



HARRIMAN

**MEETING NOTES**

To  
Jill Cahill – Director of Community Development, City of Gloucester

---

From  
Kartik Shah and Steve Cecil - Harriman

---

Date  
August 31, 2018

---

Project  
City of Gloucester  
Support Center and Office Renovation  
Gloucester, MA  
Project No. 18485

---

Subject  
Kick-off Meeting held on August 15, 2018

Attendees  
Steve Cecil – Principal, Harriman (SC)  
Kartik Shah – Project Manager, Harriman (KS)

**Building Committee**  
Jill Cahill - Project Manager, Director of Community Development, City of Gloucester (JC)  
Thomas Ciarametaro Jr.- Gloucester Harbormaster (TJ)  
Tony Gross, Chair - Waterways Board (TG)  
Bill Sanborn, Inspector of Buildings - City of Gloucester (WS)  
John Ellis, Weston and Sampson – General Manager (JE)  
Joe Caruso, (JC2)  
Kenneth Lento, National Grid (KL)

**Not attending:**  
Michael Hale, Director of Public Works, City of Gloucester (MH)

46 HARRIMAN DRIVE  
AUBURN, ME 04210  
207.784.5100

123 MIDDLE STREET  
PORTLAND, ME 04101  
207.775.0053

33 JEWELL COURT, SUITE 101  
PORTSMOUTH, NH 03801  
603.626.1242

170 MILK STREET, SUITE 5  
BOSTON, MA 02109-3438  
617.426.5050

www.harriman.com

Topics	Action Items
<p><b>1. Agenda, Schedule and Project Updates</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Harriman provided the overview of the agenda.</li> <li>b. SC presented Budget and funding, grant proposal schedule outline.</li> <li>c. Kartik Shah and Steve Cecil to be the primary contact for the Harriman design team. Jill Cahill and Thomas Ciarametaro Jr. will be the primary contact for the City.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. JC and TJ will use a Doodle poll to set up the meetings.</li> <li>2. Harriman to provide the copy of the updated schedule, prior feasibility report to the Committee.</li> </ul>



<p><b>2. Seaport Council Grant Submission</b></p> <p>a. Seaport Economic Council (SEC) Grant proposal is due on November 1<sup>st</sup>. Grant proposal presentations not due till January or February 2019.</p> <p>b. The grant proposal requires preliminary conceptual level layouts and renderings. The actual presentations will not be until February 2019.</p>	<p>3. JC to coordinate and the schedule and requirement.</p>
<p><b>3. Massachusetts Boating Infrastructure Grant (MA-BIG) Program</b></p> <p>a. The Massachusetts Boating Infrastructure Grant (MA-BIG) requirements were discussed.</p> <p>b. MA-BIG grant is nationwide and competitive. It has higher match requirements at 50/50%. The City utilized the BIG grant for new floats with National Grid and the Seaport Council as partners. There may be potential for grant request, but the City should not depend on it.</p>	<p>4. JC to explore the grant submission requirements.</p>
<p><b>4. Goals and Expectations</b></p> <p>a. Following goals were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To improve facilities for Harbormaster for public safety reasons</li> <li>• Improve operations including workshop space and expansion space</li> <li>• Support visiting boaters and build landside support for the same</li> <li>• Increase visiting boater access</li> <li>• Support Shellfish</li> <li>• Potential Program elements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Community space for boater safety and community meetings</li> <li>○ Showers for visiting boaters, Washer, and dryer for in-house use, separate Public restrooms,</li> <li>○ Semi-official visitor center</li> <li>○ Some visitor boating facilities have locks with codes that can be changed every week</li> <li>○ Two additional office spaces, for Shellfish and Discover Gloucester/Swing Space</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Classroom types of spaces to run boater safety education classes in collaboration with Coastguard. A space that can accommodate 30 persons will be ideal.</li> <li>• Welcoming presence on the harbor loop side</li> <li>• How will this project tie into the Downtown and bring more visitors to the Downtown and here?</li> </ul> <p>b. Harbormaster expects 20% increase in the transient boaters in 2018 from 700 boaters last year. Nationally transient boaters spend 300\$/ night. It is a big opportunity for the City to capture this revenue and bring the transient boaters to the Downtown.</p>	<p>5. JC to consult with DPW about the operations of the Public Restrooms</p> <p>6. Harriman will generate ideas about the outside for the committee.</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. City council member Ken Hecht expressed that the building should express Gloucester. The Committee expressed that the City will like to see improvement on the outside if they are spending \$1.6 M on renovating the building.</li> <li>d. Harriman explained that current cost estimates reflect the improvements in the interior of the building.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>5. Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The city of Gloucester is a Green Community, and hence sustainability is important. Evaluating the sustainability opportunities with the costs will be important.</li> <li>b. This building is not expected to be LEED certified. Harriman suggested that you can build the sustainability features in, but the actual certification can be expensive.</li> <li>c. Harriman to examine the cost of incorporating sustainability features during the design stages to aid in the City’s decision making.</li> </ul>	<p>7. Harriman to examine the cost of incorporating sustainability features.</p>
<p><b>6. Budget</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The City council approved a loan request for \$1.6 Million. The City will like to be within budget for this project.</li> <li>b. Marshfield budgeted \$300k for the elevator for 2-3 floor elevator. The fire department may require a larger elevator, and that can increase the costs. Usually, elevator cost estimates for the one-floor rise are between \$80k- \$120k.</li> <li>c. Harriman to confirm the cost estimate for the elevator.</li> </ul>	<p>8. Harriman to confirm the cost estimate for the elevator.</p>
<p><b>7. Elevator</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Committee asked if the elevator is an absolute requirement. The elevator is not an absolute requirement. Newburyport doesn’t have an elevator. Marshfield doesn’t have access to the third floor via an elevator. The elevator requirement will depend on the Massachusetts Code requirements. As per the ADA, the elevator is required.</li> <li>b. The elevator will require excavation in the existing slab. Harriman doesn’t know the existing conditions of the slabs as the soil underneath the slab has not been tested.</li> <li>c. State Access Board (Architectural Access Board) is trying to change the code to include employees. Harriman suggested to plan for the elevator at this stage and decide if it is required or not.</li> <li>d. The City is working on the Accessibility Transition Plan for old buildings. A grant of up to \$250k is available for accessibility</li> </ul>	<p>9. JC to confirm after consulting the City team if the elevator is required or not.</p>



