

**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.