

City Hall Annex
Three Pond Road
Gloucester, MA 01930



CITY OF GLOUCESTER
Community Development Department
Harbormaster's Office Building Committee

Minutes

Thursday April 25, 2019

Present: Bill Sanborn, Jill Cahill, Mike Hale, TJ Ciarametaro, Tony Gross

Absent: Joe Caruso, John Ellis, Ken Lento

Jill Cahill opens meeting.

Jill makes a motion to approve March 28 minutes

2nd: Bill S: motion to approve.

? Please do a spell check and correct spelling errors.

Vote: Unanimous, minutes accepted.

Jill, many reasons not to meet with just the committee today, project is currently over budget and decisions have to be made. They are asking for \$47k additional funding.

Total number needs to be less than \$2million. Discussion ensues as to construction date, if construction begins in fall, bidding needs to be completed now, per Mike H. Numbers are already coming in higher. They can start and work inside during winter. Construction must start this fall per grant Jill mentions. Bill S asks about the chances for bids at that time of year.

Mike H. asks if there are any special requirement with the construction? i.e. women owned companies etc.

Bill S. they must be _____certified.

Mike H asks if there are any special requirements regarding the bidding?

Jill hoping pre-contract paperwork will be complete by June.

Jill, the memo from Harriman up for discussion;

Meet with Harriman next week to complete these tasks: committee discusses day and time to confirm meeting with Harriman.

Assumptions- for confirmation, we need to yes or no everything. It is basically what we have been looking at, it is where we are.

Finishes- 2nd floor, windows removed asked TJ? Is the wall to be removed?

We are confirming that these are the final changes TJ agrees.

Exterior- no new roofing, shed roof can be done as add on later. Mike H Add-ons must be in priority order

Window replacement- except where it presents code compliance conflict.

Fire separations are confirmed agrees Bill S.

Door locations are agreed upon by all.

Minor modification to railing to facility ADA accessibility.

Painting- exterior is approved.

DPW handling plumbing, water service, Mike and Tony? Discuss pipe installation, location through building, Tony suggests using existing to save costs. Discussion ensues regarding soils, and location.

Sewer- Capacity is adequate. Can use CCTV to re-check line sys Mike H. it can be lined.

Electrical- Upgrade electrical service by National Grid, not correct per?

They will do manhole.

They will also upgrade transformer. Service from transformer and new meters is our responsibility. No digging.

Engineering needs to work out how to install. Costs are not in yet.

Flood resiliency- Flood proofing not required. Lower level construction will be resilient to allow flood waters to come and go. Question how much will this cost?

Bottom line is we are required to do this, it's not an option, their statement is not correct.

Harriman to continue to seek lower cost solutions.

Project Scope- Harriman requires further direction for operable partition wall. Cost is \$20,000. We understand it makes room more functional. At this point it is one of the only things to remove.

Alternatives list so far-

Operable wall \$20,000.

Flagpole \$5,545.

Roof

Discussion ensues about types of flag poles among committee

Mike suggests wall be listed as #1, as anything mechanical should be done now. ? aks if it could be done now.

Door is not electric, could be installed later- other solution is hard wall with door.

Cost variables still before us.

Electrical total from transformer to building \$23,000.

All committee discussion ensues as to how the work will be completed.

Exterior wall repair- brick and veneer wall repair from construction. New installation may find additional repairs needed.

Contingency is only 10%, being that project is over budget already, that is not sufficient, multiple member's state.

Engineering number provided includes additional \$47,000.

We need to be sure we are only paying for services needed. We do not need 3 people in a meeting from their team.

Structural test done by them yet? Re insulation etc. – Mike H says no contact.

Jill asks for thoughts regarding the memo for additional funding.

All members join in discussion.

They have consumed more time to get to this point.

Many changes to program i.e. 1st floor offices, adding shellfish and 2nd floor office space. This should be negotiated.

Questions on the time spent as all agree that these were in original scope.

No heads up on this from their team.

We have only asked for minor changes and some were incorrect when returned.

Flood proofing is a challenge, and as they did feasibility study they knew this information.

Jill poses a question, is it normal to negotiate after bid comes back, we are over and have not gone to bid yet? Company chosen for their work they should have been clearer, work done by City Departments being billed by company.

Consensus is we did not change scope to warrant increase in fees. We had minor layout changes, and correction due to their errors in design.

Call to be scheduled to discuss differences.

The items include; bid contingency, fees associated with plan issuance, review, mailing of bid packages etc. Increase over \$400,000. They are asking for \$47,000.

How do we make these significant changes? It will also cost us more money to make these changes.

Code changes that come into effect, could change value as well.

Mike H questions statement that CA not required on site, discussion ensues, figures to not match.

Can also make 2nd floor Alt 1-

Conversation continues as to having bid changed to creating the new 1st floor and keeping 2nd floor as an add on. Cost estimate is about \$100,000.

There is not \$300k to remove from the 1st floor work.

? says without re-doing entire plan there will be no way to re-coup cost changes.

From 1st design, we have brought it down significantly.

Can we go back to the grant to ask for an increase?

Jill replies yes, 20%, project has been thinned as much as possible.

Perhaps we can go back and see if there is any year end funds that may be available. Mike H mentions there are sources in the state that may provide additional funds.

Bill – over all we are doing more work with less money it is a good project, we need a facility that works.

Questions for Harriman, are they confident in their estimated pricing? What types of companies will bid on this.

Next meeting will be with architect firm. A conversation will be needed prior to the next meeting.

Conversation should be had with other offices (Treasurers) prior to Mayor's office being approached.

Next meeting May 1, 9am - most can make it.

Meeting adjourned:

2nd :