

Department of Public Works Building Committee

AGENDA

Wednesday February 21, 2024 at 4:30pm

FEB 16 '24 AM 8:40

Planning Board Meeting Room
Seekonk Town Hall
100 Peck St.
Seekonk MA, 02771

- A. Call the meeting to order
- B. OPM Report
- C. Architect Report
- D. Review and approve invoices
- E. Review and approve meeting minutes
- F. Discuss other topics not reasonably anticipated by the Chairman 48 hours before the meeting
- G. Public Comment
- H. Schedule next meeting
- I. Adjourn

SEEKONK DPW COMPLEX BUILDING COMMITTEE

02.21.2024

➤ UPDATES, DISCUSSIONS and ACTION ITEMS:

- **Design Meetings:** BTGA, CGA, S. Cadime, D. Cabral and members of the DPW staff met several times to discuss and confirm design and programming elements.
 - Follow-up meetings were held on 1/23/24 and 2/5/24 to review and confirm the equipment layouts with the updated building footprint. The DPW determined that only one 2-post lift was required, allowing for a second lift to be installed in the future if needed. The Salt Shed knee wall will be 42" tall, which will meet OSHA requirements and not interfere with loading equipment.
 - On 1/31/24, furniture, casework, storage types, and finishes were presented to the owner for initial feedback. Furniture and storage options were reviewed for each space. Future meetings will be held.
 - A meeting was held on 2/07/24 to review door and hardware preferences. Owner confirmed locking capabilities, panic hardware, security and access control system were discussed. The DPW will provide the permanent cores for the door hardware, so that they are compatible with the Cyberkeys already used in town. The video surveillance system will include IP based cameras that can be viewed by Police Dispatch.
 - On 2/07/24, building massing and roofline configurations were reviewed with the owner who preferred the option that lowers the garage peak to 20'. This option will allow for natural light to enter the maintenance and wash bays.
 - The team reviewed site and building identification signs, wayfinding signs and potential wall graphics on 2/14/24. The site sign located on Fall River Avenue will have a digital board to post town information, like the Senior Center and the High School.
- **Upcoming Design Meetings:**
 - 2/21/24 - HVAC Design (with Commissioning Agent)
 - 2/28/24 - Exterior Building Design
 - 2/29/24 - Town of Seekonk Technical Review Committee
 - 3/07/24 - Signage and Graphics Updates
- Garage configuration and site circulation was further evaluated to create a larger outdoor covered storage by shifting the garage building 30'. This adjustment also created additional outdoor space on the north side of the building for the generator, transformer, and other mechanical equipment. The fuel station was moved closer to the salt shed for better site circulation and potential lower site costs.
- CGA and BTGA presented at the joint Building Committee and Board of Selectman meeting on January 31, 2024. Key topics included an overview of the project schedule, preliminary budget, building and site designs, and the adjustments made through value engineering exercises to get to the current budget. The Selectman expressed concern that the garage was still too high which created wasted volume

and unnecessary operational costs. The Board also suggested that the team be prepared to address public comments regarding the cost increases since the Feasibility Study.

- Commissioning kick-off meeting was held on 01/31/24 with the owner and project team to discuss project expectations and schedule. Future meetings will be held.
- **Additional Services Request:** BTGA received a proposal from Gannet Fleming (GF) for structural and electrical engineering services for the Barn and structural engineering for the Covered Storage in the amount of \$28,166. BTGA also obtained a proposal for structural engineering services from another firm as a comparison, which could do it for \$15,000. CGA requested a cost breakdown for the electrical engineering portion of GF's proposal. Neither proposal includes the architect's 10% markup. No action by the committee is needed currently since this matter is still under review and there are no available funds in the budget.
- **Geotechnical Update:** BTGA's Geotechnical Engineer is recommending additional site investigations within the building footprint to finalize their report and provide the contractors with more information to bid the project. They issued one proposal in the amount of \$16,595 for 2 days to drill 6-8 soil borings with DPW conducting up to 6 test pits. The second proposal in the amount of \$8,150 would require the DPW to rent an excavator for approximately \$3,000 to dig 15' test pits that would then be analyzed by the Geotech engineer. Neither of these proposals include the architects 10% markup. No action by the committee is needed currently since this matter is still under review and there are no available funds in the budget.
- **Value Engineering (VE):** CGA maintains concern with only removing 18" of unsuitable soil under the roadway as a value engineering option. The potential for the road to settle under the weight of the heavy equipment that will be using it is high, which will require long-term town maintenance, replacement, and costs. This VE option should be further evaluated to determine the best course of action.
- **Contractor Prequalification:** Per Mass General Law, Chapter 149, building contracts estimated to cost \$10 million or over requires the prequalification of General Contractors and certain subcontractors, known as 'Filed Sub-Bidders' (FSB). The FSB subcontractors will make up approximately half of the construction contract. There are several steps to prequalify contractors and subcontractors, which start with establishing a Prequalification Committee. The committee must include one representative from the Architect and OPM, and two representatives from the Owner. Additional information is attached to this report for reference. CGA requests forming the Prequalification Committee at the March Building Committee meeting.
- **Community Outreach:** Project team suggests further discussions on the timing to commence outreach efforts and presentations to local boards.

➤ **ANTICIPATED PROJECT SCHEDULE (subject to change):**

- Jun 23 – Aug 23: Programming/Site Investigations (3m)
- Sep 23 – Dec 23: Schematic Design (SD) Phase (4m)



OPM Report

- **Jan 24 – Apr 24:** **Design Development (DD) Phase (4m)**
 - 02/21/24: Building Committee Meeting
 - 03/13/24: Building Committee Meeting (Establish Prequal. Committee)
 - 03/22/24: Submit DD Documents to Cost Estimators
 - 03/25/24: Start DD Cost Estimating
 - **04/01/24:** **Start Contractor Prequalification Process (3m)**
 - 04/05/24: Receive Draft DD Estimates
 - 04/08/24: Cost Estimate Reconciliation Meeting
 - 04/10/24: Building Committee Meeting (Review Cost Estimates/Budget)
 - 04/23/24: Finalize DD Documents
 - 04/24/24: Building Committee Meeting
 - 05/08/24: Joint Building Committee/Board of Selectmen Presentation
- **May 24 – Aug 24:** **Construction Documents (CD) Phase & Prequalification (4m)**
- **Aug 24 – Sep 24:** **Contractor Bidding Phase (2m)**
- **Oct 24 – Nov 24:** **Town Meeting/Ballot Votes/Execute GC Contract (2m)**
- **Dec 24 – May 26:** **Construction Administration (CA) & Project Closeout (18m)**
- **June/July 2026:** **Prep and Occupy Building**

➤ **INVOICES (see attached):**

- CGA: Invoice DPW-010 for January 2024 in the amount of \$22,000.

