

Town of Plymouth
BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING
April 6, 2023

The Chairman, David Peck called the Building Committee meeting to order at 6:30 P.M. Members present were, David Malaguti, Vice Chair; Luis Pizano, Thomas Fugazzi, Tom Finnegan, Robert Morgan. Members Absent: Eugene Blanchard, Tim Grandy and Megan Marble.

Staff in attendance included: Lynne Barrett, Director of Finance; Christina Renaud, Schools; Sandy Strassel, Procurement Officer.

Guest in attendance: Rick Pomroy, Pomroy Associates.

*Disclosure: These minutes are not verbatim – they are the secretary's interpretation of what took place at the meeting. – Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A § 22.
All materials presented during this meeting are available in the Procurement Office.
Administrative Business – May include topics not reasonably anticipated by the Chair 48 hours in advance of the meeting.*

Review and Approve Minutes

- January 12, 2023, meeting minutes reviews. Motioned to approve by Thomas Fugazzi, 2nd Robert Morgan. David Malaguti abstained as he was not present at the meeting. Unanimous.
- March 9, 2023, meeting minutes reviewed. Motioned to approve by Thomas Fugazzi, 2nd David Malaguti. Unanimous.

10-Year Capital Plan Review

Lynne Barrett (LB): The update is only what was brought up at Town Meeting for FY 24 projects. We will be meeting with departments again this summer, as they are preparing the capital request for next year. We are working to get an amount for departments to help them prioritize based on available funding. I separated out some major building projects, new fire stations, additions/renovations to the police station, DPW facility, and a new elementary school. The estimate is very conservative. Those projects may end up being a debt exclusion. The Town may have to get together and decide if they want to package in one or handle over a period of time. Lots of decisions must be made over the next few years.

Tom Fugazzi (TFug): We continue with the fire stations, we have two under way. Manomet is funded and going out to bid. Next, will go to Bourne Road. That will have to go on an override funding?

LB: Probably, we have so much on the books right now and looking at what we can afford. Debt service, we do have some room to fit the ones that are on the table. In the presentation it does give you an idea of what we have outstanding right now. About sixty-six million between the General fund, Enterprise fund, and Community preservation. Lots of projects for one reason or another have been delayed. Any questions?

LB: On the second page at the top, you will see Building & Other Major Infrastructure, that includes fire stations, DPW buildings, Police station, and an Elementary school. DPW also had Water Street Promenade in their 10-year plan, and a Town Square project which is significant, included in those

numbers. It's not a plan, it's a work in progress. Decisions must be made. As far as the capital improvement committee is concerned, maybe we need to revamp the by-laws to get them more involved in the process of all this. Assisting with departments to understand what everyone needs and wants.

TFug: I heard you mention last time, the Capital improvement process we have now doesn't really seem to work.

LB: It doesn't. What I suggest is, that we do like an advisory and finance committee, but they just deal with Capital. It would meet more often with the departments to review projects helping them to prioritize.

TFug: I was involved when the town first started with the Capital planning process like that, it was an all-day session that prioritized. Every department head spoke about their projects. Everything got rated, and I don't ever recall a price being there. It was always based on the value of the project, what it meant to the Town. We had a list of criteria you could compare it to and at the end of the day we had a list.

LB: Where you just looking at one year?

TFug: Yes.

LB: Okay, that is part of the problem. What we need to do as a Town and as the different stakeholders you know, selectmen, planning board, school committee, I even suggested a member of the Building Committee should be on capital improvement. There are some members here that are on capital improvement because they are on the school committee as well. We are still doing the rating process. We meet for a whole day. I just think it's not working.

Luis Pizano (LP): You are right it's not working. Having it so infrequently, we feel like we are flying blind and not getting the big picture. The way it happens now it doesn't have enough impact.

LB: Before this year they were given many more projects than we could afford, so they would rank everything and then we would come in and say okay we can do the first ten and that's about it. The new Town Manager wants to meet with each department prior to that, to get them to focus and prioritize themselves.

LP: We were looking at roughly fifty projects and we know half of them won't be approved. To look through that many detailed presentations, it's easier to just give us the list of the projects that have a chance and let us prioritize that.

David Peck (DP): I believe that is what they did this year?

