

2014 NOV -4 AM 9:30

**UNDERWOOD POOL PROJECT
Belmont, Massachusetts**

BELMONT UNDERWOOD POOL BUILDING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING

September 2, 2014

Belmont Town Hall – Conference Room 2

Attending:

Underwood Pool Building Committee (UPBC) –Anne Paulsen (Chair), Adam Dash (Vice Chair and Warrant Committee member), Mike Smith (Historic District Commission), Joel Mooney (Permanent Building Committee member), David Kane (Recreation Commission member), Ellen Schreiber (Secretary); Steven Sala (Secretary and Permanent Building Committee member), Bob Phillips

Also in attendance – Peter Castanino (Director DPW and UPBC liaison), Tom Scarlata (BH+A), Deborah Marai (PCI), members of the public and press

Call to Order: Anne Paulsen called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m.

Action items are highlighted.

1. Meeting minutes

- Review of meeting minutes is postponed until the next UPBC meeting.

2. Prepare for Board of Selectmen Meeting

- Adam Dash reported on PCI's Options memo:
 - 1) Find the funding to cover the difference between the construction budget and the new low bid, accept the new low bid, execute the contract and start construction.
 - ❖ Joel Mooney said it seems like a stretch to find the funding, but do not necessarily eliminate this as an option.
 - ❖ Either funding that does not require Town vote or call a special Town Meeting.
 - ❖ Timing issue - bids are good for 30 business days; award by 10 a.m. on 9/26/14.
 - ❖ Even with this option, the project is off the previously established construction schedule to have the new pool open by June 15, 2015; time could potentially be made up, but for now need to assume day-for-day delay based on when the project is awarded vs. when it was scheduled to be awarded.
 - 2) Reject all bids, redesign and rebid.
 - ❖ Redesign could be minor or major.
 - Minor: Make changes estimated to cover part of the difference between the budget and new low bid, find funding to cover a potential shortfall once rebid.
 - Major: Make changes estimated to cover the difference between the construction budget and the new low bid. \$388K for base scope, does not account for Alternates and additional design and OPM fees.
 - ❖ Requires going back to Planning Board and Conservation Commission.
 - ❖ January 2015 is proposed as goal for rebidding, start work early spring.
 - ❖ If redesigning, need to consider potential additional fees for architect and OPM.
 - ❖ Any level of redesign would most likely mean the loss of a pool season.
 - 3) Reject all bids and dissolve project
 - ❖ UPBC does not support this option.
 - ❖ Understand that the Board of Selectman do not support this option.
- Adam Dash reported on the redesign options from BH+A's 9/2/14 memo. BH+A's redesign options include order-of-magnitude estimated savings.

- ❖ **Option A1** creates a single pool, maintain surface area of current two-pool option. Potential savings includes single larger filter system, reduced number of main drains and associated piping, one surge tank, one chemical controller, eliminate ramp and associated railing, and slight reduction in pool deck area. Estimated \$50-70K savings.
- ❖ **Option A** creates one pool 1,200 SF of pool surface area small than the current two-pool option. Potential savings includes same list from Option A1 plus the smaller pool surface area allows a reduction of two toilets and two showers; the west bath house could be reduced by 180 SF. Estimated \$90-140K savings.
- ❖ **Option B** pulls the project back within the existing fence line footprint and eliminates the site development and improvements outside of the pool. Includes: maintaining existing pool or a combined pool, buildings generally remain the same, finish deck elevation is level with top of culvert, top of culvert remains exposed, existing overhead power lines remain in place, no parking lot work except for restriping and signage, no drop-off or improvements to pedestrian walkways except as required for accessible entry to the pool complex, and reduced landscaping (no landscaping outside of pool fence). Estimated savings \$125-150K.
- **Cost to Redesign**
 - ❖ BH+A indicated approximate cost to redesign different option.
 - ❖ Additional cost for OPM if project time is extended.
- **Discussion**
 - ❖ Anne Paulsen reported that she, Tom Scarlata and Deborah Marai discussed the option to redesign and re-bid before the November 19, 2014 Town Meeting; it was decided that there is insufficient time, but this could be raised with the Board of Selectmen.
 - ❖ Ellen Schreiber noted that there is a point where reducing the size of the pool makes it not worth doing the project. Anne Paulsen concurred, noting that the pool size and programming should be the last items to be reduced; the scope outside of the pool fence could be a different project for the Town.
 - ❖ Ellen Schreiber asked about the possibility of making major changes to the buildings to save money. Tom Scarlata noted that if the pool is maintained at the current size, the number of fixtures remains the same; options would include combining into one building – but this brings up all the issues that were reasons to break the building program up into smaller buildings (the hill, the wetlands/riverfront buffer zones, neighbors' concerns, keeping the filter function on Cottage Street). There might be some savings in combining the filter and entry functions into one single bigger building, but again there would be an impact on the neighbors.
 - ❖ Cost of redesign (designer and OPM) needs to be weighed against potential savings of redesigned project.
 - ❖ The option of seeking a variance for a reduction in the required number of plumbing fixtures was again raised. Tom Scarlata reported he has gone before Plumbing Board for variances with pool and rink projects and it is a hard sell; the circumstances have to be very special because the Board does not want to set a precedent.
 - ❖ Anne Paulsen noted the Board of Selectmen will want to know what the UPBC proposes to do.
 - ❖ Peter Castanino believes the Board of Selectmen will also want to know why three of the four bids were above the estimates prepared for the project.
 - ❖ Tom Scarlata noted there are 3-4 pool contractors he would expect to provide bids for a pool project in Belmont; a pool contractor from Connecticut told BH+A he did not bid because of the distance. Tom contacted all the pool contractors he is familiar with, as far as he know only 2 provided numbers to general contractors.
 - ❖ Discussion regarding the appropriate level of redesign:

