

East Bridgewater High School Building Committee



Meeting No. 30

Date & Time: 5:30 pm Monday 25 July 2011
Location: East Bridgewater Town Hall – 2nd Floor Conference Room

Attended (✓) Name, Affiliation

East Bridgewater High School Building Committee

David Floeck, Chair	✓ Elizabeth Hayes
✓ Susan T. Cote, Vice-Chair	✓ George McCabe
✓ Patricia Coppola-Lugo	✓ Theresa McNulty
Domenic DeAngelo	Cheryl Pooler
✓ John Haines	✓ Paul Vieira

RFWalsh Collaborative Partners:

Joe Naughton
Paul Kalous
✓ Simon Tempest
✓ Allyson Toner
Inger Hamre-Foley

Ai3:

✓ Scott Dunlap
Jim Jordan
Troy Randall

PARE:

✓ Andrew Chagnon

1. The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair, Susan Cote at 5:37 PM.

Meeting Minutes

2. The Committee voted to approve Meeting Minutes #29, dated July 11, 2011.
 - a. Motion – Beth Hayes
 - b. Second – George McCabe
 - c. Abstentions – John Haines
 - d. Vote – Approved

Well Drilling/Irrigation Design

3. PARE reported that well drillers found sufficient water at approximately 65 feet at the front of the high school therefore will not have to go to a bed rock well. Pump tests and water quality tests were performed and have been turned over to PARE's irrigation consultant for review. No issues were found with water quality tests that were a concern.
4. The well drilling company visited the well at Church Street and found that the existing well is collapsed and will need to be replaced. The well drilling company reported that the well found is a deep bed rock well and not gravel packed and estimated that the cost to drill new well is approximately \$10,165. George McCabe asked if the Committee should seek an additional review of the existing well. Susan Cote indicated that the Recreation Department may be interested in getting involved with the School Department to construct an additional field for the Town. The Committee should discuss these issues in the future, when David Floeck is in attendance, and possibly schedule a meeting with the Recreation Department to discuss their plans as well.

Local Approvals

5. The Planning Board public hearing for project approval of the new school is scheduled for tonight at 7:00PM. The Planning Board has expressed concern with traffic and egress on the site and have asked that a turning lane be constructed on Plymouth Street. They feel that traffic will become backed up on Plymouth Street during peak hours and parents will begin dropping off students on the main street instead of pulling into the site. In order to construct a turning lane on Plymouth Street wetlands will need to be filled and replicated elsewhere, permitting will be required from the Army Corps of Engineers, and substantial changes will need to be designed and added to the construction documents as a change order, all of which will take a significant amount of time and money to complete. In order to hire the General Contractor by August 9th and keep the project on schedule, the Planning Board will need to approve the project before it can move forward. PARE discussed the presentation planned for the Planning Board hearing.
 - a. Due to the heavy traffic that already exists on Route 18 and efforts to keep a separate path for bus traffic, PARE's analysis is based on traffic patterns that will consist of 80% accessing the site off Plymouth Street and 20% off Route 18. This was the proposed traffic plan that had been developed based on previous discussion during meetings with Police, Fire, and other local officials, including a Planning Board hearing on January 24, 2011, where no issues were identified. A controlled gate has been designed to prevent thru traffic going from Route 18 to Plymouth Street. To keep the numbers conservative, all students, including those who take the bus to school, were included in the numbers used for the traffic analysis to determine the rate of flow at the primary access point off Plymouth Street. The Planning Board is concerned with traffic on Plymouth Street, especially during peak morning hours. PARE's traffic analysis shows there is minimal impact on regular traffic on Plymouth Street because the length of the exit lane on the site allows traffic to cue up on the school site. There is a 15 minute period during peak both in the AM and PM that traffic waiting to turn onto Plymouth Street may be delayed approximately 60 seconds.
 - b. The Planning Board believes that the school's traffic will have an impact Plymouth Street and is therefore requesting an additional (turning) lane on the Plymouth Street access road. PARE discussed the challenges of building a turning lane in this location. If this road is widened more than it already has been, wetlands will need to be filled on either side. To fill in wetlands, permitting will need to be filed with the Army Corp of Engineers which could take up to 2-3 months depending on what type of permit will be required. PARE has looked at alternatives, such as a traffic signal that would be used during peak hours, but after looking at the variables in this location, do not recommend a traffic signal as a solution. A traffic signal is not only an expensive option, it could cause right-of-way issues and could potentially cause traffic to cue up on Plymouth Street, which is the issue trying to be avoided. PARE also looked at the option of a shorter (turning) lane (approx. 100ft) so fewer wetlands would need to be filled/replicated therefore require a lower level of review from the Army Corp of Engineers for permits. PARE indicated that typically a turning lane would be approximately 500ft and, after reviewing with John Delano and the Planning Board, they do not feel the 100ft lane is a sufficient solution either.
 - c. The traffic plan will need to be enforced by the School Department. Susan Cote discussed other options for egress that could be made available on the site. Central School is not in session during the peak morning hours and could potentially be used to alleviate some of the AM traffic at the new school if needed. It is difficult to determine traffic patterns until the school is in operation, but if traffic becomes an issue, there are operational changes within the site that could be made. There are other locations on the site that parents could drop off students with ADA accessible walkways leading to the school. Parents also have the option of bussing their kids to school. Options such as lowering bus fees to reduce parent drop off traffic and offering discounted breakfast as an incentive for students to arrive earlier to school have been discussed as possible ways to alleviate traffic during peak hours.