➤ **PRECONSTRUCTION PROJECT BUDGET & CASH FLOW REPORT:**

Project Budget	Budget	Billed to Date	Balance
OPM Basic Services	\$ 306,000.00	\$ 98,000.00	\$ 208,000.00
A&E: Basic Services	\$ 1,130,536.00	\$ 306,473.78	\$ 824,062.22
A&E Allowances:			
<i>Conservation Permitting</i>	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -	\$ 5,000.00
<i>Wetland Flagging</i>	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ -
<i>MA DOT Permitting</i>	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -	\$ 20,000.00
<i>Expanded Traffic Study</i>	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00
<i>Geotech CD Specifications</i>	\$ 3,000.00	\$ -	\$ 3,000.00
Commissioning Agent	\$ 15,000.00		
Available Contingency	\$ 8,964.00		
Budget Subtotal	\$ 1,500,000.00	\$ 404,473.78	\$ 1,095,526.22

➤ **PROPOSED BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING DATES (subject to change):**

- 3/13/24; 4/10/24; 4/24/24

Contractor and Subcontractor Prequalification Requirements for Building Contracts Estimated to Cost \$10 Million or More

For M.G.L. c. 149 building contracts estimated to cost \$10 million or more, general bidders and filed sub-bidders must be prequalified by your jurisdiction in accordance with the detailed prequalification procedures contained in M.G.L. c. 149. Awarding authorities may elect to institute these prequalification procedures for building contracts estimated to cost between \$100,000 and \$10 million.³⁴ On M.G.L. c. 149 contracts for which prequalification procedures are required or adopted, you will solicit bids only from prequalified general bidders and filed sub-bidders.

The following agencies are exempt from the mandatory contractor and subcontractor prequalification requirements contained in M.G.L. c. 149 but may elect to follow them: DCAMM, the Massachusetts Port Authority, the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority, the Massachusetts State College Building Authority and the University of Massachusetts Building Authority.

The detailed legal requirements for prequalifying general bidders and filed sub-bidders on these larger building construction contracts are found in M.G.L. c. 149, §§ 44D½ and 44D¾, and in DCAMM regulations, 810 CMR 9.00 and 10.00. These requirements are summarized below but the following summary is not comprehensive. Awarding authorities embarking on a prequalification process should consult the relevant provisions of M.G.L. c. 149 and the DCAMM regulations cited above.

The basic steps for prequalifying contractors and subcontractors to bid on public building contracts estimated to cost \$10 million or more are as follows:

1. Establish a prequalification committee.
2. Prepare the request for qualifications (RFQ).
3. Advertise the RFQ and receive statements of qualifications.
4. Evaluate and prequalify contractors or subcontractors.

³⁴ If you elect to use a prequalification process on a building contract estimated to cost between \$100,000 and \$10 million, you are not required to prequalify subcontractors in all subtrade categories. However, if you elect to prequalify subcontractors in a particular subtrade category, then all subcontractors submitting filed sub-bids for that subtrade category must be prequalified. 810 CMR 10.03(4).

5. Notify applicants; post and publish public notice of prequalified contractors or subcontractors.
6. Solicit bids or filed sub-bids from prequalified contractors or subcontractors.

Step 1: Establish a prequalification committee.

Before issuing the RFQ for general bidders or filed sub-bidders, you must establish a prequalification committee consisting of one representative of the project designer and three representatives of your jurisdiction, one of whom will be the owner's project manager (OPM), if an OPM is required.³⁵ The representative of the project designer must either have prepared the design documents or be the designer's designated representative for the building project. If the OPM is a consultant, the scope of services of your contract with the OPM must include the prequalification committee services and related costs. At its initial meeting, the prequalification committee must designate one of the three representatives of your jurisdiction to serve as chairperson. The chairperson will be responsible for coordinating the committee meetings and managing the evaluation process. 810 CMR 9.04. If you are prequalifying both general bidders and filed sub-bidders for a construction contract, the prequalification committee members for each prequalification process should be the same to the extent possible.

Step 2: Prepare the RFQ.

The RFQ must include an RFQ Interest Form in a form consistent with the RFQ Interest Form prescribed by DCAMM in two documents available at www.mass.gov/dcamm: *Standard Forms for General Contractor Prequalification* and *Standard Forms for Subcontractor Prequalification*. You are required to maintain a list of all firms that have submitted an RFQ Interest Form with their responses to the RFQ and to provide notice of any addenda or other communications regarding the prequalification process to all firms that have submitted the RFQ Interest Form. 810 CMR 9.05, 10.05.

The RFQ must also include a standard Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) in a form consistent with the Statement of Qualifications prescribed by DCAMM in the *Standard Forms for General Contractor Prequalification* and the *Standard Forms for*

³⁵ An OPM will be required on all building projects estimated to cost \$1.5 million or more.

Subcontractor Prequalification. Your jurisdiction may customize the SOQ to include project-specific information pertaining to the evaluation criteria listed below, but the standard SOQ may not otherwise be modified or changed. You are required to make the SOQ available in both electronic and paper form to interested general contractors and subcontractors. The general contractor or subcontractor submitting the SOQ in response to the RFQ must sign the SOQ under pains and penalties of perjury.

In preparing the RFQ, you must use only the evaluation criteria, information requirements and point rating system that are specified in M.G.L. c. 149 and are listed below. Different requirements for contractors and subcontractors are noted.

1. Management experience (50 points; minimum of 25 points required for approval)

- Business owners: Name, title and years with firm of the owner(s) of the business.
- Management personnel: Names, title, education and construction experience, years with firm and list of projects completed by all management personnel who will have any direct or indirect responsibility for the building project.
- Similar project experience: Project name(s), description, original contract sum, final contract sum with explanation and date completed of similar projects. Your jurisdiction has the discretion to include in the RFQ a description of what you consider a “similar project.”
- Terminations: A list of any projects on which the firm was terminated or failed to complete the work, including an explanation for each instance listed.
- Legal proceedings (general contractors): A list of all legal or administrative proceedings currently pending against the general contractor or concluded adversely to the general contractor within the past five years that relate to the procurement or performance of any public or private construction contract.
- Legal proceedings (subcontractors): A list of all legal or administrative proceedings currently pending against the subcontractor or concluded adversely to the subcontractor within the past three years that relate to the procurement or performance of any public or private construction contract. Legal proceedings do not include any actions that primarily involve personal injury or workers' compensation claims, or where the sole cause of action involves the subcontractor's exercise of its rights for direct payment under M.G.L. c. 30, § 39F.
- Safety record: The three-year history of the firm's workers' compensation experience modifier.

