

TOWN OF SEEKONK
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING COMMITTEE

DATE: Wednesday February 21, 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: None

Attendees: Shawn Cadime, Town Administration; 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 4:29 PM.

B. **OPM Report:**

1. CGA provided updates on activities held since the previous Building Committee meeting, noting that additional details would be given by BTGA in their Architect's report. D. Tavares explained now that the project was in Design Development, BTGA was refining the project details for construction documentation.
2. Equipment review meetings were held on 1/23/24 and 2/05/24, confirming layouts in the revised building footprint. The DPW removed one of the two-post lifts from their design requirements and confirmed that an OSHA standard 42" knee wall in the Salt Shed would not impede their loading operation.
3. Furniture, casework, and finishes were reviewed on 1/31/24. BTGA presented color palates and design styles for S. Cadime, D. Cabral, and J. Halpin to consider and select what would work best for the DPW. Final furniture styles will be decided in the future.
4. A door, hardware, and security/access control meeting was held on 2/07/24. The DPW identified doors that should be on access control, the keying system that will be the basis of design, and the cores that would be part of the Cyberkeys system the town uses. It was determined that the DPW would purchase these cores to be installed in the new building.
5. Building massing and site reconfiguration was reviewed with S. Cadime and D. Cabral on 2/07/24. BTGA reevaluated the building height requirements and roofline configurations. The preferred design lowered the height of the garage to 20' which was below the mechanics bay height. This roof line reduction eliminated wasted space and provided an opportunity for windows on the northwest side of the mechanics area, allowing natural light to enter.

6. Interior and exterior signage, as well as potential wall graphics were discussed on 2/14/24. The street sign to be located on Fall River Avenue will be designed to integrate digital messaging, similar to Seekonk Senior Center. A follow up meeting is scheduled for 3/7/24.
7. An HVAC design meeting was held on 02/21/24 to review and approve the different mechanical systems for the garage, administration, maintenance and loading bays. The Commissioning Agent was in attendance and provided feedback on the options.
8. D. Tavares reported that a meeting to review exterior building material options is scheduled for 2/28/24 and that the project is on the Technical Review Committee (TRC) agenda for 2/29/24 at 9:00am, where code officials will identify the project's permitting requirements.
9. D. Tavares explained that the garage configuration and site circulation was further evaluated. To regain some of the outdoor storage space that was eliminated during value engineering, the garage building was shifted 30' to the south, providing an additional 30'x60' roof overhang for the exterior storage. At the front of the building, it created an area for the generator and exterior mechanical units. D. Tavares noted that the garage length had been reduced during value engineering, which allowed the building shift without encroaching on the wetland setbacks. The fueling station was moved closer to the salt shed for better circulation for the larger vehicles while reducing paving and costs.
10. CGA noted a joint Building Committee and Board of Selectman meeting was held on 1/31/24. An overview of the project was presented, which included the schedule, budget, cost analysis since the feasibility study, the value engineering efforts made to streamline the building and site layouts and renderings. The Board recommended that the Committee be prepared to address public comments on the project cost increase, and to reduce the height of the garage, which BTGA took into consideration.
11. D. Tavares reported that a kickoff meeting with the Commissioning team was held to introduce members of the team and review project schedule and communication protocols.
12. CGA explained BTGA's engineers submitted additional services request in the amount of \$28,166 for their structural and electrical engineering services on the covered storage and the barn. For comparison, BTGA obtained a proposal from another structural engineering firm, which came in at \$15,000. BTGA agreed to get the breakdown from Gannet Fleming for the electrical engineer's work. D. Tavares noted that neither proposal included BTGA's mark up, and no action could be taken as there is no budget for these services. BTGA was reviewing whether their budget could cover the additional cost.
13. CGA mentioned that the geotechnical engineer is recommending additional site investigations. Their initial exploration only had 2 tests within the building footprint, since more of the site was being reviewed for the barn and outside storage. One proposal is for 2 days of site drilling 6-8 borings, and the DPW conducting test pits in the amount of \$16,595. The second proposal in the amount of \$8,150 would only be test pits dug by the DPW but requires the DPW to rent an excavator that can reach 15' depths. D. Tavares noted that these proposals did not include BTGA's mark up, and no action could be taken at this time. The team was reviewing if all the allowances in BTGA's contract would be required, since there was not enough contingency in the project budget for this effort. This work would need to be done in March or April to provide contractors with more information when the project goes out for bid.
14. CGA presented a Gantt Chart Schedule of the project which incorporated key milestones, leading up the November 2024 Town Meeting and working back to the Select Board

approving the Article for the project, while tying in the contractor bids and completing the design. CGA stated that this was a live document which aligns with BTGA's schedule. Additional meetings would be inserted as they get scheduled. D. Tavares explained that the General Contractor bids would need to be held for 45 days to provide time for the town to vote on the project. Typically, contractor bids are held for 30 days, this 15-day extension may come at a premium.

