing with leaking and burst pipes this past week, with the geothermal system, what safeguards are in place to prevent this type of problem. (Scott) – assured this would be a very tight building and there should be no problems. Suggested contact be made with Manchester and Mansfield school staff for their experiences. Any problems would be addressed.

PLA Presentation

Dan McInerney piggy backed off his previous presentation discussing the seven benefits of a Project Labor Agreement.

1. Ability to work on the percentage of local residents on the job. Conduct job fairs in the schools regarding benefits of going into building trades.
2. Protecting the Taxpayer – having a highly qualified and skilled work force that will make sure the infrastructure will be done with the most confident work force available.
3. Worker Safety – very safety conscious requiring at the least an OSHA 10 or OSHA 20 card.
4. Creating apprenticeships by holding job fairs; construction tours conducted when work is not being done to allow individuals to see the trade's work on the project.
5. Finish On Time and On Budget – group has not had a project that was over budget or over time.
6. Be Fair to Connecticut Small Business - do not take advantage of their work force; pay the actual wages and benefits of each individual building trade collective bargaining agreement.
7. Health Insurance and Retirement Plans – various plans available; require an apprentice to work a certain amount of hours on site to be eligible.

(Nugent) – explain the bidding process. (McInerney) – any contractor can bid a Project Labor Agreement. They have to sign on to the agreement that says they can bring in certain key members of their work force and the rest of the labor is from the local union labor pool. The bidding process is no different than any other bidding process. His company keeps mind of the budget.
(Lubin) – any other costs that a non-union employer would have other than to agree to hire a certain number of union labor. (McInerney) – no, it is the same cost because of the prevailing wage section from the Department of Labor. They have to match the benefit package.

(Bova) – discussed the project with regard to CHRO requirements. What is the benefit of PLA.
(McInerney) – you would not get the local workers without a PLA. This is a negotiated amount in the contract with the Town.
(Costa) – reviewed the Norwalk PLA, noting the Town would have preferences. (McInerney) - the Town's preferences would be included in the PLA.
(Costa) – strike history on public school projects. (McInerney) – most collective bargaining agreements have no strike clauses. Manpower could be the main problem but have not encountered this in the past.
(Costa) – have very detailed agreements with the CM including conflict resolution and the governance of the project. The PLA has language regarding grievances and conflict resolution. How do you square this with the Bismark agreement. (McInerney) – Would sit down and discuss to find common ground. The bigger part with the PLA is sitting down before each contractor comes onto the job site, review their scope of work and make sure there is no conflict. If there is, it would be resolved before they started. It is reiterating the same thing.
(Costa) – union and non-union trades can bid this job, if they are non-union and are the selected bidder, they would have to sign the agreement. (McInerney) – yes.
(Nugent) – this will need to be put to a vote fairly soon. When Construction Documents are ready to go out, we will need to have the PLA in effect. It will also need to be presented to the Town Council to approve it. (Costa) – suggested the Committee have a chance to read the PLA and review and discuss with a possible vote at the next meeting.
(Nugent) – is going to require a clause in the PLA that indicates if we are dissatisfied with the bids received under the PLA (if approved and in effect), they can rebid without the PLA.
(Lubin) – have you had contact with other building committees regarding working with a PLA; would you share that information so the Committee members can gather more information.

<u>Mutivista Presentation</u>
David Lerner, Multivista Regional Director, noted his company is a visual construction documentation company. They create a digital record of the building/school that is used both during and after construction - during construction to mitigate inherent risks and control unforeseen costs that may be seen. Discussed how the process works including –

1. Website where information would be available. No limitations on users. Uploading plan documentation used as a reference. How to use the site to find information.
2. Information is captured through their own technicians (OSHA 40 individuals with 6-7 years of construction experience). They come in as an unbiased third party to the job. Information for every square foot is available in each capture throughout the course of construction to create a history.

(Lubin) – how often should the captures be scheduled. (Lerner) - biweekly is the usual time frame but can be customized.
(Sather) – is the sign-in to the website secure. (Lerner) – never had a breach. It is a single log in with high level security behind it.

3. Customizes a scope of work on each project. Provides a detailed capture of the site at the beginning and works through the project. This would be done by drones and technicians on the ground. Provide a progression and exact built document. They would capture all underground

utilities before they are backfilled to provide detailed information as well as other areas prior to enclosure.

4. Provide real time progress tracking with an AI engine for percentage completion by location and trade.
5. MEP exact built was reviewed. This captures the walls and ceilings before closure after inspection. Creates a perfect digital as built depicting installed conditions. This provides institutional knowledge moving forward.

(Lubin) - is that MEP accessible to the staff only through the website or is it digitized to provide a copy to the Town. (Lerner) – both. The on-line version will stay available in perpetuity. At the end of the project, a copy will be made to be utilized as well but this has limited functionality due to technology available. Some items are hard to put on an external device for this reason. There is a full support team to acclimate project team members to the system and derive maximum value.

6. Webcam - provide a 24/7 video stream of the project area. Keeps a minimum of two weeks of full video of the project. They also serve as security of the site.
7. Provide video on the project – they are on the platform, it is being done by a professional technician and all videos are QR coded to be used by the facilities to obtain instructional information.