- Compliance record (general contractors): Information on, and evidence of, the firm's compliance record with respect to minority business enterprise and women business enterprise inclusion goals and workforce inclusion goals, if applicable, on building projects within the past five years.

2. References (30 points; minimum of 15 points required for approval)

- Project references: A list of references from owners and architects for all "similar projects" provided in response to the third item listed under "Management Experience" (above), including project names and names of the owners and architects, with a current address, telephone and fax number, and contact person for each project.
- Credit references: A list of at least five credit references, including the telephone and fax numbers of contact persons from key suppliers, vendors and banks.
- Public project records: A list of all public building construction projects subject to M.G.L. c. 149 completed during the past three years, including the owner's name, current address, telephone number, fax number and contact person for each project.

3. Capacity to complete projects (20 points; minimum of 10 points required for approval)

- General contractors: An audited financial statement for the most recent fiscal year.³⁶
- Subcontractors: Annual revenue for the prior three fiscal years.³⁷ (Note that the RFQ for subcontractors may not require submission of financial statements.)
- Revenue under contract for the next three fiscal years.

³⁶ To preserve the confidentiality of this information and the information regarding the general contractor's revenue under contract for the next three years, interested general contractors may submit the required information in a sealed envelope that is stapled to the SOQ package, labeled with the general contractor's name, the project name, the project number and a notation stating that the envelope contains confidential financial information. 810 CMR 9.05(4).

³⁷ To preserve the confidentiality of this information and the information regarding the subcontractor's revenue under contract for the next three years, interested subcontractors may submit the required information in a sealed envelope that is stapled to the SOQ package, labeled with the subcontractor's name, the project name, the project number and a notation stating that the envelope contains confidential financial information. 810 CMR 10.05(4).

4. Mandatory requirements for which no points are assigned

- A commitment letter, issued by a surety company licensed to do business in the Commonwealth and whose name appears on United States Treasury Department Circular 570, for payment and performance bonds indicating that the contractor or subcontractor is bondable for 100 percent of the estimated contract or subcontract value.³⁸ If the commitment letter is written by another party on behalf of a surety company, the commitment letter must be accompanied by an authorized power of attorney from a surety company.
- General contractors: A Certificate of Eligibility issued by DCAMM showing single and aggregate capacity ratings sufficient for the project, and a completed Update Statement.
- Subcontractors: A Certificate of Eligibility issued by DCAMM and a completed Update Statement.

The RFQ must identify the specific point allocation for each category and subcategory of information. Within each category of information, the prequalification committee may use discretion in allocating points among the subcategories, consistent with the total points for the category.

For prequalification of both general contractors and subcontractors, the RFQ and the public notice must include the following information:

1. For general contractors, the RFQ must include a statement that the RFQ will be used to prequalify general contractors that will be invited to submit bids pursuant to M.G.L. c. 149, § 44E. For subcontractors, the RFQ must include a statement indicating that the RFQ will be used to prequalify subcontractors that will be invited to submit filed sub-bids pursuant to M.G.L. c. 149, §§ 44E-44F.
2. The location(s) where interested general contractors or subcontractors can obtain a full copy of the RFQ, including the actual and electronic addresses where copies may be obtained.
3. The time and date for receipt of responses to the RFQ, which must be at least two weeks after the date of the advertisement.
4. The mailing and physical addresses of the office to which responses are to be delivered.
5. The time frame in which the public agency will respond to the responses.

³⁸ This commitment letter constitutes a written determination by the surety that, based on the information known at the time, it would approve the issuance of payment and performance bonds for 100 percent of the estimated contract or subcontract value.

6. A general description of the building project, including a description of the physical location of the project and work to be performed.
7. The anticipated schedule for the building project from the time a notice to proceed is issued by your jurisdiction.
8. The estimated construction cost for the project and estimated construction cost for each and every subcontractor for which subcontractors will be prequalified to submit filed sub-bids.
9. A listing of the project team, including the awarding authority, the designer and the awarding authority's OPM, if applicable.
10. A detailed description of the evaluation procedure and criteria for prequalification of general contractors or subcontractors, including the point rating system and specific point allocations for each evaluation category and subcategory, and the anticipated schedule for the start and completion of the evaluation process.
11. A prohibition against any unauthorized communication or contact with your jurisdiction outside of the official pre-bid meetings.
12. Any limitations desired by your jurisdiction on the size of and number of pages to be included in the response to the RFQ.

If inclusion of all of the above information in the text of the public notice is not practicable due to space and cost limitations, you must include items 1 through 9 above. You may state in the public notice that all further required information, including the prequalification evaluation criteria and selection process, is included in the RFQ. 810 CMR 9.07, 10.07.

Step 3: Advertise the RFQ and receive statements of qualifications.

At least two weeks before the deadline for submitting responses to the RFQ, you must advertise the RFQ in a newspaper of general circulation in the area in which the building project is located, in the *Central Register* and on COMMBUYS.³⁹ If you so choose, you may also post the public notice on your jurisdiction's website.

The SOQs are not opened publicly but must be opened in the presence of one or more witnesses at the time specified in the RFQ. The opening of the SOQs by the prequalification committee will satisfy this requirement.

³⁹ COMMBUYS is the Commonwealth's electronic procurement system. Any public agency in Massachusetts can post solicitations on COMMBUYS free of charge. For additional information, visit www.commbuys.com.

The prequalification committee is required to prepare a register of responders that includes the name of each general contractor or subcontractor that submitted a SOQ in response to the RFQ. The register of responders must be open for public inspection. After the SOQs have been evaluated by the prequalification committee, the SOQs must be made available to the public with the exception of the financial information they contain, which is not a public record. M.G.L. c. 149, § 44D½(g).

Step 4: Evaluate and prequalify contractors or subcontractors.

After opening the responses to the RFQ, the prequalification committee is required to review the register of responders and obtain copies of each SOQ and all supporting documentation. The prequalification committee may delegate the checking of references to individuals that are not committee members provided that the prequalification committee develops a written reference check form with uniform questions to be asked by those checking general contractor and subcontractor references. The chairperson of the prequalification committee may delegate additional administrative tasks necessary to facilitate the prequalification process. 810 CMR 9.08, 10.08.

