

DPW/BPD Building Committee  
Committee Meeting, June 11, 2018  
Town Hall, Room 4

**RECEIVED  
TOWN CLERK  
BELMONT, MA**

DATE: January 25, 2022  
TIME: 2:31 PM

Meeting is called to order by Anne Marie Mahoney at 7:06 PM. Members present are Anne Marie Mahoney, Jay Marcotte, Steve Rosales, Ted Galante, Tom Gatzunis, Mike Santoro, Anthony Ferrante, Judith Ananian Sarno, Richard McLaughlin, Jaime MacIsaac, Steve Dorrance, Fitzie Cowing, Bill Shea, Roy Epstein. Absent from meeting is Member Mike Smith

- Chair Mahoney reviews goals for the day, minutes, timeline, meeting calendar for summer, etc.
- Member Rosales requests a moment to acknowledge how far the committee has come and enjoy the success of the town meeting vote
- Introduction of new facilities director Steve Dorrance
- Chair Mahoney entertains motion to approve TGAS invoice, Member Epstein moves, Member Rosales seconds, unanimous pass
- Chair Mahoney entertains motion to approve Anderson Krieger Attorneys, Member Rosales moves, Member Ferrante seconds, unanimous pass
- Chair Mahoney entertains motion to approve Daedalus invoice, Member Cowing moves, Member Rosales seconds, unanimous pass
- It has come to the attention of the committee that the article from November 2017 town meeting only formed us through to schematic design. This means that we cannot pay bills until special town meeting in November 2018. In the meantime we need 3 members of permanent building committee to sign the contracts and pay TGAS/Daedalus. After special town meeting we will get authorized again.
- Member Rosales asks – now do we have any authority? Chair Mahoney is unsure of our exact standing and is seeking guidance from relevant parties
- Chair Mahoney asks Ted and Tom to discuss their jobs moving forward. Ted hands out color coded schedule for both project.
- Ted – first step is design development, honing in on each area and making decisions on each area. Member Epstein asks – will we be looking at drawings etc? Ted says yes.
- Member Epstein inquires as to whether at some point will there be a master checklist of tasks that need to be done? Ted – that’s not really something that is done – that is the job of the design team, and we meet with the necessary stakeholders, as an example a meeting with the fire chief that resulted in a request to change the height of a pump access point on the DPW.
- Looking at the timeline, the problem for DPW is that the construction time currently falls from November to March, Jay says we can’t have work going on during snow and ice season.
- Tom points out that the work in the back shouldn’t impact them so could that happen? Concerns over pouring foundation in November? Ted says they do it all the time, and poured foundations in January of this year.
- Member Rosales posits that with all due respect to Mike and Jay, we should try not to delay any more than necessary, and while we want to avoid inconvenience we also need to move now.

Additionally, given that we had March blizzards this year, pushing off work could be doubly costly if snow season runs long.

- Member Rosales inquires – if its modulars, what actually has to happen? We submit construction docs to mod company, they send their offer back in terms of what they can do, we work back and forth to come to a design that works for us and is DOABLE for them.
- Member Rosales asks, who is watching them build these things so that we know that what they send us is squared away?
- Ted breaks down the project in 4 parts. First part is front offices – may be easier to be stick built now. So it looks like only the back section may be modular.
- Chair Mahoney points out that there's no capital budget money for furnishings till July 1 next year
- Member Cowing points out – we can still build it though and worst case it stays unfurnished.
- Member Ferrante points out even without chairs we would at least have lockers and showers for them.
- Jay asks Ted – will it have its own heating system? Ted says yes.
- Member Rosales questions – who do we ask about what other permits we need, and where do they fit in the schedule? Ted says in the design phase, which is the first 1/3 to 1/2 of the project.
- Member Epstein points out that DPW is likely not subject to stormwater, Ted says he thinks it won't trigger it.
- Member Epstein asks about the issue of timing of DPW and how long does pouring footings take, 3 days? Ted says no, 3 weeks at least.
- Member Epstein asks how much space in the back would you need to do this? Ted says building is 200 ft long, addition is 100 ft long, plan for them to need the back of the building full length for staging.
- Member Cowing asks – is it possible to change up order of construction if the weather permits. Ted says yes.
- Member Ferrante asks about how much work is outside after the footing is poured, not much right? Ted says not that much, ideally.
- Member Rosales asks Mike and Jay if they need us to find additional space for equipment and other needs as they are now losing that back area. Mike and Jay say “we'll adjust”.
- Member Cowing points out that not being able to furnish the back area may make sense in a way, as we should keep it flex space for the other construction so that as example the kitchen can be moved back there during reno, etc, correct? Ted and Tom say yes exactly they are counting on that space to be flex space.
- Chair Mahoney asks if we are ready to wrap up DPW and move on to PD, committee agrees
- BPD
- PD has a much longer timeline. It need to be structurally careful and structurally inventive/creative, which is part of why it takes longer.
- In the next week both buildings will be swarmed with people to start taking intensely detailed measurements, etc.
- MA general law provides the 6 week bid timeline.
- Member Rosales asks about timeline as presented, one document says May, one says July, Ted says JULY 2020 is the end date that should be recorded.

