

TOWN OF SEEKONK
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING COMMITTEE

DATE: Wednesday April 17, 2024

TIME: 3:30 p.m.

PLACE: Virtual via Zoom:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85868081269?pwd=eG3HmaDQLkSXVT7jKMVnGqj6P4T7sb.1>

MEETING MINUTES

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

Absent: None

Attendees: Shawn Cadime, Town Administrator; Carol Days. Assistant Town Administrator; Christine Shea, Brewster Thornton Group Architects (BTGA); Nathan Ginsburg, BTGA; Marybeth Carney, CGA Project Management (CGA); Dan Tavares, CGA.

- A. **Call to Order:** Chairman John Pozzi opened the Building Committee meeting 3:38 PM.
- B. **OPM Report:**
 - 1. CGA provided updates on activities held since the previous Building Committee meeting.
 - 2. The septic test pits and perk test report is still pending.
 - 3. Additional geotechnical test pits are scheduled for April 22nd and 23rd. The geotechnical engineer has requested a third day of test pits, which is pending D. Cabral's confirmation when he returns from vacation on April 22nd.
 - 4. The contractor prequalification subcommittee will meet following this Building Committee meeting to review the draft Request for Qualification (RFQ) and Statement of Qualifications (SOQ). The schedule is to post the legal notifications to COMMBUY'S, the local paper and Central Register on 04/25/24. CGA will draft a legal ad for S. Cadime to post. The contractor's SOQs are due on May 22nd, when the committee will evaluate and share results for Building Committee approval in July.
 - 5. CGA and BTGA reviewed garage alternative options, and the cost estimators provided rough order of magnitude costs for a lean-to garage option and an option to remove the garage completely and install pavement. D. Tavares presented cost estimate comparisons with each division reduction highlighted, and the revised total project budgets which included the removal of the barn and covered storage. The lean-to option with cost mark-ups provided a \$2.76 million reduction, bringing the total project budget to \$35.2 million. Removing the garage completely with cost mark-ups provided an \$8.9 million reduction that resulted in a total project budget of \$30.59 million. The total project budget did not include any value engineering options from the team. D. Tavares explained that value engineering options would not reduce the project by millions of dollars, but still worth researching. The team was surprised by the savings to eliminate the garage. CGA did not think the lean-to option was cost-effectively the right option for the town.

6. The Building Committee discussed if the garage could be added in the future if it was not included in the initial project. CGA explained that the infrastructure could be included in the design so that a garage could be added in the future.
7. The increase in construction costs over the last few years was discussed. D. Tavares explained that cost estimators use historic data and current bids to determine escalation trends. Prior to covid, escalation was in the 3% to 4% range per annum but is now higher. CGA will confirm with their estimator. N. Ginsburg further noted due to metal being more expensive after covid, it was up to 8% in the recent past. S. Cadime recalled the South End Fire station was approximately \$11 million for an 8,000 SF building.
8. S. Cadime stated his opinion that requesting town approval for a \$29 million project with no garage and outbuildings would be shortsighted. It would be difficult for residents to approve additional funding in the future for the garage and storage buildings. S. Cadime will investigate alternate funding mechanisms for the project as designed, possibly through Free Cash. Residents were concerned that taxes and inflation were increasing, therefore he would determine the debt schedule for presentation.
9. The residents need to be informed why the DPW project is needed, how it would benefit the entire town and should be approved as designed with the garage. The presentation to the Board of Selectman and other town boards should include this information as well as any value engineering options. D. Tavares noted that another round of estimates will be done during the Construction Document phase, but the project with garage, outdoor storage, and barn was a \$38 million project. N. Ginsburg remarked that presenting the cost of equipment replacement savings would be beneficial. C. Shea reported that over a 50-year lifespan, using 2024 dollars, the equipment list provided by the DPW would have a \$5.5 million replacement savings. Obtaining actual costs and replacement frequency from DPW would help with this analysis.
10. S. Cadime recommending reconvening on May 1st to prepare the May 8th Board of Selectman presentation. At that time, S. Cadime would have the tax impact analysis and debt schedule to determine the anticipated cost per average house value for the taxpayer. He suggested that the Board of Selectman would determine the direction of the project.
11. S. Cadime asked if it would be advantageous to authorize BTGA to move forward to Construction Documents. N. Ginsburg and D. Tavares agreed that it would not be beneficial to move the project forward just to undo any design based on future changes. The project team would use this time to create value engineering options and get the latest test pit results. The designer allocated 4 months for Construction Documents and going out to bid in August is critical. The team will review the impact of any delays to the original schedule.
12. CGA noted that Gannet Fleming proposed a list of equipment that the Owner could furnish, some of which the contractor would install, to save costs. S. Cadime stated the list should be reviewed with the DPW, but saving the contractor markup may not be as cost effective as the cost of coordination and time and effort it would take for the town to purchase the equipment.
13. The Building Committee questioned the best approach to inform the residents about the project and costs. S. Cadime noted that TV9 is not running any town programming currently which would have been a great way to communicate to many concerned residents. N. Ginsburg suggested making a video that shows the project and town's need, or using a QR code to conduct an online survey which would provide facts prior to asking the residents what they want. S. Cadime said that he could ask the school district to make the video. The town website and Facebook page were discussed, exhibiting facts and information that the project was going to town meeting in November. There was debate whether reporting the costs of a similar project

would be beneficial. As an example, N. Ginsburg shared the town of Billerica's website link for their proposed DPW project with the timeline, renderings, and a current cost at \$49.9 million. <https://www.town.billerica.ma.us/964/New-Billerica-DPW-Facility>.

C. Architects Report:

1. C. Shea presented options to shift the building away from the abutters on Carters Way in response to the concerns noted at the Zoning Board meeting. One option was to shift the entire building 25' south which would not change the traffic circulation. The second option was to rotate the northeast corner of the building moving the furthest point 100' way from the property line while maintaining 50' at the other corner. The rotation option would give the neighbors a less intrusive sightline, which may be more palatable. In both options, the salt shed and fueling station can stay where they are, but the covered storage would need to be moved. The covered storage could be relocated at the end of the garage building where the larger parking spaces are located, depending on wetland setbacks. Both options are dependent on the volume of fill that would be needed based on excavation requirements.
2. N. Ginsburg stated that to contain the cost, all excavated material would remain on site. If it was just unsuitable soil, it could be placed over the site. However, if it was trash, at a minimum, a hole would need to be dug to bury it elsewhere on site. The DPW members remarked that the parcel of land by their corrals was located near wetlands limiting that area for any use.
3. The additional geotechnical test pits would assist in determining the depth of unsuitable soil and trash that would need to be removed from the building footprints and roadways. This information would provide the calculations needed to allow the Building Committee to evaluate the different options, including not moving the building if it was not cost effective. BTGA explained that the geotechnical engineer will attempt to analyze the data, make a comprehensive fill map, and return their report within a week noting that if the data is not thorough, additional borings may be needed.

D. Review and approve Value Engineering Cost Reduction Options

Not discussed.

E. Review and Approve Invoices

No new invoices to approve.

F. Review and Approve Meeting Minutes:

No meeting minutes to approve.

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

H. Public Comment: None.

I. Schedule Next Meetings:

May 1, 2024, to prepare for the BoS presentation and review the tax impact analysis.

May 8, 2024, Joint Building Committee and Board of Selectman Meeting

J. Adjournment: John Pozzi made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:43 PM, which was seconded by Michelle Hines. Motion passed unanimously.