(Cinelli) – frequencies are customizable but with regard to services, are they packaged or individual.
(Lerner) – typically they would be packaged and customizable.
(Cinelli) – access to information. (Lerner) – lifetime of the building. No access fees. The service fee is paid in a lump sum to provide services over the course of the construction. The platform remains at no additional cost after the end of the project.
(Lubin) – will we have security cameras included in this project. (Raucci) – yes.
(Costa) – webcam and security. Very sensitive to school security. Need to communicate to the community to show progress on the work. The easy way would be through a stop action video camera. Is there a way to provide access in a limited manner on the progress. (Lerner) – could create a separate live stream on a public site such as the Town website. It would be live input to provide a snapshot of the progress and would update every five minutes. (Costa) – would like to have a stop action video of the progress. (Lerner) – will consult with technology regarding this request.
(Costa) – video capture – Bismark will be coming every month to provide an update on the work and the Committee would appreciate videos as part of the presentation. (Lerner) – could provide a video each month as requested. (Costa) – does like the QR code idea.
(Costa) – update proposal and provide to the Committee for review.

<u>OPM's Project Update</u> – Mr. Tencza discussed the following:

1. Finalized Third Party Structural Threshold Reviewer RFP – have final sign offs and it will be out this week. There is a requirement where the building needs certain criteria and you need to have a third party structural reviewer to review TSKP's structural design. There are over 1,000 occupants so this check needs to be completed. They will come in at 90% CD or full CDs and review. Report will be submitted to the design team and any issues will be resolved. Mr. Bova noted the RFP will be out February 11, due March 18 with final questions for addendums due March 11. Review would be at the March 24 meeting.
2. Developing Third Party Code Reviewer RFP – Meeting with Fire Marshall and the Building Official on February 11 to review and finalize the scope of what they are looking for in the document,

the review process and how much they want to undertake. Looking to have this out for bid soon with selection in March.

3. Multivista meeting with TPS facilities was held to review capabilities.
4. Design Development CTHPB Notification Letter is being sent to the State. This includes a LEED checklist, notification of moving into Contract Document phase and what we are looking at for LEED points. We are looking for Gold.
5. Phase 1 PCR Check In – looking for time frames and any questions. Will officially schedule the conference in the next few weeks.
6. 90 day Outlook includes the two RFPs with review and selection expected in March; Phase l Construction Documents completed; approval from the Building Committee and the Board of Education on the final documents; April - OGA PCR review conference.
7. Reviewed the pre-construction schedule.
8. Financials – no changes to the encumbered amount of just under $2,200,000. Shows no reimbursement from OGA as the first request to the State will be made in April for approximately $900,000. The only change made to the Owners Contingency is the test well for $23,870. Remaining is $8.17 million.

(Nugent) – is there a place in the budget for Multivista. (Tencza) – no this would be an Owners Contingency draw. There may be opportunities through the RFPs to recoup some funding. (Lubin) – is Multivista a State reimbursable cost. (Tencza) – not sure.
(Sather) – on the OGA, are the dates requested and we are waiting. (Tencza) – will speak with Finance but it is thought it would be a submission in April. (Costa) – is the $900,00 is at the 44% rate. (Tencza) – yes.

9. Working through what will be included in Phase 1 and reviewing the numbers. Estimated cost is between $11 million and $12 million. They are comfortable with the estimate and have contingencies in the estimate noted in ten or eleven value engineer items. If it comes back unfavorable, there are options to be considered. The question is if the Committee is willing to commit to that dollar value prior to GMP. Looking for bidding on Phase ll for the balance of the project in July/August. Looking for approval on September 8.

(Costa) – what is the process for the Town to award construction on a partial package. (Nugent) – needs to be on the Town Council agenda. The Building Rules do not specify anything about a partial package. Town Council needs to be updated on contracts being considered. Dates were discussed with regard to approvals. Mr. Mecca and Ms. Sather will confirm the process and dates of the Town Council and its Committees to provide the necessary reviews. Presentation dates will be confirmed and Mr. Tencza will provide an update for the Town Council meeting.
(Cinelli) – PLA presentation – will there be recommendations given so the Committee can make a decision. (Tencza) – yes, a discussion can be held.

<u>Construction Manager Update</u> – Mr. Raucci discussed the following:

1. Started to develop the bid packages. Met with TSKP design team regarding constructability and working through site packages as these would be part of the early phases.
2. Reviewing the site logistics plan and implemented signage for Daniels Farm Road.
3. Met with Frontier regarding the hub on site. There will be no disruption with the construction.
4. Meeting with the Police Chief and Fire Marshall to review access to the site during construction.
5. Meeting with CHRO to review bid packages next week.

6. RAM detailing for the steel. Expedites the steel package. Takes the estimate out and provides actual quantities. This would be a change to the Bismark contract. There would be no Change Orders as the plan would be worked out with the design team and engineer prior to getting to the contractors. Sent out for review to vote on at the next meeting.

(Costa) – do we need to do anything with this proposal from the detailers, is this something we can award. (Bova) – if it is over a certain dollar amount, you cannot award. (Costa) – requested Mr. Bova to review the document and advise the Committee.

Next Meeting

February 24, 2026 at 7:00 pm in Council Chambers. Agenda items include a review of the PLA, Multivista proposal, advice on the RAM drafting service for possible action.

Invoicing

The Finance Director is reviewing electronic transfers with Accounts Payable.

Actions/Approvals of Building Committee

RAM decision needs to be made within the next two meetings.

Adjournment

There being no further business, motion was made by Mr. Cinelli to adjourn the meeting at 8:29 pm; seconded by Ms. Sather. Unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Crandall
Clerk