15. D. Tavares explained that Contractor Prequalification was required for this project. Per Mass General Law (MGL) Chapter 149, any project with building contracts estimated \$10 million or more requires contractors to be prequalified. Included in the OPM report was the MGL Prequalification Requirements for record. Prequalification does not require project drawings or specifications; it is a standard MGL evaluation that contractors need a score of 70 or above to pass. It confirms the General Contractors and the Filed Sub-bid (FSB) subcontractors that bid on the project are qualified to do so. FSB subcontractors make up about half the contractors on the project. There were 6 steps in the process, starting with the formation of a prequalification committee, which was comprised of one representative from the project designer, one OPM member and 2 members of the building committee who will sign off on the evaluations. Additional people can participate and help with the reviews. The process would take approximately 4 months, therefore with the aggressive schedule it would be started soon. Results of the prequalification process can be challenged. Protests can be submitted to the Attorney General's Office if the contractor believes the process was completed fraudulently, capriciously, or arbitrarily. The Building Committee will need to identify two members to officially be on the contractor prequalification committee at their next meeting. Kevin Hurst offered to be part of the prequalification committee.
16. CGA presented the overall project schedule, identifying Building Committee meetings and phase requirements. The schedule targeted May 8th for Building Committee approval for the project documents to go out to bid, allowing the project cost to be presented at the Annual Town meeting on November 18, 2024. To meet this schedule, the time between the Design Development and Construction Documentation phases was reduced. BTGA is adjusting the tasks within their consultant's schedule to meet this new deadline. The reduction would only be an issue if numerous redesigns were required.

C. Architects Report:

1. C. Shea presented the results of the meetings that occurred over the past month. The floor plan was updated to accommodate the shift in the garage. BTGA was designing a small picnic area at the front of the building. The site plan relocated the salt shed and fueling station closer to the main buildings. The lot along Fall River Avenue will be used for the location sign.
2. The signage meeting that occurred included interior and exterior wayfinding and directional signage, which would continue to be refined.
3. C. Shea presented the chosen furniture and casework "Finish Palette", with samples of carpeting, tile, and paint colors. They shared the presentation packet that was provided to the owner/user group, starting with precedent images, then explaining how the requirements for each room were reviewed. The final furniture choices will occur in the future.
4. C. Shea explained that today marked the design team's 50% internal deadline for the Design Development phase. BTGA's consultants would all share their drawings to confirm the design was coordinated. All the basis of design products being proposed will be sent to the specifications writer to include in the contract documents.

5. Design Development documents will be issued to the Cost Estimators for review on 3/25/24. The estimate would confirm the design is continuing within budget and determine the cost of the mechanical systems and prefab metal buildings. A cost reconciliation is scheduled for 4/08/24. Providing value engineering is not required to keep the project on budget, the design team will continue moving forward to the Construction Document phase following Building Committee approval.
6. D. Tavares stated that the value engineering option of only removing 18” of unsuitable soil under the roadway needed to be reevaluated. The potential for the road settling under the weight of the DPW equipment requiring long term maintenance costs and repairs was high. The geotechnical engineer may have other recommendations for the roadway that will not plague the town with reoccurring cost. D. Tavares reiterated that it is not advisable to build roads over existing trash. M. Hines stated they do not want trash under the building. The initial soil investigation did not identify trash under the proposed building location, just unsuitable soil. N. Ginsburg explained knowing more information about the soil is the best way to know what accommodations would be needed to support the building and roadways. The cost estimators will price out every option that the engineers recommend, from removing all material to virgin soil, providing a 6” slab, or Rammed Aggregate Piers (RAPs).
7. BTGA explained that they presented four building massing options to S. Cadime and D. Cabral. The mechanics bay and wash bay were the tallest building sections, and the remaining buildings were reduced in height. The height reductions will lower the steel and mechanical unit costs. The project team continues to work together to produce a cost-effective design, with the civil engineer reviewing site circulation and possibilities of reducing the pavement.
8. C. Shea noted that acoustical fencing was proposed along the residential boundaries. The acoustic engineer suggested it would be a good investment, but neighbors may have issues with the fence being installed.
9. The committee discussed notifying the abutters, possibly holding a working group discussion. It was noted that the Planning Board meeting would notify the direct abutters. BTGA said they could put up a website for residents to get real information on the project, if that is what the town wanted. The committee could start planning the language now but show the plans after approval of Design Development. M. Hines reminded the board that she had suggested notifying the neighbors at the beginning of the project. D. Cabral believes that a notification went out during the site survey. It was noted that the Town website has a project page which could be used to post project design updates and reports.

D. Review and Approve Invoices

1. Michelle Hines made the motion, seconded by Kevin Hurst, to approve and submit invoice DPW-010 in the amount of \$22,000 for CGA Project Management to S. Cadime for payment. Vote was unanimously approved.
2. Michelle Hines made the motion, seconded by Kevin Hurst, that BTGA’s Invoice 3773, dated 1/31/24 in the amount of \$92,196.79, to be submitted to S. Cadime for payment after CGA’s review. The vote was unanimously approved.

E. Review and Approve Meeting Minutes:

1. Michael Gagne made the motion, which was seconded by Ed Monigan, to approve meeting minutes from January 3, 2024. The vote was unanimous.
2. Michael Gagne made the motion, which was seconded by Ed Monigan, to approve meeting minutes from January 31, 2024. The vote was unanimous.

- F. Other topics not reasonable anticipated by the Chairman 48 hours before the meeting:** None.
- G. Public Comment:** C. Zorra asked what the cost savings were by lowering the height of the garage. N. Ginsburg explained that the cost estimates had not been done yet, but there would be savings with the reduced HVAC, mechanical systems, and steel sizing. C. Zorra recommended sending a letter inviting the neighbors on Carters Way and Route 114, to a meeting showing them the proposed design. The project should also be posted on the town FB page to get residents' feedback.
- H. Schedule Next Meetings:**
March 13, 2023, at 4:30 PM in the Planning Board Room.
- I. Adjournment:** Ed Monigan made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:26 PM, which was seconded by Michael Gagne. Motion passed unanimously.