The prequalification committee is responsible for evaluating each SOQ submitted in response to the RFQ, using only the evaluation criteria contained in the RFQ. After prequalification committee members have completed their individual reviews of the SOQs, the prequalification committee must collectively evaluate the responses to the RFQ. The prequalification committee may consult with other representatives of your jurisdiction, the designer, client or user agency (if applicable) or legal counsel as necessary to expedite the evaluation process. The prequalification committee may also contact interested general contractors and subcontractors to clarify or verify timely information submitted by an interested general contractor or subcontractor in its SOQ. After the evaluation process is completed, the chairperson must complete a Prequalification Evaluation Report in a form consistent with the Prequalification Evaluation Report prescribed by the DCAMM *Guidelines for Prequalification*. This report must reflect the consensus of the prequalification committee regarding the score received by the general contractor or subcontractor for each evaluation category and subcategory and must indicate the total points awarded. The report may be customized

by the prequalification committee only to reflect project-specific information. 810 CMR 9.08, 10.08.

Only general contractors and subcontractors receiving the minimum number of points in each of the four general evaluation categories as set forth in the RFQ, as well as a total minimum score of 70 points, may be prequalified to submit bids and filed sub-bids. All general contractors and subcontractors that fulfill these requirements must be invited to submit bids and filed sub-bids. 810 CMR 9.08, 10.08.

The prequalification committee must select at least three qualified general contractors to submit bids on the construction contract. If the prequalification committee prequalifies fewer than three general contractors for a M.G.L. c. 149 construction contract estimated to cost \$10 million or more (for which contractor prequalification is mandatory), your jurisdiction must reject all responses and issue at least one new RFQ. If that RFQ produces fewer than three prequalified general contractors, you have two options: (1) you may solicit general bids pursuant to M.G.L. c. 149, §§ 44B-44E; or (2) if at least two general bidders have been prequalified, you may invite bids from those prequalified general bidders.

If your jurisdiction chose to use the prequalification process for a M.G.L. c. 149 construction contract estimated to cost between \$100,000 and \$10 million, and if the prequalification committee prequalifies fewer than three general contractors, you have three options: (1) you may reject all responses and issue a new RFQ; (2) you may solicit general bids pursuant to M.G.L. c. 149; or (3) if at least two general contractors have been prequalified, you may invite general bids from those prequalified general contractors. If you reissue an RFQ for general bidders, your RFQ may stipulate that a general contractor that was prequalified for a particular project during the first RFQ process will remain prequalified for that project, without any further submissions by the general contractor or review by your jurisdiction. This prequalification will last for up to 120 days from the due date of responses to the first RFQ. M.G.L. c. 149, § 44D½(i).

Similarly, the prequalification committee must select at least three qualified subcontractors to submit filed sub-bids for each category of work subject to the filed sub-bidding requirements of M.G.L. c. 149. If the prequalification committee

prequalifies fewer than three subcontractors for a particular trade in connection with a M.G.L. c. 149 construction contract estimated to cost \$10 million or more (for which subcontractor prequalification is mandatory), you must reject all responses and issue at least one new RFQ. If that RFQ produces fewer than three prequalified subcontractors, you have two options: (1) you may solicit filed sub-bids pursuant to M.G.L. c. 149, §§ 44B-44E; or (2) if at least two sub-bidders have been prequalified, you may invite bids from those prequalified subcontractors.

If your jurisdiction chose to use the prequalification process for a M.G.L. c. 149 construction contract estimated to cost between \$100,000 and \$10 million, and the prequalification committee prequalifies fewer than three contractors, you have three options: (1) you may reject all responses and issue a new RFQ; (2) you may solicit filed sub-bids pursuant to M.G.L. c. 149; or (3) if at least two subcontractors have been prequalified, you may invite filed sub-bids from the two prequalified subcontractors. If you reissue an RFQ for subcontractors, your RFQ may stipulate that a subcontractor that was prequalified for a particular project during the first RFQ process will remain prequalified for that project, without any further submissions by the subcontractor or review by your jurisdiction. This prequalification will last for up to 120 days from the due date of responses to the first RFQ. M.G.L. c. 149, § 44D^{3/4}(i).

Step 5: Notify applicants; post and publish public notice of prequalified contractors and subcontractors.

Within 14 days of the completion of the prequalification committee's evaluation process, your jurisdiction is required to send via first class mail, postage prepaid:

- written notices to all contractors and subcontractors that were not prequalified, advising them that they did not achieve a sufficient score from the prequalification committee to be prequalified; and
- written notices to all prequalified contractors and subcontractors, advising them that they have been prequalified by the prequalification committee to submit bids or filed sub-bids on the project.

Also within 14 days of the completion of the prequalification committee's evaluation process, your jurisdiction is required to publish a public notice listing all general contractors or subcontractors that have been prequalified for the building project and

stating that only prequalified general contractors or subcontractors are eligible to submit bids or filed sub-bids. The notice must be posted in your jurisdiction's bid room or place of business where general bids are customarily received for building projects and on COMMBUYs. You may also post the public notice on your jurisdiction's website.

General contractors and subcontractors submitting SOQs in response to an RFQ may obtain their scores upon written request to your jurisdiction. M.G.L. c. 149, §§ 44D½ and 44D¾ provide that the decisions of the prequalification committee shall be final and shall not be subject to appeal except on grounds of arbitrariness, capriciousness, fraud or collusion.

Step 6: Solicit bids or filed sub-bids from prequalified contractors or subcontractors.

A copy of the public notice referenced in Step 5 must be sent via first class mail, postage prepaid, to all prequalified general contractors or subcontractors along with an invitation to bid. The invitation to bid must state where prequalified general contractors and subcontractors can obtain copies of the plans and specifications for the project and must specify the deadlines for submitting bids and filed sub-bids. The invitation to bid must be issued at least two weeks before the deadlines for submitting bids and filed sub-bids. Any other parties interested in obtaining the plans and specifications may do so by providing a deposit designated by your jurisdiction. You must refund the deposit when the documents are returned. 810 CMR 9.10, 10.10.