LB: Yes

DP: At Town Meeting I asked why the Bartlett Bridge Road is ranked at 37, that sounded to be like it was below a cut. It was explained you only had what the town could afford, and everything on the list was by in large going to be moving ahead.

LP: If people were given the line, they would have put it below the line. We knew everything in front of us was going to pass, so it got put at the bottom.

LB: When we met with the departments, things that fell to the bottom were moved over to FY 25 column. It's really about funding sources, there aren't enough funds for it. You either do a debt exclusion or a capital exclusion. A capital exclusion is, you have a million-dollar project and it's really a priority but don't want to borrow for it. We go to the ballot and ask for the project to be paid in one year, it just goes on the tax bill that one year. The town has never done those types of things but there would have to be an appetite for it. People don't want to pay their taxes already. It's very challenging. Right now, they are spread out into different years but, we may end up looking at those things and doing them all as a bundle kind of thing.

DP: Is the plan to keep it rolling forward? Meaning add FY33 when FY23 falls off?

LB: Yes. I think this year when we meet with all the department, I'd like to look at these years going out, to come up with a plan. As they get closer and closer, we will be able to narrow down things like the elementary school. It will become clearer moving forward what the strategy will have to be, for that and others.

Christina Renaud (CR): I'll give you an example we are looking at the grant, that's a great opportunity. We are looking at the new schools, but the HVAC at South Middle is going to be our next big problem. Five and a half million dollars to do it at South Elementary so what's that number going to be when we finally get to it? What used to be a doable project ten years ago is now just so expensive.

LB: I agree. It doesn't help that interest rates are going up because that will limit the amount that we can borrow within our levy limit. Again, this is why we may need to borrow outside of the levy to do some of it.

DP: I think this is terrific. It gives us some homework to go through and I'm sure we will have some questions, but we understand the process and the need, it's not going away. Challenging to even accomplish the projects.

Schools:

CR: There is a grant available through the Department of Energy called Renew America's School Grants. The maximum amount you can apply for is fifteen million dollars and when I saw it, I knew what was going on at South Elementary. We had to delay and cancel the HVAC job for several reasons, we were not able to do the ADA project because it would have eaten our entire capital budget for this year. We came up with the Next Generation Plymouth Grant. We submitted the concept paper. Very quickly we heard back and were encouraged to apply for the grant. What we did was to say we have a lot of needs at South Elementary, how do we bundle them all together in one request for this grant which is energy based. We focused on the building envelope, the HVAC and energy sources like solar and

geothermal. This project would tighten up the building envelope, new windows, repairs to the walls, and replacement and/or repairs to part of the roof, some of the roof there, is very sound. We would install solar on the roof, a solar roof park port, as well a battery behind and a geothermal system for heating and air conditioning on the roof. The ADA upgrades would be included in this project, altogether totaling around twenty-two million dollars. But again, that is basically a rehab of the envelope and HVAC at the school. We presented it to the Select Board and the School Board is aware of this program. The way it works we could get zero dollars all the way up to fifteen million or anything in between. If we are only awarded between 3-4 million, the goal will be to have the design and engineering portion done. These grants won't stop for solar and geothermal, so when the opportunity presents again, we will be more shovel ready. If we can do all this work the way it is designed, it will be a NetZero energy building. Meaning we will be using zero from the grid and no fossil fuels. The way we are pitching this is because it is NetZero, and due to the location, it would be available during emergencies as a shelter because it is self-sufficient, heat, cool, potable water even without the grid. We will have a support letter circulating for the board.

David Malaguti (DM): Geothermal, it never worked at Plymouth South High School.

CR: I get that question a lot. So, what I'm going to ask from this committee if you have any information on the system, because I can't find any in my files.

DM: Wasn't it the acidity in the water that we had to put that in there?

CR: That's what I heard. I have the best partner on this project, her name is Tracey Augdin, and she does all the geothermal in Massachusetts and everything around the area including New York. I have that written down as a question to ask her. My answer for that question right now is geothermal has come a long way, that system was like the iPhone 1, and we are on the iPhone 14.

DM: You probably need to get some analysis. I remember when I lived on Sugar Bush Lane my well was 5.9 on the pH scale.

