

TOWN OF SEEKONK
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING COMMITTEE

DATE: Wednesday April 10, 2024

TIME: 4:30 p.m.

**PLACE: Planning Board Meeting Room
Seekonk Town Hall
100 Peck Street
Seekonk, MA 02771**

MEETING MINUTES

Present: John Pozzi, Chair; Michael Gagne Michelle Hines; Kevin Hurst, Edward Monigan

Absent:

Attendees: Shawn Cadime, Town Administrator; Jennifer Argo, Finance Director; David Cabral, DPW Director; Christine Shea, Brewster Thornton Group Architects (BTGA); Nathan Ginsberg, BTGA; Marybeth Carney, CGA Project Management (CGA); Dan Tavares, CGA; Chris Zorra, Board of Selectmen, Gary Sagar, Zoning Board of Appeals.

- A. **Call to Order:** Chairman John Pozzi opened the Building Committee meeting 4:35 PM.
- B. **Public Comment:** The committee approved moving Public Comment to the top of the agenda to hear comment from Gary Sagar, Chairman of the Seekonk Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Sagar explained that the Board approved the Special Use Permit at the April 8, 2024, meeting. He noted that he was in support of a DPW project, but did not agree with the proposed location, stating his opinion was that the structure was too big and the cost too high for that property. He suggested, in his opinion, that the town would be more amenable to renovating or constructing a new facility on the current DPW site and to temporarily relocate their operation to another site in town. S. Cadime explained this would be a different project than was approved by the Town with additional costs to start the process over.
- C. **Discussion on Meetings:** J. Pozzi expressed the Building Committee's displeasure that they were not notified in advance of the Abutter Meeting on 4/03/24 and the Zoning Board Meeting on 4/08/24. He reminded the project team that the Building Committee must be notified in advance of any meeting pertaining to this project, and last-minute notification is not acceptable. All public meetings pertaining to the project must be scheduled through the Building Committee. Per the Open Meeting Law, the building committee members can attend the same meeting without posting, if they do not discuss the project together. Design meetings with the Owner do not require committee notification. CGA apologized for not getting the information out sooner and will notify the Building Committee of all workshops and proposed public meetings.
- D. **OPM Report:**
1. CGA provided updates on activities held since the previous Building Committee meeting.
 2. Design Development drawing review meetings occurred with S. Cadime, D. Cabral, and the engineers to confirm the project intention was correct.

3. CGA noted that during the last Building Committee meeting, the frequency of Stretch Energy Code updates was discussed. CGA determined that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts website states that the Stretch Code is typically updated every 3 years and the last time was in 2023. This project would still be under the current stretch code when it goes out to bid.
4. Test pits for the proposed septic system location were dug by the DPW and witnessed by the Board of Health on April 3, 2024. The final report is pending, but no trash was found in the excavation and the health agent was satisfied. Additional test pits for roadways, buildings, and outbuilding subsurface exploration are being coordinated with DPW for the week of 4/22/24.
5. The Prequalification Committee met to discuss the evaluation process and criteria. CGA is in the process of drafting the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and Statement of Qualifications (SOQ), which will be posted publicly on 04/25/24, with the contractor's SOQ due on 05/22/24. The Prequalification Committee will evaluate each of the general and subcontractors and share the results at a future Building Committee meeting.
6. An informational meeting was scheduled by the town for the abutters on 04/03/23. Three property owners were in attendance. Their biggest concerns were related to the location of the building, proximity to their property line, the potential for sound and fume transmissions.
7. The project was presented to the Zoning Board of Approvals on 04/08/24. The Zoning application which was submitted on 03/18/24, included the Building Inspector's Letter of Determination, stating a Special Permit was required for any municipal use in all Zoning Districts. J. Casali, BTGA, CGA, and M. Hines attended the meeting. The abutters in attendance voiced their concerns, similar to the abutter's meeting. Proximity to property line, vegetation screening and density, and concern that the DPW use would devalue their property. Following the hearing, ZBA granted permission in a 4 to 1 vote, with the stipulation that the project would move the building as far away as possible from the neighbors while remaining outside of the trash area.

