

Department of Public Works Building Committee

AGENDA

APR 29 '24 AM 8:19

Wednesday May 1 2024, at 4:30pm

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 discuss Board of Selectman Presentation
- E. Review and discuss the Draft Tax Impact Analysis
- F. Review and approve meeting minutes.
- G. Discuss other topics not reasonably anticipated by the Chairman 48 hours before the meeting.
- H. Public Comment
- I. Schedule next meeting
- J. Adjourn

SEEKONK DPW COMPLEX BUILDING COMMITTEE

05.01.2024

➤ **UPDATES, DISCUSSIONS and ACTION ITEMS:**

- **Contractor Prequalification:** The Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) were made public today. SOQ's are due by 5/22/24. Currently, there have been (2) General Contractors and (14) Subcontractors who have received the prequalification documents.
- **Septic System:** Test pits and perk test reports are still pending.
- **Geotechnical Design:** Twenty-two test pits were completed within the building footprint, salt shed, fueling station and roadway in two days. The Geotechnical Report indicates that the subsurface conditions under the building footprint contain materials that are not suitable to support foundations. The engineer's recommendation is to remove and replace the existing fill, topsoil, and subsoil up to depths of 14' under the entire building footprint, or use geotechnical piers under the foundation. For paved areas, the recommendation is to remove a depth of 18" of unsuitable soils beneath the bottom of the pavement and install a geotextile grid with 12" of processed gravel under heavy duty pavement, and 8" under standard pavement.
- **Value Engineering (VE):** BTGA/CGA updated the list of VE options for consideration.
- **Other Potential Savings:** A meeting with D. Cabral will be scheduled to determine if certain equipment items can be purchased directly by the department.
- **Community Outreach:** CGA recommends forming a group to begin developing a marketing campaign to inform the community of the project.
- **Tax Impact Analysis:** The town ran preliminary tax impact analysis based on current project budget estimates of the building garage options.
- **Board of Selectmen Meeting:** Review draft presentation for comment.

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

- Jun 23 – Aug 23: **PROGRAMMING/SITE INVESTIGATIONS (3 mo.)**
- Sep 23 – Dec 23: **SCHEMATIC DESIGN (SD) (4 mo.)**
- **Jan 24 – Apr 24:** **DESIGN DEVELOPMENT (DD) (4 mo.)**
 - 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 (3 mo.)
 - 04/03/24: Abutter Information Meeting
 - 04/05/24: Receive Draft DD Estimates
 - 04/08/24: Cost Estimate Reconciliation Meeting
 - 04/08/24: ZBA Hearing

- 04/10/24: Building Committee Meeting (Review Cost Estimates/Budget)
- **04/17/24: Building Committee Meeting (Review VE Options/Budget)**
- 04/23/24: Finalize DD Documents
- 04/22-4/23/24: Additional Geotechnical Test Pit Exploration
- 05/01/24: Contractor Request for Qualifications (RFQ) Available
- **05/01/24: Building Committee Meeting (Tax Impact Analysis/BoS Prep)**
- **05/08/24: Joint Building Committee/Board of Selectmen Presentation**
- **05/13/24: Building Committee Meeting (Approve Invoices)**
- 05/14/24: Planning Board Meeting (*to be confirmed with Engineer*)
- 05/22/24: Contractor Prequalification Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) Due
- **May 24 – Aug 24: CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS (CD) & PREQUAL (4 mo.)**
- **Aug 24 – Sep 24: CONTRACTOR BIDDING (2 mo.)**
- **Oct 24 – Nov 24: TOWN MEETING/REFERENDUM/AWARD CONTRACT (2 mo.)**
- **Dec 24 – May 26: CONSTRUCTION & PROJECT CLOSEOUT (18 mo.)**
- **June 2026: OCCUPY NEW BUILDING**

➤ **INVOICES:**

- NV5: Invoice 383733 in the amount of \$3,344.00

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

Project Budget	Budget	Billed to Date	Balance
OPM Basic Services	\$ 306,000.00	\$ 142,000.00	\$ 164,000.00
A&E: Basic Services	\$ 1,130,536.00	\$ 641,987.58	\$ 488,548.42
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	\$ 3,344.00	\$ 11,656.00
Available Contingency	\$ 8,964.00		
Budget Subtotal	\$ 1,500,000.00	\$ 785,487.58	\$ 714,512.42

➤ **PROPOSED BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING DATES:**

- 05/08/24 Joint Building Committee/Board of Selectmen Presentation
- 05/13/24: Building Committee Meeting
- 05/14/24: Planning Board Meeting (BTGA to confirm)

Debt Service Calculator

This calculator is provided by the Division of Local Services only as a guide to assist communities in projecting debt service. Refer to M.G.L. Ch. 44 s.7 (inside debt limit) and Ch. 44 s.8 (outside debt limit) to determine allowable borrowing terms for various financing purposes. Any premiums or costs of borrowing (i.e., legal or bond counsel fees) are not accounted for. We strongly advise municipalities to confirm borrowing conditions and calculations with the city or town treasurer and financial advisor.