CR: I can tell you with very little water treatment because we use a well there already at South Elementary, we are at 8 on the pH scale.

DM: You're at 8? That's too much alkalinity.

CR: I know. It's high 7's that's why I said 8. I don't think we are going to have an issue with that. Where the system is now, they are designed to handle pH in the water. And it's not an open loop, it's a closed loop so if you just think of it like a boiler system that comes from the ground. But I will get more answers on this when I speak to Tracey next week.

Robert Morgan (RM): And you had to heat that water with electricity to bring it up, so it wasn't doing its job.

TF: Then you ended up putting outside boilers there for I don't know how long.

DP: Of course, that building had other issues too. I'm getting multiple questions from Tiffany about the grant, the history of that building. It turns out it's the history of four buildings, West, South, Indian Brook, and Federal Furnace. People know those buildings are basically like walk-in coolers. Carver had an elementary school with the same design.

CR: I don't believe they use that school anymore because they built a new one.

DP: You're right they have a brand-new Elementary school. But its at least five buildings I'm aware of that used that walk-in cooler technology.

CR: And our other three have new windows and are getting new roofs so if this does become a model. The project will be smaller if we are able to prove repeatability and these grants keep coming. The thing that I have learned about geothermal is, it has a lot smaller footprint than you would think. Space is not an issue. It is in my notes to poke around about the acidity level.

DM: Also, the temperature I think, underground water is 59 degrees. Does that sound right?

CR: I did ask her about that, and she said geothermal is used throughout the northeast. There are locations that have done large geothermal projects in the northeast. We would not be the first by any means. If you would like to take a vote on the letter of support.

TF: I'll make a motion that we approve of this concept.

LP: Second

DP: Discussion? All in Favor? Unanimous approval to sign the letter of support.

CR: New school SOI is do April 13th. We have been working to gather all the data for Cold Springs SOI and Hedge SOI. Idea is to build one school to encompass staff and students at the Cold Springs site. We have the AI3 group come out, and they recommended that Cold Springs is the most viable site.

TF: If approved, is there a time frame on when the Town would need to act?

CR: In the sense of voting, yes. If approved, at the next Town meeting we will have the proposed schedule with the cost.

DP: Is it likely the same reimbursement rate?

CR: It does change but, it won't be by much. They look at the demographics to alter the percentages, 45% to 55% depending.

School Roof Updates:

CR: We met with the principals, head custodians, program managers for Colliers, and Greenwood. We went through a very basic schedule review and the laydown areas. Spoke with Anne Slusser today because west is used by the Town, we are at a point we can share the site. The way the contractor will

set up will still allow them to use the space. All meetings went well. As for the railings, they were in the first drawing but missed in the second two. Greenwood has given a large price for them. I am working with TSKP to really look at it, they are not required. We might look at adding them in only certain areas.

Tom Finnegan (TFin): On the construction administration, we haven't started any of these roofs yet?

CR: No, we have not.

TFin: I'm just concerned construction administration is already billed over 61%. Should they be billing over the construction of the project for administration?

CR: I think it's because the administration of the project is only two months long. Let's look at how much is left. I think the approach was to spread it out. If they bill at the same rate throughout the project, then they are on track.

DP: They have been running zoom meetings, we have been working on this project for some time.

TFin: Are you going to continue to have construction meetings over a weekly basis those two months?

CR: Yes. They are starting at Indian brook and West, around August 1st is when they will move to Federal Furnace for the majority for those two crews.

Invoices submitted for approval:

Vendor	Invoice Number	Amount	Approvals
TSKP	210703-17	\$3,000.00	Luis Pizano motioned to approve, David Malaguti 2 nd the motion, unanimous approval. The board voted for all TSKP invoices together.
TSKP	210801-17	\$3,384.66	
TSKP	210902-17	\$3,000.00	
TSKP	210703-18	\$3,000.00	
TSKP	210801-18	\$3,384.61	
TSKP	210902-18	\$3,000.00	

Fire Station Updates:

(Update packet provided)

Station No 2- Phase II

Rick Pomroy (RP): Things are going well. Structural steel was set this week, detailing it now. Planning to see concrete slab next week for the second floor. As soon as the slab is poured, we will give that upper level back to commercial masonry and they will begin the second floor CMU so we can get the trusses up on the building and they will turn their attention to the face of the building after that.