For contracts estimated to cost \$10 million or more, or for contracts estimated to cost between \$100,000 and \$10 million for which you have elected to prequalify the general bidders and filed sub-bidders, you will solicit bids and filed sub-bids only from general bidders and filed sub-bidders that have been prequalified by your jurisdiction using the procedures summarized above.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT SCHEDULE

DRAFT

Seekonk Department of Public Works Complex

Activity Name	Duration (Days)	Start Date	Finish Date	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026													
				6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
PROJECT TEAM PROCUREMENT	170.00	9/22/22	5/17/23		▼	→															
OPM Procurement	65.00	9/22/22	12/21/22		■																
Building Committee-OPM Kick-Off Meeting	0.00	1/10/23	1/10/23			▼															
Designer Procurement	95.00	1/2/23	5/12/23		■	■	■														
Building Committee Meeting	0.00	3/13/23	3/13/23			●															
Building Committee Meeting-Approve BTGA Architects	0.00	3/27/23	3/27/23			●															
Building Committee-OPM-Architect Kick-off Meeting	0.00	5/17/23	5/17/23				▼														
PROGRAMMING & SITE INVESTIGATIONS	70.00	5/18/23	8/23/23		■	■	■	▼	→	▼	→										
Building Committee Meeting (Site Visit & Programming)	0.00	6/7/23	6/7/23				●														
Building Committee Meeting	0.00	6/14/23	6/14/23				●														
Building Committee Meeting	0.00	7/12/23	7/12/23				●														
Building Committee Meeting	0.00	8/9/23	8/9/23				●														
Building Committee Meeting (Authorize to Start SD Phase)	0.00	8/23/23	8/23/23					▼													
SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE	95.00	8/24/23	1/3/24		■	■	■	■	▼	→	▼	→									
Building Committee Meeting	0.00	9/27/23	9/27/23					●													
Building Committee Meeting	0.00	10/11/23	10/11/23					●													
Release SD Documents to Cost Estimators	0.00	10/31/23	10/31/23					■													
SD Cost Estimating	10.00	11/6/23	11/17/23						■												
SD Cost Estimate Reconciliation Meeting	0.00	11/20/23	11/20/23						■												
Building Committee Meeting	0.00	11/29/23	11/29/23						●												
Value Engineering "VE" Exercises	24.00	11/30/23	1/2/24							■											
Develop Draft VE List	0.00	12/6/23	12/6/23							■											
Owner Meeting to Review Draft VE List	0.00	12/7/23	12/7/23							■											
Owner Meeting to Review Draft VE List	0.00	12/11/23	12/11/23							■											
Coordination Meeting with DPW	0.00	12/13/23	12/13/23							■											
BTGA-CGA Team Meeting to Review VE Status	0.00	12/20/23	12/20/23							■											
Owner Design VE Review Meeting	0.00	12/21/23	12/21/23							■											
Design Review with DPW	0.00	12/27/23	12/27/23							■											
Owner Design VE Review Meeting	0.00	1/3/24	1/3/24							■											
Building Committee Meeting (Approve Budget/Start DD Phase)	0.00	1/3/24	1/3/24								▼										
					6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	10	11	12

PRELIMINARY PROJECT SCHEDULE

Seekonk Department of Public Works Complex

Activity Name	Duration (Days)	Start Date	Finish Date	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026												
				6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE	80.00	1/4/24	4/24/24																	
Develop 90% DD Documents	57.00	1/4/24	3/22/24																	
Project Team Review Meeting	0.00	1/10/24	1/10/24																	
Equipment Review Meeting	0.00	1/23/24	1/23/24																	
Project Team Review Meeting	0.00	1/24/24	1/24/24																	
Project Team Review Meeting	0.00	1/29/24	1/29/24																	
Site Plan & Building Review with Team/Owner	0.00	1/30/24	1/30/24																	
FF&E & Finishes Review Meeting	0.00	1/31/24	1/31/24																	
Joint Building Committee/Board of Selectmen Meeting	0.00	1/31/24	1/31/24																	
Hardware/Security & Exterior Building Modeling Review	0.00	2/7/24	2/7/24																	
BTGA-CGA Site Design Review	0.00	2/8/24	2/8/24																	
Signage & Graphics Review	0.00	2/14/24	2/14/24																	
HVAC/Commissioning Review	0.00	2/21/24	2/21/24																	
Building Committee Meeting	0.00	2/21/24	2/21/24																	
Exterior Design Review	0.00	2/28/24	2/28/24																	
Town Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting	0.00	2/29/24	2/29/24																	
Zoning Board Meeting (To Be Confirmed)	0.00	3/4/24	3/4/24																	
Signage & Graphics Follow-up Review Meeting	0.00	3/7/24	3/7/24																	
Building Committee Meeting (Establish Prequal Committee)	0.00	3/13/24	3/13/24																	
Release DD Documents to Cost Estimators	0.00	3/22/24	3/22/24																	
DD Cost Estimating	10.00	3/25/24	4/5/24																	
DD Cost Estimate Reconciliation Meeting (1pm-5pm)	0.00	4/8/24	4/8/24																	
Finalize DD Documents/Costs/Budget	10.00	4/11/24	4/24/24																	
Building Committee (Approve DD Documents/Start CD Phase)	0.00	4/24/24	4/24/24																	
Joint Building Committee/Board of Selectmen Meeting	0.00	5/8/24	5/8/24																	
CONTRACTOR PREQUALIFICATION	78.00	3/13/24	6/28/24																	
Establish Contractor Prequalification Committee (BC Meeting)	0.00	3/13/24	3/13/24																	
Prequalification Committee Meeting #1	0.00	4/3/24	4/3/24																	
Prepare & Finalize Request for Qualifications (RFQ)	15.00	4/4/24	4/24/24																	
Prequalification Committee Meeting #2	0.00	4/24/24	4/24/24																	