- Asst. Chief MacIsaac asks when are documents DONE, and nothing else can be added? Ted and Tom say at the end of Design Development, that's it, speak by then or forever hold your peace.
- Chief adds that in a conversation with Patrice there was question about the timeline and can the process be accelerated in any way further? Tom says he already cut time off as much as was possible. Tom doesn't want to cut anymore off PD because frankly it's immensely complicated.
- Member Cowing asks – this timeline represents, (for lack of a better word) worst case scenario? Tom says yes, it will not take LONGER than that.
- Question about timeline of HS project and whether or not some groups may bid on our project to stay in town and potentially we may see some cost savings there? Possibly.
- Tom points out we will likely have different contractors for the different projects because the PD has very different needs from the DPW.
- Member Rosales wants more explanation on why the construction documents take so long? Ted says – especially on municipal projects, every screwhead has to be identified. How a door meets a wall. Every tiny little thing has to be identified – the documents have to be as tight as tight can be so that there aren't any change orders or surprises.
- Member Rosales asks if Tom is comfortable with this? Tom says yes, this is the right-sized timeline.
- Chair Mahoney highlights that from experience, literally everything needs to be identified. Provides the example that they had to specify exactly 651 lockers at Chenery.
- Discussion of who will make decisions on things – general consensus is users first with Ted and Tom and final say made by committee.
- Member Shea asks – will phasing decisions be made in design development or construction docs? Ted and Tom say end of design and beginning of construction docs.
- Member Epstein asks what contractual provisions are made to force the contractor to finish on time? Ted says document called the "front end", an attorney written document, informed by Ted in terms of dates is what outlines that, and the standard approach is liquidated damages if they don't finish on time. Also, companies submit schedule of values, they typically front load it, and we counter with tail end balances to keep them "money hungry". Member Epstein asks about whether we can provide incentives? Ted says he doesn't think we can on a municipal project. Member Shea says its uncommon as well and would be difficult.
- Member Rosales asks about the footprint needed for construction for PD? Ted says along with phasing there will need to be a site logistics plan formed. Member Rosales asks if we can include parking restrictions on contractors? Yes. Ted and Tom point out though that each restriction has costs in terms of either bid amount \$, or timeline.
- Chair Mahoney asks Tom to pose the question about oversight? Tom – for our services, on site representative – in order to keep within budget they cannot do it with an onsite rep at both sites. So, do we want a part time on site rep, or do we want to go over the 4% cost? Member Ferrante asks about cost/how and where do we need them? (Note: Fire station had only 1 person between both sites and we saw how that turned out) Chair Mahoney points out that errors at FD are now OVER 2.5 million so should we spend the money now?
- Member Epstein asks what's the scope here, are we talking about just the 4 months at DPW and the 14 at the PD? Steve Dorrance clears up some questions – talks about the utility of a site rep. He says he doesn't think we need a full time rep for DPW but ABSOLUTELY do for PD.
- Member Cowing asks can we see a cost breakdown of each full time/part time iteration?

- Member Shea asks how it is billed? Hourly or flat fee? Tom says when it's hourly people tend to avoid meetings in order to save money which is a bad thing so he recommends flat fee.
- Chair Mahoney states that Tom is going to get us information on that so we can go forward. Any information still needed from Ted?
- Member Epstein asks Ted, your design goes up to the sidewalk of the PD – but there's also a traffic signal issue, curb cutting, etc. How do we get a sense of what those "others" will cost? Ted says we should talk to Glen Clancy and DPW in order to get that information. Those conversations need to happen with the other stakeholders. Tom – the BSC group is the town's traffic consultant, and they are the ones who actually designed the Pleasant St. intersection, so they would be the best people to work with.
- Chair Mahoney proposes, while we are all still here, can we get some calendar dates down please. June 26 at 7:00. July 10 at 7:00. July 31 at 7:00. Ted requests those meetings occur in selectmen's room for the sake of the screen.
- Non Building Committee members dismissed.
- Discussion of Ted's contract. \$832,000 currently available to us from the \$232,000 we had leftover and the \$590,000 we got from the Kendall fund in May. Ted's numbers dovetail with that. Member Shea asks if we have Tom's input? He says go for it. Chair Mahoney entertains motion to accept TGAS proposal for scope of cost and services through to the remainder of the project. (Side conversation about whether or not we can even vote on this? Decide to do so, and determine whether further action is needed afterward.) Voted unanimously.
- Moved to accept April 2 minutes, Member Epstein suggests changes, changes made, adjusted minutes accepted unanimously.
- Moved to accept April 9, Member Epstein suggests changes, changes made, adjusted minutes accepted unanimously
- Moved to accept April 20, Member Epstein suggests changes, Member Ferrante suggests a change, changes made, adjusted minutes accepted unanimously
- Moved to accept May 1, grammar edits and changes made, adjusted minutes accepted unanimously
- Moved to accept May 10, accepted unanimously
- Moved to accept May 21, accepted unanimously
- Discussion of what next for the CPA, what can we apply to have funds cover? Suggest Mike Smith work that out.
- Member Epstein asks about talking to BSC group about traffic implications?
- Adjourned at 9:07