<p>transition on a city-wide basis. JC and MH to decide if this elevator needs to be part of the accessibility grant.</p> <p>e. JC to investigate with the city team if the elevator is required or not.</p>	
<p><b>8. Programming and Public Meeting Schedule</b></p> <p>a. The City is committed to do a public hearing and get feedback from the public before the program is firmed up. City wants to make sure public input is incorporated before the design is finalized.</p> <p>b. Harriman explained that the design will be linked to the program and the building space is finite for the amount of program that can be accommodated in the facility.</p> <p>c. Harriman to present layouts with the programming discussion so that building committee can see what program can fit. Layouts can be very conceptual to understand what program can fit within the space.</p> <p>d. City to hold the public meeting after the next programming meeting to gather public feedback.</p>	<p>10. Harriman to develop conceptual layouts for programming discussion.</p>
<p><b>9. Floodproofing and FEMA Regulations</b></p> <p>a. Harriman clarified that there are no existing drawings available of the building. National Grid is working with the contractors to get final as-built drawings for the building. National Grid will provide the same when the work is complete. No timeline is available as of yet.</p> <p>b. The current level of the ground floor is lower than the FEMA Base Flood Elevation (BFE) level of 14 feet by approximately 15 inches. Harriman explained that since correct elevations of the building were not available during the feasibility stage, the raising of the ground floor level for flood-proofing the building was not considered in cost estimates. FEMA offers an alternative approach for the non-residential building to be certified and insured with FEMA. This alternative approach involves demonstrating the building can withstand flooding certified by the Architect or the Engineer.</p> <p>c. The City is self-insured for FEMA. As a part of the lease agreement, National Grid doesn't have insurance for the building; it is with the City as a part of the triple net Lease.</p> <p>d. The Committee asked if it the city has any latitude in following the FEMA regulations or not. Harriman explained that if the value of the renovation is below a certain threshold than the building doesn't require to be compliant with the FEMA. The City has previously used Replacement Cost of the building to compare the value of the renovation.</p>	<p>11. Harriman to examine the FEMA requirement for certification</p> <p>12. Harriman will examine the building conditions and provide choices to the City to floodproof the building without raising the ground floor</p>



<p>Recent FEMA regulations require the depreciated value of the Replacement Cost of the building to be compared with the value of the renovation.</p> <p>e. Harriman to examine the FEMA requirement to be certified and insured.</p> <p>f. The Committee asked about the impact of the raising the level of the ground floor. Harriman explained that the roof would have to be rebuilt and windows and doors will have to be raised. Harriman suggested using the alternative approach of making the building flood-proof without raising the level of the first floor. The Committee does not see the raising the building level as an option.</p> <p>g. Harriman will examine the building conditions and provide choices to the City to floodproof the building without raising the ground floor.</p> <p>h. DNAP rooms may require floodproofing</p>	
<p><b>10. Chapter 91</b></p> <p>a. National Grid/The City will provide the Chapter 91 information.</p>	<p>13. JC will coordinate the Chapter 91 license requirements.</p>
<p><b>11. Other Topics</b></p> <p>a. If the City/Harriman team can define the sewage and drainage requirements, then National Grid can do the work and provide the clean building site for renovation.</p>	

*If written notice is not received within two weeks of receipt, the above meeting notes represent an accurate summary of the meeting and its conclusions.*