

RECEIVED  
TOWN CLERK  
BELMONT, MA.

FEB 25 2 28 PM '14

**UNDERWOOD POOL PROJECT**  
Belmont, Massachusetts  
**BELMONT UNDERWOOD POOL BUILDING COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
February 6, 2014  
Belmont Town Hall – Conference Room 2

**Attending:**

**Underwood Pool Building Committee (UPBC)** – Anne Paulsen (Chair), Stephen Sala (Secretary & Permanent Building Committee member), David Kane (Recreation Commission Vice-chair), Ellen Schreiber, Kristine Armstrong

**Also in attendance** – Peter Castanino (Director DPW and UPBC liaison), Gerald Boyle (Director of Facilities), Chris Rotti (BH+A), Tom Scarlata (BH+A), Deborah Marai (PCI), Robert Phillips (neighbor), Franklin Tucker (press),

**Call to Order:** Anne Paulsen called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

**1. Approve Minutes of Previous UPBC Meeting**

- Stephen Sala made a motion to approve the minutes from the 1/28/14 Building Committee meeting; Ellen Schreiber seconded the motion. All committee members in attendance at the 1/28/14 Building Committee meeting voted in favor of approving the minutes.
- Stephen Sala made a motion to approve the minutes from the 1/30/14 Building Committee meeting; Ellen Schreiber seconded the motion. All committee members in attendance at the 1/30/14 Building Committee meeting voted in favor of approving the minutes.

**2. Design**

- Chris Rotti reported that there have been no changes to the design since 1/30/14 meeting. The 2 pool scheme with site work as included in the Schematic Design estimate will be presented to the Board of Selectmen.

**3. Budget**

- The total project budget, including the reconciled Schematic Design estimate, reviewed at the last UPBC meeting will be presented to the Board of Selectmen. UPBC members discussed questions on that budget with the team.
- Anne Paulsen inquired about what the cost of other recent pool projects are coming in at. Tom Scarlata indicated that the pool numbers in the BUP SD estimate are based on recent bids for a public project in East Longmeadow.
- Ellen Schreiber fielded a question as to why this project so much more expensive than the public pool in Wayland pool that has a bubble over it. Tom Scarlata said he is familiar with the project and the two cannot be compared; the work did not include upgrades to the existing, smaller pool.
- Ellen has fielded other questions about the bubble idea; she feels the UPBC needs to explain how much it would cost to go this route – not just the added foundation, but also the bubble itself, required upgrades to building envelope, mechanical equipment, and maintenance. It is not easy to come up with an accurate number because this is a different design; Stephen Sala wants to insure any number put out there is researched. In addition to the building envelope and mechanical equipment changes, there are major concerns with

the lack of parking for what is proposed to be a year-round structure and proposing a membrane structure in this neighborhood location. Gerry Boyle suggested that it might be sufficient to say the UPBC has not asked the designers to fully price the out the bubble option; the Wayland pool bubble and foundations reportedly cost \$2.5M, but this does not take into account changes required to buildings or the new pools. Tom Scarlata will forward his memo on this matter electronically to team; it can be distributed and Anne will send to interested parties.

- Tom Scarlata distributed a previously forwarded 2/4/14 memo outlining the major scope additions from Feasibility Study Option 1 to Schematic Design.
- Tom Scarlata distributed a previously forwarded 2/4/14 cost comparison/ breakdown from Feasibility Study Option 1 to Schematic Design.
  - Anne Paulsen asked why site demo more expensive now. Tom explained that more is actually included in that line item now, things that were in other line items before. These two numbers cannot be directly compared.
  - It is estimated that deletion of the utility pole and duct bank scope would be about an \$80K reduction (plus reductions in mark-ups/ multipliers)
  - Including a single pool in lieu of two pools in the design would be about a \$60K reduction (plus reductions in mark-ups/multipliers); the pool design in the Feasibility Study was much simpler than the current design.
  - Anne Paulsen noted that the proposed improvements to the existing parking lot and sidewalks have done a lot to address planning board and neighbor concerns.
- The role of the Clerk of Works was discussed as it relates to the allowance soft cost line item in the total project budget. PCI can provide the Clerk or the Town, if it has the manpower, can provide one internally. Employing a Clerk is a quality control effort; they are the Owner's eyes and ears on site. The Clerk is on site to provide general oversight and can assist with coordination of required testing and facilitate resolution to issues that may come up with the OPM, design team and Owner. The budget assumes a half-time Clerk for a 10 month construction duration; the project's size makes it difficult to justify a full-time Clerk, and the expense to go from half to full time may not pay off in added value. Deborah explained PCI has staff who just perform clerking duties, and others who sometimes split their time between clerking and other roles; there is flexibility, and the Clerk will learn when the best times to be on site are. The designer and their engineers also visit the site on a regular basis, which augments the Clerk of Works oversight and observations.

