

TOWN HALL BUILDING COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
October 27, 2020

Members Present: Mike Twomey, Jean-Pierre Minois, Jay Butler, Darcy Dale, Rosemary Kennedy, Jack Lawrence, Tim Olson, and Patrick Reffett

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Owner Project Manager (OPM) – Lee Sollenberger and John Sayre-Scibona of Design Technique (DTI); and Designer/Architect - Lerner, Ladds, Bartels (LLB), Mark Ritz and Drayton Fair; and Nick Tensen, FINCOM

Mike Twomey opened the Zoom audio/video teleconference at 1:27 PM.

**Past Meeting Minutes**

**Jay made a motion to accept the 10/22/20 meeting minutes which was seconded. Hearing no comments, Jay asked for and received a roll call approval of 6-0, as Jack and Tim had not yet joined the meeting.**

**Subcontractor Pricing Results from Bids Received 10/23/20**

Lee proceeded to review the results of the subcontractor bids received this past Friday. The subject spreadsheets had been sent out to the committee by John this past Saturday.

We received eight bids on Masonry ranging from \$86,100 to \$315,000 vs. our budget estimate of \$105,800, but the low bid by Northern Contracting Corp. was restricted by them to be used only by themselves as they wish to bid the on the GC contract. Thus, for estimating purposes, John chose the next lowest bid of \$147,550 from Chapman Waterproofing Company of Holbrook, MA that was \$41,750 over our estimate.

The Metal Fabrications bids are not due until 10/30/20 so John used the PM&C estimate of \$126,334 in developing the current total estimate.

We received five bids for Waterproofing, Damp-Proofing and Caulking ranging from \$45,100 to \$114,100 vs. our budget of \$62,261. Again, Northern Contracting's lowest bid was restricted by them, so John chose the next lowest bid of \$86,800 from The Waterproofing Company of Boston, MA that was \$19,539 over our estimate.

We received three bids for Roofing and Flashing ranging from \$183,000 to \$189,600 vs. our budget of \$140,698. John was forced to choose the highest bid from Capeway Roofing Systems of Westport, MA as the other two bidders had restricted use of their bids from other potential GC companies.

We received three bids for Resilient Flooring ranging from \$12,803 to \$39,013 vs. our budget of \$24,805. John chose the middle bid of \$17,651 from Santangelo Flooring of Dorchester, MA as

the lowest bidder restricted their bid from three potential GC's. This bid was \$7,154 less than our budget.

We received two Painting bids of \$187,800 and \$237,000 vs. our budget of \$141,812, so John chose the lower bid from Dandis Contracting Co. of Canton, MA that was \$45,988 over our budget estimate.

We received two Tiling bids of \$37,053 and \$48,184 vs. our budget of \$30,490 but since both were restricted, he tentatively used the lower bid that was \$6,563 over our budget.

We received two bids for Acoustical Ceiling Tiles of \$37,520 and \$38,000 vs. our budget of \$36,653. John chose the lower bid from The Cheviot Co. of Needham, MA that was \$867 over our budget.

We received only one bid for the Holeless Hydraulic Elevator of \$223,000 from Delta Beckwith of Canton, MA vs. our budget of \$220,000. The bid was \$3000 over our budget.

The Fire Protection bids are due on 10/30/20 so John used the PM&C budgeted number of \$138,340.

We received four Plumbing bids ranging from \$131,880 to \$173,000 vs. our budget of \$187,300. John chose the lowest bid from Robert W. Irvine & Sons of Lynn, MA that was \$55,420 lower than our budget.

We received three HVAC bids ranging from \$615,000 to \$638,000 vs. our budget of \$615,272. John chose the lowest bid from Thomas E. Snowden, Inc. of Saugus, MA that was \$272 less than our budget.

We received nine Electrical bids ranging from \$625,000 to \$975,000 vs. our budget of \$754,463. John chose the lowest bid from Wayne J. Griffin Electric Inc. of Holliston, MA that was \$129,463 lower than our budget.

Based on the above, John estimated that the lowest subcontractor unrestricted bids received or estimated to date equal \$2,563,528 vs. our PM&C budget of \$2,589,228. This shows the current bidding status as being \$25,700 under our budget.

**In a summary sheet, John took the LLB/PM&C budget estimate for the above categories and estimated the GC bid at \$3,893,799 for a budgeted total cost of construction at \$6,483,027. (This includes the projected \$112k COVID 19 costs.)**

Rosemary asked how the companies were checked out as to their history and reputation. Lee explained that many of the companies are well known by the prospective GC's and have history. Mark offered that in the case of the GC's, that the MA Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance (DCAMM) who provides them with their Historical Preservation certification, keeps track of their performance and complaints. Patrick mentioned that the DCAMM keeps track of any complaints or lawsuits and keeps a "bad list" for all contractors that one can check

out. Mike noted that it was an easy list to get on but a difficult one to get off. Mike and John both commented that several of the bidders were well known and very competent.

Jean-Pierre asked who chooses the low bidder. John explained that General Contractors usually choose the lowest subcontractor bids when formulating their final bids, but they could “cherry pick” if they wish. John further explained that the lowest bidder was not necessarily the lowest quality. He noted the Wayne J. Griffin Electrical bid as an example since they had extensive experience and an excellent reputation. The committee has no input into those decisions on the use of the subcontractors. The GC chooses. Jack asked why the large range in bids for some categories. Were some contractors just throwing out random large bids and were not really interested? John said the difference in many cases was in how contractors interpreted the drawings. Mike said that the large range was common in bidding.