E. Architects Report:

1. Covered by the OPM's report.

F. Review Cost Estimate and Budget

1. CGA stated that the Design Development documents were reviewed by two independent cost estimators and the commissioning agent for two weeks. After the reconciliation process where the project scope and costs were confirmed, the estimates were within \$500,000, with PM&C at \$34.5 million and Keough at \$35 million once adjustments were made. This confirmed that the documents provided clearer and more complete information. The reconciled estimates are higher than what was presented during Schematic Design after the value engineering assumptions were removed. D. Tavares presented the Schematic Design budget, which showed a value engineering reduction of \$22 million, rendering the total project budget just under \$30 million, noting that not all assumptions were realized. A cost estimate comparison between Schematic Design and Design Development was presented confirming these results. The updated documents including the SD value engineering reductions brought the project from \$50.9 to \$35 million. The project team expressed concern that another round of value engineering exercise would not be enough reductions to bring the project back to the schematic design costs but should still occur. Project alternates were also priced, with Alternates 1C and 1D being removal of unsuitable soils and trash under the building and pavement being biggest challenge since the beginning of the project. Additional test pits have been scheduled to help determine if the cost of these items can be removed from the project. D. Tavares noted that the

costs on the comparison shown indicated that the estimators reviewed Alternates 1C and 1D conversely. CGA presented the project budget using the reconciled Design Development numbers, with a revised FF&E Budget of \$200,000 per BTGA, for a current value of \$38 million. They presented a second budget showing a reduction of \$8 million was needed to get back to the Schematic Design budget. CGA and BTGA are working together to identify further cost reductions and value engineering opportunities. They recommended moving the Barn and the Covered Storage to the Alternates. If the test pits come back good and soil/trash removal is minimal, skylights are removed, storefronts are reduced, the Public Address system and BDA are removed, and the outbuildings are removed, the project cost would only be reduced by \$5 million. D. Tavares explained that the project documents are more complete; therefore, the numbers are now more realistic. He noted that \$500/SF is within the range of with current construction costs. This is a \$35 million project without removing the garage and any further reductions in project would need to be made now prior to starting the next phase.

2. The committee noted that the reconciled estimates showed a difference of \$600,000 for concrete. D. Tavares explained the difference was due to quantity estimates. Keough's number increased from Schematic Design, due to slab thickness. The design engineer could provide actual quantities to bring the estimates closer. The electrical and mechanical divisions would also need further review. The team agreed that they will continue to review the estimates.
3. S. Cadime agreed that the estimates accurately reflect the correct costs noting that the South End Fire Station was 8,000 SF and the General Contractor bids came in at \$11 million. The proposed facility is conservatively designed, and the site is difficult.
4. Committee members expressed concern that a \$35 million project would not pass a town vote. Residents must be informed why a new facility is needed, the cost of replacing equipment when it is not stored under cover, and the equipment cost increase after Covid. The town approved preconstruction funds to design a new facility on this parcel of land and there is no other town owned property that could be used for this project. Renovating the existing building would trigger many code upgrades, including ADA to comply with the regulations and cost more money. The existing site is also too small to accommodate their needs, which would require equipment to be stored elsewhere. S. Cadime will work with D. Cabral and J. Argo to determine if portions of the project could be funded with outside sources (Free Cash, Enterprise Fund, Grants) to help reduce the taxpayer's burden. S. Cadime will also provide a tax impact analysis including debt coming off the books from previous projects.
5. The committee requested the project team determine the cost savings if the garage was removed and a parking lot was constructed, as well as if the garage was designed as a lean-to in lieu of an enclosed structure.
6. D. Tavares presented the Preconstruction Budget, noting the project has billed out over half of the funds appropriated for this phase of the project.

G. Review and Approve Invoices

1. Kevin Hurst made the motion, seconded by Michelle Hines, to approve and submit invoice DPW-012 dated 3/29/24 in the amount of \$22,000 for CGA Project Management to S. Cadime for payment. The vote was unanimously approved.
2. Kevin Hurst made the motion, seconded by Michelle Hines, to approve and submit BTGA's Invoice 11997, dated 3/31/24 in the amount of \$121,745.89, to S. Cadime for payment. The vote was unanimously approved.

H. Review and Approve Meeting Minutes:

Kevin Hurst made the motion, which was seconded by Ed Monigan, to approve the 2/21/24 and 3/13/24 meeting minutes as submitted. The vote was unanimously approved.

I. Other topics not reasonable anticipated by the Chairman 48 hours before the meeting: None.

J. Public Comment: No additional public comment. Refer to item B for more information.

K. Schedule Next Meetings:

A follow-up meeting to discuss the estimated garage reduction savings is scheduled for 4/17/24 at 3:30 virtually via Zoom.

L. Adjournment: John Pozzi made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:43 PM, which was seconded by Ed Monigan. Motion passed unanimously.