PRELIMINARY PROJECT SCHEDULE

Seekonk Department of Public Works Complex

Activity Name	Duration (Days)	Start Date	Finish Date	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026														
				6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	
Submit Notice of RFQ for Contractors and FSB Subcontractors	0.00	4/25/24	4/25/24																			
RFQ Available for Contractors and FSB Subcontractors	15.00	5/1/24	5/21/24																			
Receive Contractor and Subcontractor Qualifications (SOQ)	0.00	5/22/24	5/22/24																			
Prequalification Committee #3	0.00	5/24/24	5/24/24																			
Evaluate and Prequalify Contractors and Subcontractors	20.00	5/27/24	6/21/24																			
Prequalification Committee #4	0.00	6/26/24	6/26/24																			
Building Committee to Approve Prequalified GC/Subcontractors	0.00	7/10/24	7/10/24																			
Issue & Post Public Notice of Prequalified Contractors and Subs	0.00	7/11/24	7/11/24																			
CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENT PHASE	80.00	4/25/24	8/14/24																			
60% CD Development	25.00	4/25/24	5/29/24																			
Building Committee Meeting	0.00	5/8/24	5/8/24																			
90% CD Development	25.00	5/30/24	7/3/24																			
Release 60% CD Documents to Cost Estimators	0.00	5/31/24	5/31/24																			
Building Committee Meeting (60% CD Review)	0.00	6/12/24	6/12/24																			
60% CD Cost Estimating	10.00	6/3/24	6/14/24																			
60% CD Cost Estimate Review and Reconciliation	0.00	6/17/24	6/17/24																			
Building Committee Meeting (Review Cost Estimates & Budget)	0.00	6/19/24	6/19/24																			
Joint Building Committee/Board of Selectmen Meeting	0.00	6/26/24	6/26/24																			
90% CD Documents (Owner Review)	10.00	7/8/24	7/19/24																			
Building Committee Meeting	0.00	7/10/24	7/10/24																			
100% CD Development	30.00	7/4/24	8/14/24																			
100% Bid Documents Available for Bid	0.00	8/14/24	8/14/24																			
Building Committee Meeting	0.00	8/14/24	8/14/24																			
CONTRACTOR BIDDING	45.00	8/8/24	10/9/24																			
Submit Central Register, COMMBUYS & Legal Advertisement	0.00	8/8/24	8/8/24																			
100% Contractor Bid Documents Available	0.00	8/14/24	8/14/24																			
Filed Sub-Bid Subcontractor Bids Due	0.00	9/11/24	9/11/24																			
Building Committee Meeting (Approve FSB Bids)	0.00	9/18/24	9/18/24																			
General Contractor Bids Due	0.00	9/25/24	9/25/24																			
Building Committee Meeting (Approve GC Bids)	0.00	10/9/24	10/9/24																			
				6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	

PRELIMINARY PROJECT SCHEDULE

Seekonk Department of Public Works Complex

Activity Name	Duration (Days)	Start Date	Finish Date	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026												
				6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
TOWN APPROVAL & BOND REFERENDUM	41.00	10/9/24	12/4/24																	
Board of Selectmen Vote to Approve TM Warrant Article/Ballot	0.00	10/9/24	10/9/24																	
Town Meeting (TBD)	0.00	11/18/24	11/18/24																	
<i>Referendum Ballot Vote (TBD) Saturday, 11/23/24</i>	0.00	11/25/24	11/25/24																	
Board of Selectmen Vote to Award GC Contract/Notice to Proceed	0.00	12/4/24	12/4/24																	
CONSTRUCTION / CLOSEOUT & OCCUPANCY	404.00	12/4/24	6/22/26																	
Building Committee Kick-Off Meeting with General Contractor	0.00	12/11/24	12/11/24																	
Construction	345.00	12/4/24	3/31/26																	
Date of Substantial Completion	0.00	3/31/26	3/31/26																	
Project Closeout	43.00	4/1/26	5/29/26																	
Date of Final Completion	0.00	5/29/26	5/29/26																	
Occupy New Building	0.00	6/1/26	6/1/26																	
				6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	10	11	12



CGA Project Management, LLC
P.O. Box 3147
Fall River, MA 02722

INVOICE

Town of Seekonk
100 Peck Street
Seekonk, MA 02771

Project: Seekonk DPW Complex
Invoice #: DPW-010
Invoice Date: 1/31/2024

Base Contract Amount: \$ 306,000.00

Amended Contract Amount: \$ -

Total Contract Amount: \$ 306,000.00

Description	Contract Amount	Previously Billed	Total Earned	% Complete	Current Billing
Designer Procurement	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	100%	\$ -
Schematic Design	\$ 66,000.00	\$ 66,000.00	\$ 66,000.00	100%	\$ -
Design Development	\$ 88,000.00	\$ -	\$ 22,000.00	25%	\$ 22,000.00
Construction Documents	\$ 120,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Contractor Bid	\$ 22,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Construction Phase	\$ 399,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Project Closeout	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Summary	\$ 725,000.00	\$ 76,000.00	\$ 98,000.00	14%	\$ 22,000.00

TOTAL DUE: \$ 22,000.00

Please remit payment to:

CGA Project Management, LLC
P.O. Box 3147
Fall River, MA 02722

Payment Terms: *Thirty (30) days*

DRAFT

TOWN OF SEEKONK

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING COMMITTEE

DATE: Wednesday January 3, 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

Absent: Edward Monigan

Attendees: Shawn Cadime, Town Administration; Jennifer Argo, Town Finance Director; David Cabral, DPW Director; Nate Ginsburg, Brewster Thornton Group Architects (BTGA); Christine Shea, BTGA; Marybeth Carney, CGA Project Management (CGA); Dan Tavares, CGA (OPM); Chris Zorra, Seekonk Board of Selectman

- A. **Call to Order:** Chairman John Pozzi opened the Building Committee meeting 4:36 PM.
- B. **OPM Report:**
 - 1. CGA provided updates on activities held since the previous Building Committee meeting.
 - 2. CGA noted that several “value engineering” meetings were held to review cost reduction options that were attended by the Town Administrator and DPW representatives or just between CGA and BTGA. The focus was to reconfirm building and site programs and layouts, and equipment. Based on these meetings and in working it collaboration with the town, approximately \$22 million of acceptable cost reductions options was identified. The building size was reduced by 4,800 square feet, changing the size from approximately 66,000 square feet to approximately 61,200 square feet. The overall height was also reduced appropriately. The building mechanical systems were confirmed, which reduced costs, indicating that the cost estimators may not have understood the systems being proposed. Based on these adjustments, the estimated cost of construction would be \$26,643,786.
 - 3. CGA presented a draft of the Project Budget based on the new estimated construction cost. CGA noted that the Commissioning Agent budget was increased based on quotes received during the procurement process. Incorporating the proposed value engineering, the estimated total project budget is \$31,284,772. Removing the preconstruction budget, the construction cost was \$29,784,772. D. Cabral noted that the request at the Town Meeting would be less than \$30 million since the preconstruction budget of \$1.5 million would be removed. CGA reminded the committee that this budget will continue to evolve through the remaining phases. CGA recommended that the Building Committee approve the value engineering options as presented and authorize BTGA to move forward into the Design Development phase.