Mike noted that the Fire Protection and Fabricated Metals sub bids are due 10/30/20 and the GC bids due 11/6/20. He felt that we were in good shape with the bids thus received vs. our estimates. Rosemary asked how many GC’s would be bidding and no one knew at this time.

### **Total Project Budget**

Mike asked Tim how he and John were doing with preparation of the last slide in Drayton’s presentation that would explain the project costs along with the expected “Ask” of the Town. Tim explained that the recent addition of the new ramp, sidewalks, curbs will cost an additional \$200 - \$300k. There will also be additional costs for architectural management fees and two months of OPM fees which will bring the latest additional costs up to \$500k. Thus, he was not sure the Town Meeting “Ask” would be \$4.8M or \$5.3M depending on if the late additions were accepted. Mike indicated that he was not happy with such a large unexpected increase at this late point in the schedule only days before Town Meeting. Mike was also unhappy with the issue that we have not been given a directed decision by the MA AAB on our requests. He went on to note that we had incorporated a 10% construction cost contingency equal to \$800k that he admitted was higher than many projects, so that might help. He mentioned that a 5% contingency might be acceptable, but not comfortable. He hoped that the GC bids were low.

Jean-Pierre said that he was blind to what the actual project number was but Mike indicated that he had no breakdown of the numbers and that until the GC bids are received, we would not know the final number.

Jay interjected at this point by reminding the committee that the voting public has only seen what was presented at last Fall’s Town Meeting and that the LLB/PM&C budget comparisons that we have been doing were against our self-established internal budgets that have never been sent outside of the committee. He felt that the committee should be focusing on what we showed Town Meeting last Fall as the Total Project Cost (\$9.7M) to see if we came in under that number. Mike and Tim noted that we were right at that number now. Mike felt we are too close to that number. Nick Tensen asked if the latest \$500k in adds were included in that number. The answer was yes. Tim noted that the CPC grant will help and Jay noted that the thought back in late 2019 was a \$2M grant which was now a \$3M grant. Mike noted that the current numbers show that the effect on the tax rate for the Ask was \$0.20. Tim mentioned that he has approximately \$167k left of the amounts approved at the Fall 2019 and that once spent, the down

payment of \$1.1M would have been made, in addition to the \$3M CPC grant. And he noted that the committee had to absorb \$300k in costs mandated by the state.

### **Town Meeting Presentation**

Drayton began by briefly showing the committee his updated draft presentation that had been sent out to the committee earlier, which included the following elements: photos of current problem areas within the building; a comparison of building problem issues with proposed fixes; the current site plan; the current floor layouts; rendering of the view from the road looking at the building; rendering of new access ramp from the North entrance; several second floor meeting room renderings; a list of organizations who either reviewed or approved the project; the current project schedule; a photo of Pilgrim Hall; and lastly a TBD summary cost sheet under development between Tim and John. Drayton then opened the discussion for comments.

Mark noted that at the MA AAB had not yet supported or approved our project.

A discussion ensued once again about the final cost slide. The result of this discussion was that there will be actually two slides that will show: the Total Project Cost; the sources of funding for the project; the current Ask for construction; the effect on the tax rate, i.e., \$0.20; and the effect on the tax rate for the average home cost in Hamilton (\$631,420), i.e., \$121.41 per year. Darcy wanted that \$121.40 expressed in cost per week or cost of number of coffees. Jack wanted the interest cost of the bond shown. Nick Tensen noted that the FINCOM will show that cost. Nick also suggested we stress that the change to the building will make it last for another 100 years. Tim asked if we had the financing sheet showing the decreasing cost of the bond over the 30 years. Nick said the FINCOM did but was not sure it would be shown. Rosemary said we should mention the great 3% interest rate we got on the bond. John wondered if we should show shedding of some debt. Tim noted that the only debt he saw being shed would be in 2026 for the Public Safety Building. Jack quickly noted that there was a long list of items to be added if debt service were available.

Jay asked that Drayton mention the \$200k in estimated savings by us getting a no-cost lease from Gordon Conwell for Pilgrim Hall. Nick asked if that was included in current estimates. Lee said it was removed previously.

Mike then asked Jay who would represent him at Town Meeting and Jay indicated it would be Shawn Farrell. Darcy noted that at last night's BOS meeting that it was decided that the formal presentation for the Town Hall Project would occur on the schedule for Town Meeting before the two warrants for the project were presented. Mike asked that Jay coordinate what Shawn was going to say to introduce the CPC grant and Jay indicated that he was writing a script for Shawn and that he would share that with Mike. Jay also said the CPC would not have any power point slides. Drayton asked if the deadline for supplying the slides was 10/30 and Rosemary said that they could be submitted a week or so later.

### **Next Meeting**

**Mike announced that the next THBC meeting will be a Zoom teleconference on Tuesday, November 10th at 1:00 PM.**

Nick asked if he could be kept in the loop as regards the final Ask number. He mentioned that the FINCOM analysis document needed to go out soon and they will use the current estimate of \$5.3M. Mike said that we need to base all estimates on the \$9.7M.

**Darcy made a motion to adjourn at 2:43 PM that was seconded and voted by roll call unanimously, 8-0.**

A True Record,

Jay Butler, Secretary