- Bob Phillips noted the redesign options proposed by BH+A do not even come close to the difference between the now low bid and the budget.
- Ellen Schreiber noted it is difficult to know the target since there were multiple estimates done to verify budget, and the original low bid was within budget.
- Mike Smith does not see the merit in cutting a lot from the project since one bid came in where expected.
- Joel Mooney suggested considering whether option A1 of redesigning to one pool and changing construction schedule to avoid winter conditions would be sufficient to go back out to bid; potential of more favorable bidding climate.
- Regarding the question of how much change is required to go back out to bid, Deborah Marai recommended the UPBC confer with Town Counsel.
- Deborah Marai cautioned that redesign does not guarantee estimated savings.
- ❖ If redesign and rebid in January:
 - Pros
 - January/February are generally good months to bid construction projects
 - Construction period will not include winter/need for winter conditions
 - There is sufficient time to redesign and go through permitting requirements
 - Not so far off that escalation will be a huge factor
 - Cons
 - Town Meeting is in May. If bids came in above budget and the decision was made to seek additional funding from the Town, could only hold bids for 30 days. Would need to make Award contingent on favorable Town Meeting vote, which could dampen the bidding interest, or call special Town Meeting.
- Board of Selectmen presentation
 - ❖ Present UPBC consensus to Board of Selectmen.
 - ❖ Go through 3 options as outlined by PCI
 - 1) Find a way to accept new low bid without requirement for Town Meeting. Convey that the funding gap is small percentage of the project cost and redesign options to find savings are not very productive given additional costs that will be incurred.
 - 2) Options for redesign
 - Anne Paulsen noted that redesign, whether minor or major, will change what people voted on. Adam Dash noted that technically people voted on money allocated for pool, not on the actual design.
 - Option A1 to create a single pool – Adam Dash said that there was a programmatic problem that the project tried to solve with by creating two pools, but it may come down to what the project can afford. However, all agree that this options represents a small amount of cost savings given the cost to redesign.
 - Option A to reduce the pool size - The pool as currently designed is already smaller than the existing pool; UPBC consensus that the pool should not be reduced even further.
 - Option B to limit work to within original pool fence footprint – Savings but not certain if this would be enough.
 - Question Board of Selectmen about the option to call special Town Meeting.
 - 3) UPBC does not want to end the project; they want to work on it through its successful completion.
 - ❖ Consultants (BH+A, PCI) do not need to attend tomorrow morning.

3. Discuss Actions Required with Current Bids

- Both the Attorney General's Bid Unit and own Counsel agreed that Seaver Construction provided appropriate documentation to back up their bid retraction due to significant clerical error.
- ***UPBC to discuss option with Board of Selectmen prior to returning bonds to any bidders.***

4. Meeting Adjourned

- Ellen Schreiber made a motion to adjourn the meeting, David Kane seconded the motion. The UPBC voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Adjourned: The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 p.m.

Next UPBC Meeting Dates:

- TBD

Upcoming Milestones:

- Meet with Board of Selectmen tomorrow morning, 8:00 a.m. 9/3/14

Attachments:

- PCI: UPBC Meeting Discussion Point
- PCI 8/29/14 Memo re: Options Moving Forward after Bidding
- BH+A 9/2/14 Memo re: Potential Rebid Options

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