#### **4. Community & Stakeholder Outreach**

- **Planning Board**
  - An informal meeting is scheduled for 2/18/14. BH+A, KZLA and PCI to attend.
- **Schedule Meetings with Town Committees**
  - Traffic Advisory: BUP is scheduled to be on the agenda for 2/13/14 meeting. Anne Paulsen, BH+A and/or KZLA, and PCI to attend. Present improvements the project is attempting to make to parking, Cottage Street sidewalk, Cottage Street vehicular access (people who cut up the Concord Avenue end of the street the wrong way to zip into the little parking area), and Concord Avenue seasonal/informal "drop off".

- **Board of Selectmen**
  - Anne Paulsen noted the design that was used for the Schematic Design estimate and the total project budget reviewed last week will be presented to the BOS.
  - Anne Paulsen indicate the Board of Selectmen are generally aware of the project design and the budget numbers design and numbers the UPBC will present next week.
  - Tom Scarlata noted that at the last Public Meeting, Mark Paolillo stated that the presentation from the UPBC should be relatively short. Peter Castanino indicated the UPBC's time with the BOA will probably be 20-30 minutes total.
  - Chris Rotti passed out a draft presentation.
    - ❖ Introduction, explain existing site, existing features need work with
    - ❖ Key plan of entire site, showing existing conditions dealing with
    - ❖ Key plan of site showing proposed site improvements, new pool and bathhouses
    - ❖ Specific site improvement
    - ❖ Proposed pool
    - ❖ Proposed bathhouses, including plumbing fixture requirements
    - ❖ Renderings
  - Comments:
    - ❖ Anne Paulsen noted that the BOS needs to decide if they will be putting this on the ballot; this is about the money – \$2.9M override.
    - ❖ Anne Paulsen recommends a slide explaining why number is different than Feasibility Study estimate. Ellen Schreiber suggests breaking out into 3 simple elements: pool, bathhouses, site work.
    - ❖ Tom Scarlata noted there are 2 questions – why is the estimated value of this project more than the Feasibility Study estimate, and why do pools cost more today. He will distill his memo, create bullet point list. Feasibility Study was only about exploring the options to rebuild the pool in the same area or up the hill; this project attempts to meet the needs of the larger community and includes enhancements to improve safety, improve access, and addressed the larger site.
    - ❖ Important to note that the size of the bathhouse is due to Code requirements.
    - ❖ Important to discuss site issues – urban, constrained site with multiple existing conditions to address.
  - Anne Paulsen discussed overall presentation to the BOS.
    - ❖ Introduction and why the UPBC is in front of the BOS – to ask that a question be put on the ballot for money/override to build the pool project.
    - ❖ BH+A presentation slides - include goals and images; Tom will add slide with project goals.
    - ❖ Cost summary/total project budget cost using cost estimate that is the difference of the 2 SD estimates; break down in simple categories.
    - ❖ Discussion as to what the project includes.
    - ❖ Discussion why it differs from Feasibility Study.
  - Peter Castanino said if the presentation is ready by midday tomorrow, send to BOS; but not absolutely necessary because everyone is aware of project/it is not a new topic.
  - Anne Paulsen asked that paper copies be provided for the BOS.