4. CGA provided status of the commissioning agent procurement noting that the town received nine Commissioning Agent proposals on December 1, 2023. CGA added that they have worked with several of the firms. M. Hines questioned the role and responsibility of a commissioning agent with the belief that the OPM would be providing these services. CGA explained that they would be coordinating this effort with all parties and be present on site but added that they are not qualified as commissioning agents. CGA further explained that while engineers are responsible for the design of the mechanical systems, and contractors are responsible for the installations, a commissioning agent is an independent third party representing the town to verify that the mechanical systems are functioning per design and code. CGA added that the commissioning agent would also have a role in reviewing the design and installation of the building envelope. S. Cadime reiterated that having a commissioning agent is important to verify the systems are installed per design, avoiding some of the challenges the town has faced in the past. N. Ginsberg added that a commissioning agent could also help with alternate cost-saving ideas and better designed HVAC systems in the design phase. It was further noted that commissioning agents are onsite during construction confirming the envelope is built correctly, during mechanical equipment factory start up and then return to confirm the system continues to operate properly prior to when the one-year warranty expires.
5. CGA stated that they have reviewed the proposals, contacted references, and considered their experience when evaluating the firms. CGA noted that since we are in the preconstruction phase and that the requirements of the next phases are still undetermined, they ranked the firms based on preconstruction fees only, while considering overall potential costs. Based on this process, CGA stated that the lowest qualified proposer for preconstruction services was NV5 at \$8,800. Their construction phase fee was \$50,705 but this would need to be adjusted based on the final design. CGA noted that NV5 had a complete and comprehensive proposal, and they had specific experience with DPW facilities. Although the price to commission the building envelope was requested, the building is a pre-manufactured building, and the cost will need to be determined once the design is completed. The Request for Proposal (RFP) was written to allow the contract to be awarded by phase.
6. CGA explained that meetings with the geotechnical engineer will be scheduled to determine whether additional subsurface investigations are needed to confirm soil remediation options.
7. CGA stated that the community outreach status is a placeholder in the OPM report. S. Cadime stated the Board of Selectman will have a new policy that town formed committees will be required to make a presentation at the end of each design phase. The committee determined that a presentation of the updated site and floor plans would be sufficient to update the Board of Selectmen at their January 31, 2024 meeting. It was confirmed that this would not be a public hearing. This would be a posted joint meeting with the Building Committee and Board.
8. CGA presented an updated project schedule that shifted by 3 weeks. BTGA stated this loss of time would be recuperated during the Design Development phase assuming the confirmation of program that done during Schematic Design provided a more efficient design. Design Development is scheduled to end in April 2024.
9. Michelle Hines made a motion, seconded by Kevin Hurst, to approve the NV5 proposal as the Commissioning Agent for the DPW Building Project. The vote was unanimously approved.

C. Architects Report:

1. BTGA reminded the committee that the original estimated cost of construction taking the average of the two cost estimates is \$48,725,185. With that as the starting point, BTGA provided an overview of their spreadsheet with four value engineering options. Items were listed sequentially, each including cost reductions of the items in the previous option. Option 1 identified “low hanging fruit” that BTGA stated should be taken regardless with savings increasing from Option 1 to Option 4, which would involve deeper cuts in the program.
2. BTGA explained that Option 1 included value engineering options discussed at the November Building Committee meeting. BTGA reported they met with two metal building manufacturers and confirmed that the cost of the proposed metal building would be approximately \$4.5 million less than estimated. This would also result in a reduction of costs for the outbuildings as well. Option 1 was estimated to be approximately an \$15.2 million cost reduction resulting in a \$33,470,412 construction cost and would include the following assumptions: removal of 18” soil/trash/debris under pavement areas instead of going to virgin soil; relocating unsuitable soil to an area on the same property in lieu of hauling offsite; reducing the amount of asphalt to the barn and around the salt shed; reducing the height of the building, which was initially designed based on height of the bridge crane in the mechanic bay; reducing the cost of the garage plumbing and electrical, which the cost estimators initially used the same price per square foot as the administration building, which is not necessary; changing the design of the outdoor covered storage to a standard metal building; eliminate epoxy flooring; eliminate solar system, building will be solar ready.
3. BTGA stated that Option 2 would be an additional potential savings of \$5 million resulting in a construction cost \$26,643,786 and would include the following assumptions: reduce the number of parking spaces from 51 to 40; reduce the mechanical screening over the administration system; reduce the administration building by 20% (final edits have a reduction of 33%); eliminate BDA system if confirmed by the Fire Department; simplify the mechanical heating system in the garage to unit heaters; reduce windows and building height; reduce overall size of garage by removing four parking spaces, reducing the travel lane width, and reorganizing the trucks so that longer spaces are all on one side of the building which would reduce the length of the parking spaces on the other side; reduce covered storage by \$1 million, leaving \$774,000, which would be further investigated in the next design phase to see if additional covered storage could be provided by extending the roof structure beyond the wash bay to the end of the garage providing approximately 18,00 square feet of covered storage.
4. Option 3 are items BTGA recommended as alternates if needed, for a savings of approximately \$1 million, which would include eliminating the mechanical screening completely, all skylights, all covered storage.
5. BTGA reported that Option 4 would cut the project deeply and affect operations and program but listed them for discussion which would include: further reduction of the Administration square footage; remove one loading bay; remove high velocity fans in garage; remove the Salt Shed drive through; eliminate barn; and eliminate sunshades.
6. Michelle Hines stated that in her opinion the mechanical screening was just for aesthetics and acoustics and should be removed in Option 2. BTGA said they would investigate whether moving the mechanical unit inside a room in the garage is an option. This could eliminate the need for any rooftop unit and a ladder resulting in additional cost savings.

7. BTGA presented the revised floor plan using the reductions from Option 2, as well as a recommendation from S. Cadime and approved by the DPW, to switch the location of maintenance and the loading bays to reduce noise in the administrative area. Equipment storage was changed to cages with sliding gates instead of walls, which was not accounted for in the cost reduction. Gannet Fleming reviewed these changes and confirmed that equipment would fit in the new layout. In administration, the Plan Room, Break Room, and reception were reduced in size, and the lobby was reduced to one entry point. The men's locker room was redesigned for one shower and toilet stalls instead of individual water closets. CGA noted that sight-lines still needed to be addressed into the locker rooms.
8. C. Shea mentioned that Gannet Fleming did not believe the wash bay was oversized but was reviewing to see if the equipment could fit along the back wall. C. Zorra recommended removing the wall separating the equipment room, stating it was not needed.
9. D. Cabral said the reduction in height of the loading bays eliminated the possibility of the 33' dump truck fitting in the bays, stating that they currently do not have or that it was needed.
10. The reduction in the building footprint size prompted the committee to discuss whether the building should be shifted further away from the landfill side. The committee maintained that the 50' buffer from the neighbors should be held.