- d. The Planning Board has indicated that they plan to give approval of the project as to not delay the schedule, but it is likely the approval will be contingent of including a third lane as a change order. If this is the case, PARE would submit a proposal for designing the third lane to the Building Committee for their approval. Design of the third lane will include, not just building the roadway, but changes to drainage, re-design of retaining walls, as well as a plan to replicate the wetlands that will be filled in. Usually wetland replication requires a 2:1 ration and can often be difficult to take. Permitting will be required before wetlands can be filled in and a submission to the Army Corps of Engineers with the design and wetlands plan will now be required. The design would also need to be submitted to the Planning Board and the Conservation Commission for approval. The change order, which could cost approximately \$700K - \$1.1 Million, will also need to be negotiated with the contractor for making these significant modifications.
 - e. RFWCP indicated that the Planning Board has said that if the Army Corps of Engineers will not grant permitting for the turning lane, the Planning Board will request a "right-turn only" out of the school during peak hours. Even if permits are granted from the Army Corps of Engineers, there is still a cost limitation and the question will be if the project can even afford it. At the hearing this evening, the Building Committee will have to delineate the cost and time involved in the turning lane and ask for approval from the Planning Board acknowledging that design, permitting, and cost will be explored to see if the turning lane is a feasible option.
6. The Conservation Commission hearing for project approval is tomorrow, July 26, 2011 at 7:00PM at the Town Hall. Since the Planning Board is requiring the turning lane, discussion is likely to continue with ConComm as well. The Committee should ask that ConComm approve the current site design in order to begin construction and acknowledge that any change to the plan will require resubmission to the board for approval.

Bidding

7. RFWCP reported that the Filed Sub Bid opening took place on Thursday, July 21, 2011 and distributed the bid tabulation. The Committee reviewed and discussed the filed sub bid tabulation. The total apparent low bidders of all sub trades equals approximately \$2 Million less than what has been budgeted for the project, however it is difficult to determine if the project bids are under budget, or by how much, until all general bids have been received and the awarded general contractor has chosen the subcontractors for the project. The General Bid opening is August 2, 2011 at 2PM. The Waterproofing Company has withdrawn from bidding on the project. There may be a bid protest from electrical contractor, LeVangie, against the apparent low bidder, Griffin. The Building Committee took a proprietary vote on the technology piece and the bidders were asked to price items and vendors that will install the technology. The apparent low bidder, Griffin, did not list a certified installer for the particular technology equipment and the apparent second low bidder, LeVangie, is claiming that Griffin did not list a certified installer for the proprietary items referenced in the specifications and that the substitution used is not an equal of the proprietary item. LeVangie is claiming that if Griffin had used a certified installer, they would not have had the lower bid. If a protest is filed, it will go to the Attorney General's office and Project Counsel, Garrity, will represent the Town of East Bridgewater.
8. The Committee voted to accept the bid results from the filed sub bid opening on July 21, 2011 and to allow the results to be released to the General Contractors and plan holders.
 - a. Motion – Paul Vieira
 - b. Second – Susan Cote
 - c. Vote - Unanimous

Project Budget

9. RFWCP reported that all invoices included in the monthly invoice package for June 2011 have been reviewed by George Samia and Phyllis Tirrell. The PFA budget has been entered into ProPay and invoices will be submitted for reimbursement by the MSBA by this Friday, July 29, 2011 by Patricia Lugo.

10. Committee voted to approve RFWCP Invoice #101017-10 amount \$57,097.09 for Project Management services during the month of June 2011.
 - a. Motion – George McCabe
 - b. Second – Paul Vieira
 - c. Vote – Unanimous

11. The Committee voted to approve Ai3 Invoice #0009B-1003 in the amount of \$460,443.50 for Basic Services during the month of June 2011.
 - a. Motion – Susan Cote
 - b. Second - Paul Vieira
 - c. Vote - Unanimous

12. The Committee voted to approve Ai3 Invoice #0010E-1003 in the amount of \$79,092.71 for Extra Services during the month of June 2011.
 - a. Motion – Beth Hayes
 - b. Second – Paul Vieira
 - c. Vote – Unanimous

13. The Committee voted to approve Garrity & Knisley Invoice #2727 in the amount of \$8,450 for Legal Services during the months of March, April, May, and June 2011.
 - a. Motion – George McCabe
 - b. Second – Theresa McNulty
 - c. Vote – Unanimous

14. The Committee voted to approve DM Berg Consultants Invoice #30394 in the amount of \$5,800 for the Structural Peer Review.
 - a. Motion – Theresa McNulty
 - b. Second – Beth Hayes
 - c. Vote – Unanimous

Project Update

15. The Geotechnical Peer Review, requested by the MSBA, is complete and was submitted to the MSBA. The MSBA agreed with PARE's assessment and have advised that the Committee to follow PARE's recommendations.

16. Structural Peer Review is complete and minor concerns have been address and have already been incorporated in the construction documents by addendum.

17. The next Building Committee meeting will be held on August 8th, 2011 for the Committee to approve the lowest eligible General Contractor. The Construction Contract will be awarded the following day, August 9th. George Samia will be on vacation the week of August 8th but letter of intent can be signed by the Committee and George Samia can sign the contract when he returns.

Other Business

18. The meeting was adjourned at 6:47 PM.

- a. Motion – Paul Vieira
- b. Second – George McCabe
- c. Vote – Unanimous

Future Meetings/Events:

Date	Time	Group	Location
25 Jul 11	7:00 PM	Planning Board Hearing	Town Hall
26 Jul 11	7:00 PM	Conservation Commission Hearing	Town Hall
4 Aug 11	2:00 PM	<i>General Contractor Bid Opening</i>	<i>EBHS Auditorium</i>
8 Aug 11	7:00 PM	EBHS Building Committee	Town Hall
15 Aug 11	10:00 AM	Finance Meeting	Superintendent's Office
15 Aug 11	7:00 PM	EBHS Building Committee	EBHS Library

These notes will become part of the project record as written, unless corrections or additions are received in writing within 6 days of distribution.