1) Enter amount to be borrowed.

2) Enter borrowing conditions: Interest Rate (e.g., 3.5% as 3.5):
Term (enter 5 or more)

3) Indicate ("x") payment type. Check both for comparisons.

Level Debt Service

Level Principal

Projected annual payment

Level Debt Service

Level Principal (Year One)

Projected total payments over term.

Principal & Interest

Interest only

Level Debt Service

Level Principal

Year	Level debt service (\$)	Year	Level debt service (\$)
1	2,283,768	21	2,283,768
2	2,283,768	22	2,283,768
3	2,283,768	23	2,283,768
4	2,283,768	24	2,283,768
5	2,283,768	25	2,283,768
6	2,283,768	26	2,283,768
7	2,283,768	27	2,283,768
8	2,283,768	28	2,283,768
9	2,283,768	29	2,283,768
10	2,283,768	30	2,283,768
11	2,283,768		
12	2,283,768		
13	2,283,768		
14	2,283,768		
15	2,283,768		
16	2,283,768		
17	2,283,768		
18	2,283,768		
19	2,283,768		
20	2,283,768		



DLS
DIVISION OF LOCAL SERVICES
MA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

Data Analytics and Resources Bureau

Estimated Impact on Property Taxes with a
Prop 2 ½ Referendum Question Approval

Data current as of 05/01/2024

Select a Municipality:



Enter Amount to Adjust by

Seekonk

	Residential & Open Space (RO)	Commercial, Industrial and Personal Property (CIP)	Total
FY 2024 # of Parcels	5,974	924	6,898
FY 2024 Assessed Value	2,742,675,049	684,615,866	3,427,290,915
FY 2024 Tax Levy	33,872,037	18,241,951	52,113,988

RO Tax Rate	CIP Tax Rate
12.35	26.66

	RO	CIP
Proposed Increase/Decrease to Levy:	1,484,359	799,409
Levy Share:	64.9961%	35.0039%
Proposed Tax Rate Impact Per \$1,000:	0.54	1.17
Proposed New Tax Rate Per \$1,000 (Estimated New):	12.89	27.83
FY 2024 Average Single Family Assessed Value (Current):	494,807	
FY 2024 Average Single Family Tax Bill (Current):	6,111	
FY 2024 Average Single Family Tax Bill Impact (Estimated New):	267.20	

Assessed Value	Current Estimated RO Tax Bill	Proposed Estimated RO Tax Bill	Estimated RO Tax Bill Impact	Current Estimated CIP Tax Bill	Proposed Estimated CIP Tax Bill	Estimated CIP Tax Bill Impact
250,000	3,087.50	3,222.50	135.00	6,665.00	6,957.50	292.50
350,000	4,322.50	4,511.50	189.00	9,331.00	9,740.50	409.50
450,000	5,557.50	5,800.50	243.00	11,997.00	12,523.50	526.50
550,000	6,792.50	7,089.50	297.00	14,663.00	15,306.50	643.50
650,000	8,027.50	8,378.50	351.00	17,329.00	18,089.50	760.50
750,000	9,262.50	9,667.50	405.00	19,995.00	20,872.50	877.50
850,000	10,497.50	10,956.50	459.00	22,661.00	23,655.50	994.50
950,000	11,732.50	12,245.50	513.00	25,327.00	26,438.50	1,111.50
1,050,000	12,967.50	13,534.50	567.00	27,993.00	29,221.50	1,228.50
1,150,000	14,202.50	14,823.50	621.00	30,659.00	32,004.50	1,345.50
1,250,000	15,437.50	16,112.50	675.00	33,325.00	34,787.50	1,462.50
1,350,000	16,672.50	17,401.50	729.00	35,991.00	37,570.50	1,579.50
1,450,000	17,907.50	18,690.50	783.00	38,657.00	40,353.50	1,696.50
1,550,000	19,142.50	19,979.50	837.00	41,323.00	43,136.50	1,813.50

Debt Service Calculator

This calculator is provided by the Division of Local Services only as a guide to assist communities in projecting debt service. Refer to M.G.L. Ch. 44 s.7 (inside debt limit) and Ch. 44 s.8 (outside debt limit) to determine allowable borrowing terms for various financing purposes. Any premiums or costs of borrowing (i.e., legal or bond counsel fees) are not accounted for. We strongly advise municipalities to confirm borrowing conditions and calculations with the city or town treasurer and financial advisor.