D. Review and Approve Value Engineering and Cost Reduction Options & Authorize Architect to proceed into Design Development Phase

1. Michelle Hines made the motion, seconded by Kevin Hurst, to accept the Value Engineering items in Option 2 as presented and authorize the project team to move into the Design Development phase. The vote was unanimously approved.

E. Review and Approve Invoices:

1. Kevin Hurst made the motion, seconded by Michael Gagne, to approve CGA Invoice DPW-009 in the amount of \$11,000. The vote was unanimous.
2. Michelle Hines made the motion, seconded by Kevin Hurst, to approve BTGA Invoice 11829 in the amount of \$43,348. The vote was unanimous.
3. Michelle Hines made the motion, seconded by Kevin Hurst, to approve BTGA Invoice 11869 in the amount of \$32,511. The vote was unanimous.

F. Review and Approve Meeting Minutes:

1. Kevin Hurst made the motion, seconded by Michael Gagne to approve meeting minutes from November 29, 2023, vote was unanimous.

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

H. Public Comment: C. Zorra asked if a waste oil burner could be used to heat the garage. The team explained that the garage was too large for the waste oil they received. The current design would have the barn heated by the waste oil and the rest of the buildings would have gas fired RTU and unit heaters.

I. Schedule Next Meetings:

Board of Selectman presentation will be held on January 31, 2024 at Town Hall.

Next Building Committee meeting will be held at 4:30pm on February 14, 2024 at Town Hall.

J. Adjournment: Michelle Hines made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:43PM, which was seconded by Kevin Hurst. Motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT

TOWN OF SEEKONK

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING COMMITTEE **JOINT MEETING WITH BOARD OF SELECTMAN**

DATE: Wednesday January 31, 2024

TIME: 6:00 p.m.

PLACE: Board of Selectman Meeting Room
Seekonk Town Hall
100 Peck Street
Seekonk, MA 02771

MEETING MINUTES

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

Attendees: Board of Selectman: Chris Zorra, Chair, Michelle Hines, Pamela Pozzi, Justin Sullivan, Shawn Cadime, Town Administration; David Cabral, DPW Director; Nate Ginsburg, Brewster Thornton Group Architects (BTGA); William Lavery (J. Casali Engineering); Joe Casali, (J. Casali Engineering); Marybeth Carney, CGA Project Management (CGA); Dan Tavares, CGA (OPM)

A. Call to Order: Chairman John Pozzi opened the Building Committee meeting 6:44 PM.

B. Presentation of Project:

1. Dan Tavares opened the presentation with an overview of the project history, preliminary schedule, and the estimated Schematic Design Budget.
2. The Project Overview included milestone dates of the initial Feasibility Study, Town Meeting to approve the budget for preconstruction services, forming the Building Committee, and procuring the Owner's Project Manager and Architect. D. Tavares reported that since formed, the Building Committee has met 14 times and there have been more than 20 design-related meetings. He noted that preliminary soil investigation has occurred, but additional investigation might be necessary prior to construction bids.
3. The project schedule included the design phases and outlined milestones through bidding, town approvals, construction, and owner occupancy. D. Tavares stated that due to the construction costs being over \$10 million general contractors and subcontractors would need to be prequalified to bid on this project. The prequalification process would take a few months to conduct. The schedule was aggressive, but the intent was to bring the actual construction cost and total project budget to the November 2024 Town Meeting.
4. D. Tavares reported on the Estimated Schematic Design Project Budget and explained that the cost was based on two independent cost estimators, one hired through the OPM and the other through the Architect. The average of the initial draft estimates was over \$49 million, adding that the project team worked closely with the town to identify ways to reduce the costs through "value engineering" exercises. This also included refining and confirming the building program. Construction cost estimates were reduced to approximately \$26.7 million,

with the total estimated project budget to \$31.25 million. CGA noted that project costs would continue through the remaining phases and will continue to fluctuate prior to bid.

5. Nate Ginsberg presented a cost analysis, building floor plan, site plan and building renderings.
6. The Cost Analysis offered explanations for the increase in project cost since the 2021 Feasibility Study. N. Ginsberg reported that the increase was attributed to market increases, project scope increase and soil remediation. Adding that there has been an unprecedented increase in construction costs over the past three years since the Feasibility Study was performed. The project now includes several outbuildings to cover the equipment while not increasing the size of the garage but were not envisioned during the Feasibility Study. There have been more site investigations, which supported the need to remove existing soil and import structural fill. To reduce this higher project cost, N. Ginsberg recounted that value engineering exercises conducted were able to right size the overall building and mechanical systems, determine the feasibility of relocating unsuitable soils on site, reducing the covered storage and the proposed glass in the building.
7. BTGA presented the proposed building floor plan and site plan which reflects the accepted value engineering changes. Proper circulation was being provided for the salt shed and fueling station, as well as the visitor and employee parking. N. Ginsberg noted that the salt shed was designed to be dual level, with the ability for trucks to drive through and be loaded from the salt storage floor. The garage was sized to house the DPW inventory, which would have a long-term savings cost verses leaving equipment exposed to the elements. The site plan showed secondary covered storage for seasonal equipment, which allowed for the reduction in overall garage size. William Lavery of J. Casali Engineering explained how the site worked within the wetland and other site setbacks.
8. Dave Cabral reported that the building had initially been larger, but the size was reduced to eliminate excess spaces, but still maintain the ability for the DPW staff to grow.
9. Renderings of proposed building showcased proposed materials, windows for natural lighting in administration and the ability of viewing the incoming vehicles and circulation around the site. N. Ginsberg stated that the high point of the garage, approximately 30', was set by using the required height for the wash bay and the bridge crane in the maintenance area but were investigating ways to lower the height.
10. Selectman Zorra stated in his opinion, the garage was too high. The additional height would be wasted space. He also suggested that the building would be in use for 70 years, to make sure it was designed to fit future growth without being excessive. BTGA acknowledged the concern and confirmed that the height of the garage will continue to be evaluated.
11. Selectman Sullivan questioned where prevailing wage rates were 3-4 years ago compared to now. He suggested that this explanation and understanding would help the residents understand the project cost increases. Project team will include this information in future community outreach meetings.

C. **Adjournment:** John Pozzi made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 PM, which was seconded by Kevin Hurst. Motion passed unanimously.