

FISP Committee

Meeting Date and Time: March 8, 2017

Members Present: John Hadley, Chair, Ray Bricault, Chris Rucho, Robert Chisholm, Phil Mallet, Barur Rajeshkumar, Pat Crowley, Siobhan Bohnson

Members Not Present: Jay Duggan, Kate Ivers

Also Present: OPM Tony DiLuzio, Architect John Catlin, Town Administrator Anita Scheipers

Mr. Hadley called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

1. Minutes: Minutes were passed over and will be presented at the next meeting.
2. Police Station:
 - a. OPM Report: Eight change orders have been approved to date for the general contractor, RAC Builders, contract for a total of \$85,140.00. Framing of the building is well under way. MassDOT has issued a stop work order on the drainage that connects to the roadway drainage system until they can review and approve the plans. The concrete slab floors of the upper section of the building will be done later in March. Windows should be installed in late March, and windows by early April. The project is still running on schedule and is within the budget.
 - b. Architect Contract Amendment: Reinhardt Associates, Inc. is being bought out by Caolo & Bieniek Associates, Inc. A proposed contract amendment to allow this contract transfer is being reviewed by town counsel. Pat Crowley moved and Chris Rucho seconded to recommend approval of the change order subject to final wording being approved by Town Counsel. Vote: All yes. Motion passed.
 - c. Invoices:
 - i. Chris Rucho moved and Pat Crowley seconded to approve the Cardinal Construction invoice of \$8,384. Vote: All yes. Motion passed.
 - ii. Chris Rucho moved and Pat Crowley seconded to approve the RAC Builders invoice for \$254,844. Vote: All yes. Motion passed.
 - d. Change Orders: Chris Rucho moved and Phil Mallet seconded to approve the change order to the RAC Builders contract in the amount of \$38,850. This change order reflects proposed change orders 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9. Vote: All yes. Motion passed.
3. Senior Center: Architect John Catlin was present to speak to the pros and cons of a one story design versus two story design. He stated he has no opinion one way or the other, and that given the square footage involved, the cost of construction is quite similar for either option. He did stress that, when considering the options, the Committee should be aware of the potential of 15 to 20% in energy savings the two story design provides over the life of the building due to the smaller roof size causing less loss of heat.

He stated the building program remains the same with either design, but that the two story design includes wider circulation areas (hallways) as program space. Both are meant to be fifty years useful life buildings, with all mechanical systems placed in the attic areas. When asked he stated the Mixer parcel would work for either design with space for parking, landscaping and walking trails. He did state if a future addition were ever needed, it would be easier to do with a two story building.

Phil Mallet asked if we should build a smaller structure with the idea of future expansion, or should we build what we know is needed. It was the consensus of the committee that we should build the size building we know is needed.

Ray Bricault asked that it be noted that the Seniors are advocating for a single story design which is knowingly less space efficient than the two story design.

Bob Chisholm moved and Pat Crowley seconded to build a one story building. Ensuing discussion brought forward the following key points:

- a) Capital costs of construction of a one story versus two story are very close; a two story may achieve a \$120,000 savings over a one story design. Operating costs of a two story building are expected to be approximately 15% lower than a two story building.
- b) It was confirmed that the size of either design as proposed meets the needs of the community.
- c) It was discussed that the building will be designed to effect an estimated total project cost of \$5.2 Million, and that the estimated cost will be reviewed at several key points during design to ensure the projects stays on target with the budget as closely as possible.
- d) It was agreed that the amount of funds to be requested at the spring town meeting for the “pre-construction phase” design, engineering and OPM work will be \$500,000 based on a \$5.2Million total project cost estimate. Catlin did remind the committee that project costs should reflect a 4.5% increase for each year of project delay.

Vote: All yes. Motion passed.

It was agreed that John Catlin will provide to the Town the final concept design for the one story building, a fully detailed project cost estimate, and the rendering of the exterior building appearance. He promised to have this to the Town in time for the April FISP meeting.

Various member expressed strong concern about the lack of initiative on Catlin’s part to work with the COA on developing concepts on building size, and as shown in not returning calls or answering questions and concerns. Catlin admitted that he did get off to a bad start and apologized. Further concern was stated that misinformation had been given. Originally Catlin had told the committee that a two story design would achieve a 20% savings in construction, and this did not prove to be true based on more recent cost estimates. Catlin admitted that he originally thought such savings was feasible, but his cost estimator found that the promised savings could not be achieved when looking at a building of this smaller size. Committee members

expressed disappointment in Catlin not providing specific numbers when discussing the potential energy savings of a two story building. Catlin reminded the committee that this was a concept design only, and lacked any details regarding HVAC and electrical system, insulation, etc. Lacking that degree of design detail, it is impossible to provide any certain value of energy savings that might be achieved. It was also discussed that Catlin had provided incorrect information about the success of other communities in fundraising efforts.

After Catlin left the room, Chris Rucho moved and Pat Crowley seconded to go out for a new Request for Qualifications form other architectural firms for all remaining designer services on this project. Vote: All yes. Motion passed.

4. The committee discussed the type of information that is suggested should be placed on the website monthly to keep the public informed as to the status of the police station project. It was agreed that John Hadley would meet with the OPM to ask that he provide the necessary information to the Town for a monthly update to the website. It was also agreed it is too premature to develop information regarding the senior center.

5. Town Administrator Anita Scheipers was asked to prepare tax rate impact information for the \$500,000 needed for the remaining design work, and for the \$5,000,000 needed for the rest of the total project costs. This will be needed for the next meeting.

6. Next Meeting: The next meeting is scheduled for Wed., April 12, 2017 at 7:00pm.

7. Siobhan Bohannon moved and Chris Rucho seconded to adjourn the meeting. Vote: All yes. Motion approved. Meeting adjourned at 9:20pm.

Respectfully Submitted: Anita Scheipers

Date Approved: April 12, 2017