1) Enter amount to be borrowed.	<input type="text" value="\$31,490,986"/>
2) Enter borrowing conditions:	Interest Rate (e.g., 3.5% as 3.5): <input type="text" value="4.0000"/> Term (enter 5 or more) <input type="text" value="30"/>
3) Indicate ("x") payment type. Check both for comparisons.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level Debt Service <input type="checkbox"/> Level Principal

Projected annual payment

Level Debt Service	<input type="text" value="\$1,821,127"/>
Level Principal (Year One)	<input type="text"/>

<u>Projected total payments over term.</u>	Principal & Interest	Interest only
Level Debt Service	<input type="text" value="\$54,633,805"/>	<input type="text" value="\$23,142,819"/>
Level Principal	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Year	Level debt service (\$)	Year	Level debt service (\$)
1	1,821,127	21	1,821,127
2	1,821,127	22	1,821,127
3	1,821,127	23	1,821,127
4	1,821,127	24	1,821,127
5	1,821,127	25	1,821,127
6	1,821,127	26	1,821,127
7	1,821,127	27	1,821,127
8	1,821,127	28	1,821,127
9	1,821,127	29	1,821,127
10	1,821,127	30	1,821,127
11	1,821,127		
12	1,821,127		
13	1,821,127		
14	1,821,127		
15	1,821,127		
16	1,821,127		
17	1,821,127		
18	1,821,127		
19	1,821,127		
20	1,821,127		



Data Analytics and Resources Bureau

Estimated Impact on Property Taxes with a
Prop 2 ½ Referendum Question Approval

Data current as of 05/01/2024

Select a Municipality: 

Enter Amount to Adjust by

Seekonk			
	Residential & Open Space (RO)	Commercial, Industrial and Personal Property (CIP)	Total
FY 2024 # of Parcels	5,974	924	6,898
FY 2024 Assessed Value	2,742,675,049	684,615,866	3,427,290,915
FY 2024 Tax Levy	33,872,037	18,241,951	52,113,988

RO Tax Rate	CIP Tax Rate
12.35	26.66

	RO	CIP
Proposed Increase/Decrease to Levy:	1,183,661	637,466
Levy Share:	64.9961%	35.0039%
Proposed Tax Rate Impact Per \$1,000:	0.43	0.93
Proposed New Tax Rate Per \$1,000 (Estimated New):	12.78	27.59
FY 2024 Average Single Family Assessed Value (Current):	494,807	
FY 2024 Average Single Family Tax Bill (Current):	6,111	
FY 2024 Average Single Family Tax Bill Impact (Estimated New):	212.77	

Assessed Value	Current Estimated RO Tax Bill	Proposed Estimated RO Tax Bill	Estimated RO Tax Bill Impact	Current Estimated CIP Tax Bill	Proposed Estimated CIP Tax Bill	Estimated CIP Tax Bill Impact
250,000	3,087.50	3,195.00	107.50	6,665.00	6,897.50	232.50
350,000	4,322.50	4,473.00	150.50	9,331.00	9,656.50	325.50
450,000	5,557.50	5,751.00	193.50	11,997.00	12,415.50	418.50
550,000	6,792.50	7,029.00	236.50	14,663.00	15,174.50	511.50
650,000	8,027.50	8,307.00	279.50	17,329.00	17,933.50	604.50
750,000	9,262.50	9,585.00	322.50	19,995.00	20,692.50	697.50
850,000	10,497.50	10,863.00	365.50	22,661.00	23,451.50	790.50
950,000	11,732.50	12,141.00	408.50	25,327.00	26,210.50	883.50
1,050,000	12,967.50	13,419.00	451.50	27,993.00	28,969.50	976.50
1,150,000	14,202.50	14,697.00	494.50	30,659.00	31,728.50	1,069.50
1,250,000	15,437.50	15,975.00	537.50	33,325.00	34,487.50	1,162.50
1,350,000	16,672.50	17,253.00	580.50	35,991.00	37,246.50	1,255.50
1,450,000	17,907.50	18,531.00	623.50	38,657.00	40,005.50	1,348.50
1,550,000	19,142.50	19,809.00	666.50	41,323.00	42,764.50	1,441.50



Remittance Address
NV5 Planning & Design, Inc.
PO Box 74008680
Chicago, IL 60674-8680
Ph: 877-706-6858

Shawn Cadime
Town of Seekonk, MA
100 Peck Street
Seekonk 02771

April 17, 2024
Invoice No: 857024-0240002.00 - 383733

Project 857024-0240002.00 Seekonk Department of Public Works Facility Building Cx
Public Works Building Commissioning Services
Fall River Avenue, Seekonk, MA 02771

For professional services rendered through April 13, 2024

Fee Charges

Billing Phase	Contract Amount	% to Date	Amount Billed	Previous Billed	This Inv Billed
Design and Bid Phase	8,800.00	45.00	3,960.00	616.00	3,344.00
Construction Phase	24,955.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Acceptance Phase	18,240.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Project Closeout	2,410.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Post Occupancy	5,100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Building Envelope - 3iVe	32,800.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Fee	92,305.00		3,960.00	616.00	3,344.00
		Total Fee			3,344.00
			Total this Invoice		\$3,344.00

Outstanding Invoices

Number	Date	Balance
380207	3/26/2024	616.00
Total		616.00

Authorized by: Project Manager Danielle Garner

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 COMMBUYS, 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.