The apparatus bay drywall ceilings are going well. Rough-in has been done and signed off on. Now that spring is here, we are going to start our coordination with rebuilding the apparatus pads on the east and west side in the parking lots. It will require the department to shift sides through the summer. Septic is in and signed off on. It has proven to be a challenging project with the shifting back and forth.

We are just about ready to start placing orders for our equipment. We are going to hold off on the furniture until July. We've had our meetings with the departments and the suppliers. We have identified a few lead time items, but we are still okay. We have met with the vendors for the radio/alerting systems and are reviewing the quotes now with Zack. Everything is falling into line.

Change Order 4, the items have been floating around for a couple of months now. I wasn't here for the last meeting so the Chief went through them quickly. After Change Order 4's approval we are left with \$71,251.67 total in open changes, \$47,289.20 is for the Water Line extension (Line 11). We are going to try changing out that water meter first to see if that helps the situation. We had a 2-inch water meter in there, the Water Department asked for us to install 1 ½ during phase one. The Department has been complaining about the water flow ever since. At the very beginning of Phase I, the Water Department had asked us to install a loop, but they backed off on that. The Fire department is not able to fill the trucks at any speed, so we must pay the plumbing contractor to replace the meter because it requires re-piping. We will be going from a two-inch line down to 1 ½ inch for the meter and then back up to two. It is something we were instructed to do by the Water Dept. in Phase I that we are now going to reverse.

DP: If we make the change and the flow is restored, we don't need to do the loop?

RP: That's correct.

DP: On some of those, like the ductwork and the conduit for the stop/go features. Were they overlooked in the original design process?

RP: They were, and they should not have been. They will be classified as design issues in the overall summary. We are waiting to finalize everything first. Engineers should have picked up on them, especially with the gear drying cabinet.

DP: We will talk more about it but, there is some disappointments with the things that were missed in the design.

RP: Right now, we are sitting with design related issues around \$8,750. We are still doing good as far as the design components. There is an updated budget in the packet including Change Order 4.

LP: Target completion date?

RP: December.

Station No 5 Update

RP: The Chief tried to get an update on the closing of The Church parcel. We are still waiting to hear a date. The project as you know is out to bid right now. The filed sub-bids were done on April 3rd. The summary is in your packet. As it stands right now based upon our numbers, overall, we are about 18.5% over budget compared to the estimates that were carried out. We are still waiting to hear from the estimator, to make sure that our assumptions are correct. That's a blended overage which represents about \$611,000. We are double checking everything at this point because some numbers don't make any sense. The estimates completed on this, if you recall were done in early feasibility in 2021 and they

were voted and approved in the fall of 2022. I provided the original estimate in the packet. In August of 2021 the value was set, there was no opportunity to increase it before it went to Town meeting. Our hard number is \$8,000,000 with a contingency of just under a million. Between early 2022 and 2023 we have seen about a 10% escalation. I don't know what it's going to look like with the GC numbers. Unfortunately, when they estimated it was done on a concept not a design. There was no engineering done at that point, it was all off the feasibility report. Our GC bids are due next week (4/12). The good side is we do have the million-dollar contingency, we would rather not tap into that if we don't have to. We have about \$700,000 left at Station No 2. I'm not suggesting that we use that for this project, but it may be that you have to. The filed sub-bid estimates are total around \$3,900,000.

SS: I spoke with Lynne about the ARPA funding set aside to cover HVAC, but it was just shy of \$400,000. I mentioned they came in almost \$300,000 over that. There is a chance we could get more ARPA funding for the HVAC.

RP: The ARPA funding numbers must have come from Mark. The estimates that I have are over by about \$136,000 not \$300,000. I'm not sure how they got the original number to you, but the estimate value right now is about \$490,000 with the design contingency and escalation factor built into it.

SS: Which is what they gave Station 2, but not Station 5. So, I did speak to Lynne about it to see if ARPA could be upped to cover the HVAC.

DP: Will we need to schedule a special meeting for this committee to accept a GC?

RP: It's going to take us a bit to review things. This is not a pre-qualify project, so we need to make sure we do the DCAMM reviews. Opening is April 12th. When is the May meeting scheduled?

