

## **Pepperell Building Committee**

### **Meeting Minutes**

**Monday, January 23, 2023**

#### **1.0 Call to order**

The meeting was called to Order by Cathleen Lundeen at 1:11 pm via Zoom.

#### **2.0 Attendees**

##### **2.1 Present**

Brian Borneman, Taya Dixon Mullane, Andrew MacLean, David Scott, David Querze, Joe LoBuono, David Stairs, Catherine Lundeen

B. Fors, R. Hopkins,

##### **2.2 Absent**

None

#### **3.0 Action Items**

B. Fors – Pre-qualification meeting was last week. Vertex and Tecton working on their subcontractor and GC evaluations. There will be a meeting next week with the evaluation team to finalize pre-qualified bidders list. For the elevator sub, per MGL, project needs three bids, but received none; and the elevator scope will be re-bid per MGL with three weeks to bid; if no bids, scope falls under GC to supply elevator and basis of design. Building Committee must vote on list of bidders recommended by the evaluation subcommittee at next Building Committee meeting.

B. Fors – Will be reaching out to KP Law firm used by Town of Pepperell for contract language so information will be available for bid day.

#### **3.1 Budget Review**

B. Fors - Did not get estimate from 3<sup>rd</sup> party estimator, so working from a draft budget based on DD estimate. Changes reviewed:

- Increase to geo-tech/geo-enviro associated with soil removal and LSP requirements
- Zero'd out temporary operations and facilities
- Increase in moving costs
- Increase \$2M in base construction number

- FFE – increase associated with communications consoles, equipment and associated infrastructure; increase in costs for furniture & fixtures throughout building; PFD and Dispatch moving some existing equipment but moving will be responsibility of the contractor. Estimate for security underway. Reduced phones/AV line item.
- Communications tower - \$265k grant for communications tower – will only need to pay for relocation of tower along with associated infrastructure. R. Hopkins – consider and plan for transition period. D. Stairs – recommending retaining existing tower, install new, then take down new and move it to new station while being served by old tower. Tecton can also address design of FFE.
- Outbuilding construction, firing range reduced considerably; increase to Park St Renovation
- Allowance added for soil remediation that had not been carried in SD

Schematic Design cost: \$41.2M; Design Development cost: \$42.7M includes 5% Construction Contingency and Owners Project Contingency at 2%; current funding ask \$40.7 (excludes costs already funded/incurred)

### **3.2 Packaging Plans**

B. Fors - Consider alternates for bidding. R. Hopkins – deduct alternates to consider when estimate reviewed - will have in this week and will work with Vertex and update budget. Estimator focused on base construction estimate – new construction, outbuilding, infrastructure to fire arms range and Park Street Renovation.

- Does not include procurement of fire arms range.
- Park Street Renovation – could design now and bid separately later.
- Carport and outbuilding renovation could be alternates – easily defined scope that could be packages as deduct alternates if selected. Could accept as deduct alternate, and determine during construction if use contingency if possible.

B. Fors – ie. Ashland Public Safety did procure fire arms range through GC; Need to determine if it must go through public bidding process. R. Hopkins – because it is a procured purchased item; due to size/cost, would need to work with Town on procurement approaches. B. Fors – can work with Atty Gen office to determine how to bid this component of the project. R. Hopkins – most pre-fab are in 2 lane modules, we are proposing 4 lanes. R. Hopkins – procuring separately results in no mark-up by GC.

B. Fors – need to show the community the active VE that has been ongoing from the beginning of the project to make strategic decisions to save costs to community. A. MacLean – need to understand the operating costs for the firing range. B. Fors – will reach out to Ashland for their experience with O+M for their firing range. R. Hopkins – could consider a 2 lane firing range and price.

B. Fors – Recommend First Alternate: Outbuilding; Second Alternate: Carport. R. Hopkins – Firing Range and Park Street Station Renovation not included in GC contract. Likely \$30.3M for GC bid plus other items not included in contract. R. Hopkins – will need to determine costs of carport, may be significant cost to carry as alternate. B. Borneman – would it include the infrastructure and just not the structure? R. Hopkins – Could include infrastructure or remove it completely. Site work will be separate, so may be able to work with GC on scoping. J. LoBuono – should include it all or not. R. Hopkins – renovation to outbuilding has programmatic impacts if it does not proceed. C. Lundeen – Did not proceed with Phases 2 and 3 in the earlier public safety renovation; feel it is unlikely that the Town would support going forward with later approval of funding. B. Fors – choosing alternates now does not affect the town vote, it just gives the committee options when the bids are received. J. LoBuono – what is the programmatic impact of the carport? R. Hopkins – it protects the vehicle access; value engineered decision to provide protection from the weather without full vehicle storage. B. Fors – consider deduct alternates for carport and then construction of outbuilding. R. Hopkins – need to know today which alternates to include and in what order. During construction, if funding is remaining in the project, could decide to leverage existing budget to add back in scope. J. LoBuono – believe this is may be an approach to provide the Committee with opportunity to make decisions when bids received. C. Lundeen – J. Ladik wants the project to be reduced by \$10 million. D. Scott – the outbuilding is to provide secure vehicle storage as evidence. The carport is critical to allow police vehicles to remain covered during weather to ensure quick response time. C. Lundeen – are alternates required for the bid package? R. Hopkins – no, they are not required, it is only an option to the Committee. These are questions primarily to address if there are things that the Committee is willing to remove. C. Lundeen – there has been discussion regarding the rifle range. R. Hopkins – this is not part of the GC bid package. It is a separate contract. D. Querze – Packaging alternates could give us options. R. Hopkins – need direction from Committee on which alternates to include in the bid package. The Carport does not affect a significant dollar amount from the project. The value engineering to make it a carport rather than enclosed parking was where the funds were saved. C. Lundeen – does th committee agree these are the alternates? B. Borneman – would like to understand what the financial impacts would be. Having to keep vehicles accessible during winter storms is very difficult. The Outbuilding infrastructure is limited to conduits for cameras, etc. C. Lundeen – Can we guarantee the costs for these items from the estimates we have now? R. Hopkins – we cannot guarantee until bids are in on costs for these items. R. Hopkins – need full bid documents complete by February 3<sup>rd</sup>. J. LoBuono – do not believe we need alternates at this time. B. Fors – at next community meeting, should explain all the value engineering decisions during design to save the community money. R. Hopkins – can show that square footage is the greatest driver to save costs, and we had these discussions early in the planning process. C. Lundeen – Motion by J. LoBuono to direct Vertex and Tecton to not include alternates, second by B. Borneman. Unanimously approved by the Committee by roll call vote.

R. Hopkins – we should plan for a prep meeting for the community meeting. A. MacLean – can also approve invoices.

### **5.0 Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn A. MacLean at 2:40 pm; seconded by D. Stairs. Unanimously approved by Building Committee.