

TOWN OF SEEKONK
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING COMMITTEE

DATE: Wednesday November 29, 2023

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; Edward Monigan, Kevin Hurst

Absent: None

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); Virtual Attendee: Dan Tavares, CGA (OPM)

- A. **Call to Order:** Chairman John Pozzi opened the Building Committee meeting 4:31 PM.
- B. **OPM Report:**
 - 1. CGA provided updates on activities held since the previous Building Committee meeting.
 - 2. The Town signed a Memorandum of Understanding for the Mass Save Energy Incentive Program to provide technical review of the project's MEP systems and equipment and give financial incentives for efficiency. Mass Save will identify the amount of the rebate(s) prior to construction and after installation, confirm equipment and operation are per design, then issue the rebate to the town.
 - 3. Request for Proposal (RFP) for third-party commissioning services was published on 11/08/23 with proposals being due on 12/01/23. OPM will review the proposals received, confirm qualifications, and provide a recommendation to award at the next Building Committee meeting.
 - 4. A Building Code review meeting was held on November 11, 2023. BTGA and CGA met with the Town Administrator, Jeff Mello (Building Inspector) and Fire Department Captain Dalessio to review the schematic design plans. No issues were raised. The Code Officials agreed the occupancy regulations for the garage referred to egress and not plumbing fixtures.
 - 5. An equipment review meeting was held on November 22, 2023. BTGA, CGA, Gannett Fleming (GF) and DPW staff reviewed the proposed equipment and layouts. The equipment list was updated per DPW needs and GF to send additional manufacturer's information to the DPW for their review and approval. CGA stated that this is an ongoing process.
 - 6. Schematic Design Cost Estimates were received on November 16, 2023 from two independent cost estimators. CGA noted that both estimates came in significantly higher than anticipated. A meeting was held on November 20, 2023 with the project team and cost

estimators to confirm their understanding of scope and reconcile any major cost differences. CGA reported that the reconciled construction cost estimates were still apart at \$46.5 and \$51 million, which is not unusual at the phase of the project and would be further refined during the next project phases.

7. Since the Feasibility Study, CGA reported there had been dramatic changes in the construction market noting increases with material costs and escalation. The project construction schedule was also increased due to long-lead items, more site work was needed based on site investigations, and there was more scope added to the project. CGA added that there will be opportunities to bring the cost of the project down, but it could never be at \$20 million feasibility budget based on with the current DPW requirements and site issues.
8. CGA presented a preliminary Total Project Budget of \$51,341,202, which included the estimated construction cost provided by BTGA, Architect and OPM fees, Owner's and Construction contingencies, furniture, equipment, and other soft costs. CGA noted that this budget will continue to evolve during the remaining project phases.

C. Architects Report:

1. BTGA reported on the increase in project cost since the Feasibility Study. Metal costs increased by 200%, increasing the cost of the prefabricated metal building. The building size also increased by 50%. Site improvements included removing unsuitable soil and trash to virgin depths under the pavement. The feasibility study did not include an environmental report since the project was only focused on the wooded area which they understood did not need remediation. Scope increased as well, requiring a roadway to the south side of the property, photovoltaics, covered storage and other outer buildings.
2. BTGA presented the following list of high-level potential Value Engineering cost savings items which would not remove program, noting that these costs have not been fully vetted:
 - i. Removing 18" of soil/trash/debris under pavement areas instead of going to virgin soil, could save \$2 million. BTGA stated this could require repaving in 5 years.
 - ii. Relocating the unsuitable soil to another area on the same property, in lieu of hauling off site could save \$2 million.
 - iii. BTGA had several metal building companies review their design and indicated the cost would be in the \$3 million range, versus the \$7-9 million from the estimators. The manufacturers said the building was not designed to be "a Cadillac" (overdesigned), at 128' wide, the building did not require columns.
 - iv. Use a Spung Structure verses a metal building for the garage. This would be a metal building with fabric over the top.
 - v. Eliminate granite curb, \$40,000, and rainwater collection system, \$15,000.
 - vi. Reduce height solar canopy foundation walls from 8', \$20,000.
 - vii. Remove paved road to the barn, \$100,000.
 - viii. Town purchase equipment directly, saving \$100,000 in contractor fees.
 - ix. Reduction in height of ceilings and pitch of roof, \$50,000.
 - x. Reduce foundation height at administration, \$15,000.
 - xi. Remove mezzanines, \$50,000.

- xii. Remove A/C from maintenance area, \$600,000 savings and eliminate heat in garage, \$200,000 savings.
- xiii. Remove outbuildings, Barn, storage canopies and mini storage.

3. BTGA noted that these reductions could potentially remove \$14 million from the project.
4. CGA expressed concern with this list and the approach to achieving a more appropriate cost for this project suggesting that the project team needs to coordinate this effort together.

D. Discussion of Cost Estimates

1. The committee stated that a project with a construction cost of \$50 million would not be acceptable to the town. They did not have a set number that would be acceptable.
2. Long-term maintenance savings should be reviewed. The useful life of the machinery has a value which will need to be explained to the town.
3. The project team will further investigate the geotechnical and geo-environmental engineers' recommendation for only removing 18" of unsuitable soil beneath the asphalt areas. This was a particular concern of CGA, as well as other members of the committee.
4. The project team will collectively review the alternates and value engineering items to create a cohesive list to present to the DPW and Building Committee for their consideration. The intent would be to bring the best solution at the best possible cost for town approval.

E. Review and Approve Invoices (*It was noted that Michelle Hines left the meeting at 5:41PM and did not participate in the following votes*):

1. Michael Gagne made the motion, seconded by Kevin Hurst, to approve CGA Invoice DPW-008 in the amount of \$11,000. The vote was unanimous.
2. Michael Gagne made the motion, seconded by Ed Monigan, to approve BTGA Invoice 11781 in the amount of \$65,022. The vote was unanimous.
3. Michael Gagne made the motion, seconded by Ed Monigan, to approve BTGA Invoice 11737 in the amount of \$67,122. The vote was unanimous.

E. Review and Approve Meeting Minutes:

1. Michael Gagne made the motion, seconded by Kevin Hurst to approve meeting minutes from August 23, 2023, vote was unanimous.
2. Kevin Hurst made the motion, seconded by Ed Monigan to approve meeting minutes from September 27, 2023, vote was unanimous.
3. Ed Monigan made the motion, seconded by Michale Gagne to approve meeting minutes from October 11, 2023, vote was unanimous, with K. Hurst abstaining from vote.

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

G. Public Comment: None

H. Schedule Next Meetings:

Meeting will be scheduled when the project team is prepared to present value engineering and cost reduction options for the Building Committees review and acceptance.

I. Adjournment: Michael Gagne motioned to adjourn the meeting at 5:58 PM, which was seconded by Kevin Hurst. Motion passed unanimously.