DP: May 11th.

RP: We may have to schedule a special meeting, by statute you need to award within 30 calendar days. May 11th would be cutting it close. What if we say May 4th?

DP: We moved up a week this month, we could do the same for the next.

RP: Next steps, qualify the bids when they come in. I'm going to start working on the sub-trades now. There are a couple sub-trades here we don't know. The notice of award needs to be issued in 30 days.

Station No 4 Update

DP: We can't officially accept the land until October. I don't know if there have been further conversations. Neil Foley may have a better handle on this, but he couldn't join us tonight.

SS: The last I heard, it is going to fall town meeting to see if we could get additional funding for design.

DP: As well as accept the donation.

Invoices and Change Order submitted for approval:

Vendor	Invoice Number	Amount	Approvals
Seaver Construction, Inc.	CO# 4	\$13,525.08	David Malaguti motioned to approve, Tom Fugazzi 2 nd the motion, unanimous approval.
Pomroy Associates	PFDSR-002	\$23,0865.00	David Malaguti motioned to approve, Tom Fugazzi 2 nd the motion, unanimous approval.
Saccoccio & Associates	21002-22	\$32,949.55	David Malaguti motioned to approve, Tom Fugazzi 2 nd the motion, unanimous approval.
Seaver Construction, Inc.	Application No. 8	\$286,641.00	Tom Fugazzi motioned to approve, David Malaguti 2 nd the motion, unanimous approval.
Briggs Engineering & Testing	INV0223340	\$2,061.00	Tom Fugazzi motioned to approve, David Malaguti 2 nd the motion, unanimous approval.

Miscellaneous:

SS: Lynne received an email from Olson and Lewis, they tried reaching out to Jon Lemieux with no response. The email requests that the Town close out Olson and Lewis's portion of the maritime facility. Invoices are from 2021, three of them were not paid. Lynne and I also thought we should reach out to CHA to check if there are any outstanding invoices from the DPW project. CHA responded with two outstanding invoices.

DM: For Olson and Lewis, is there money left in that account?

SS: There is just enough left on the purchase order to cover the invoices.

TFug: The project manager is gone?

SS: O&L have been reaching out with no response. They requested we pay them.

DP: They have been contacting Vertex, or the Town as well?

SS: I'm not sure, they did not come to Procurement. Lynne and I have never seen them. This amount does bring the PO to zero, so we did owe them. You would think before now they would have reached out to say they aren't getting a response from Vertex.

DP: It's almost two years old. We can only pay what we have money for. Let's pay for them but, I would say both the architect and the project manager get black marks in our books for the future. What else?

SS: CHA, like I said once this Olson and Lewis bill appeared out of nowhere, Lynne, and I thought it would be best to check with them since JB is no longer here. CHA PO is still open, there are still funds to complete the contract. Once CHA is paid there is still open funding. The bills were sent to 26 Court

Street at JB's attention so I'm assuming they got put into the DPW mailbox. I'm not sure where they ended up.

DP: What about the July 29th bill there are outstanding invoices.

SS: Those were all paid because if you look at November invoice it only lists the thousand due which is the July bill. Their contract was \$35,922, if we pay both bills, we will have paid them \$24,500 so still a little over ten thousand left.

TFin: Have they done any work since November 2022?

SS: No, this is the final invoice.

Maritime Facility:

Invoices submitted for approval:

Vendor	Invoice Number	Amount	Approvals
Olson Lewis & Architects	3/31/21	\$4,140.00	David Malaguti motioned to approve, Luis Pizano 2 nd the motion, unanimous approval. The board voted for all Olson Lewis & Architects invoices together.
Olson Lewis & Architects	5/31/21	\$2,430.00	
Olson Lewis & Architects	6/30/21	\$1,260.00	

DPW:

Invoices submitted for approval:

Vendor	Invoice Number	Amount	Approvals
CHA	7/29/22	\$1,000.00	David Malaguti motioned to approve, Luis Pizano 2 nd the motion, unanimous approval. The board voted for all CHA invoices together.
CHA	11/25/22	\$4,000.00	

Next Meeting May 4, 2023, at 6:30 pm

Adjourn 8:09 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jackie Tobin

Administrative Assistant – Procurement