- Peter Castanino reminded the Committee that the number presented to BOS is the total project budget going forward.
  - ❖ Anne Paulsen inquired as to the confidence in the number.
  - ❖ Tom Scarlata reminded the Committee that we had 2 estimators prepare SD estimates each; there are contingencies and escalation built in to the numbers.
  - ❖ Deborah Marai added this is why we do the estimates and reconcile, and why contingencies and escalation are included.
  - ❖ Stephen Sala asked what is happening with construction costs; Deborah noted bids numbers are going up, and this was taken into consideration.
- Gerry Boyle inquired about using Construction Manager at Risk; Deborah noted can only use CM@R with construction cost of \$5M or higher.
- Gerry Boyle asked where the Committee is at in answering the question as to what the required override means for the average tax bill. Anne indicated there will be a number ready for the BOS meeting; Anne will inquire with David Kale as to whether or not this information should be on a slide. Tom Scarlata would suggest not because the rest of the presentation is about design.
- **Public Meeting:**
  - Proposing meeting on Thursday 3/13/14 @ 7:00 p.m. to update the Community on the design and project progress in advance of Debt Exclusion Vote on 4/1/14. To be held potentially at the Senior Center.
  - Peter Castanino suggested the presentation for the Public Meeting will be similar to BOS presentation. Ellen Schreiber suggested additional information – why existing pool cannot continue (go back to day 1); that the UPBC did research in community and design responds to things heard; then move to project goals.
  - Anne Paulsen stated that the UPBC is not allowed to ask the Town to vote for the debt exclusion or to advocate for the project; the Public Meeting is to provide information, and Anne will seek advisement from Town counsel prior to the meeting. Gerry Boyle indicated the UPBC can provide information but not take a position.
  - There is an advocacy group for the BUP project separate from the UPBC.
  - UPBC will meet on Thursday 2/27/14 to prepare for the 3/13/14 Public Meeting.
- **Town Vote 4/1/14**
  - If BOS support the project, vote for override for BUP project will be included on the ballot.
- **Town Meeting 5/4/14**
  - Community Preservation Act (CPA) funds will be determined.
  - Anne Paulsen noted that the Warrant Committee's attention to CPA funds will be telling; last night's Warrant Committee meeting was cancelled due to the weather, but Anne note the Committee has also delayed brining the CPA funds up until after the BUP project goes to the BOS.

## 5. Post-BOS Meeting

- Gerry Boyle asked with a positive BOS vote, does the project stop and wait until Town Vote.

- Peter Castanino recommended picking back up after a positive Town Vote, not waiting the 3 weeks for the Town Meeting CPA funds decision. Peter noted that all of the Consultants agreed to the published schedule, however it makes sense to start as soon as possible.
- With a BOS recommendation, not much for the UPBC to do before the debt exclusion vote.
  - UPBC, BH+A and PCI help prepare for the Public Meeting
  - BH+A meet with additional Town groups, committees
  - Planning Board informal meeting
  - Traffic advisory committee meeting

**6. Meeting Adjourned**

- David Kane made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Ellen Schreiber seconded the motion. The UPBC voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:47 p.m.

**Adjourned:** The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

**Next UPBC Meeting Dates:**

- Monday, February 10, 2014 @ 7:00 p.m.: UPBC joint meeting with/update to the Board of Selectmen
- Thursday, February 13, 2014: BUP update on Traffic Advisory Committee agenda
- Tuesday, February 18, 2014: BUP informal meeting with Planning Board
- Thursday, February 27, 2014 @ 7:00 p.m. UPBC Meeting

**Upcoming Milestones:**

- BOS Vote of Debt Exclusion Language
- TBD: Public Presentation by UPBC to Joint Town Committees
- February 17-21, 2014: School Vacation Week
- Thursday, March 13, 2014 @ 7:00 p.m.: Public Meeting
- Tuesday, April 1, 2014: Town Election Day / Debt Exclusion Vote
- Monday, May 5, 2014: Town Meeting

**Attachments:**

- PCI - 2/6/14 Meeting Discussion Points
- BHA – 2/6/14 Draft BOS presentation; 2/4/14 B+A memo comparing FS Option 1 and SD scope; 2/4/14 BH+A memo comparing FS Option 1 and SD estimates.

Respectfully Submitted, Deborah Marai, Pinck & Co. Inc.