

Committee Members
Timothy Harris, Chair
John Foresto, Vice-Chair
Michael Callahan, Member
Michael J Schrader, Member
Ted Kenney, Member



Medway DPW Offices
Medway Middle School Door #9
45B Holliston Street
Medway, MA 02053
Telephone (508) 533-3275
Fax (508) 321-4985

TOWN OF MEDWAY COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

WATER FACILITY BUILDING COMMITTEE

APPROVED 4/22/21

April 8, 2021

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, no in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted at this meeting. Committee members will be participating remotely. For public hearings, access via Zoom is provided for the required opportunity for public participation. Information for participating via Zoom is posted at the end of this Agenda.

In attendance via Zoom:

Tim Harris, Medway Resident & Chair
John Foresto, Selectmen & Vice-Chair
Ted Kenney, Medway Resident & Member
Michael Callahan, Medway Resident & Member
Michael Schrader, Medway Residents & Member
David D'Amico, DPW Director
Helen Gordon, Environmental Partners
Paul Millett, Environmental Partners
Jill Karakeian, DPW Program Administrator and Recording Secretary

Chair Harris called the meeting to order @ 7:00pm roll call and asked all attending members to state their name and position.

Approval of past Meeting Minutes

Meeting Minutes from 3/4/21 and 3/13/21 were tabled for further review.

Project Update

Helen Gordon explains that the contract has been signed with Wright-Pierce. They have started the work and Helen shared a summary of March prior to tonight's meeting. We are on schedule, they started the preliminary design and we had our first technical meeting, which was with Dave D'Amico, Pete Pelletier, Barry Smith, Helen Gordon and Chris Grillo from Environmental Partners and Rob & Jim from Wright-Pierce. We had a good initial discussion, trying to get to the specifics to make sure that we understand what the minimum pump and grade will be and to make sure they are the right size. We had a good conversation about communication plan between the Town, OPM and the designer. We talked about having them on the monthly meetings moving forward with the Building Committee to be able to weigh in on the project. They are prepared to do that. They are finalizing a schedule. We have a tight schedule and we all agreed to do the best we can to turn around reviews. Environmental Partner's will

coordinate that with the Designer and the Town to make sure there is enough time for review. We had a discussion about the building layout and they are going to come up with three (3) potential layouts using some of the input from Dave D'Amico, Pete Pelletier, Barry Smith and Environmental Partners. They will then present it to the Building Committee and make a decision so they can move forward with a preliminary design. That is a very early on decision that needs to be made.

Chair Harris asked how close Wright-Pierce was to be able to get the preliminary designs to the Committee to look at.

Helen Gordon feels they should have something to present in two weeks.

Director D'Amico explains that we are hoping within the next month to get the building layout picked, so they can proceed with borings. We've also been going back and forth with regards to PFAS. The bigger overwhelming question is, do we design now for a building that's big enough to house that or do we shrink the building and look to be adding that later.

Helen Gordon explains they are pushing to start the borings at the end of this month so a meeting in 2 weeks would work. Another item from the meeting, Wright-Pierce was going to look at 2 options, full GAC and then an option for GAC and finishing with the Iron Exchange and at least have the size and cost of the facility associated with that so that can be presented to the Board and the Town so we can decide where we want to go. The thinking is that full GAC is the worst case scenario in terms of the size and footprint, if you go with the dual you don't have to have as large as a foot print.

Director D'Amico feels that it will be either full GAC, the bigger one or nothing.

Member Schrader questioned if the structure type has been decided. He suggests building the extra room as much as you can and if you don't need it for GAC, it can be used for additional storage. I wouldn't spend any more that is needed on the building, if you need a front face that looks nice, that's fine, but then just do a utilitarian building for the rest of it and spend the money on square feet.

Director D'Amico agrees but until we see numbers we can't make any decisions. We will probably go in that direction. We did have conversation about the actual process building, that won't be a metal building, that will be a block structure because of it being too damp. The garage and admin buildings will be prefab or otherwise.

Helen Gordon explains they are still working towards getting the submission for the SRF funding deadline of October 15th. We are getting into the Design right now and Wright-Pierce is moving forward.

Chair Harris asked if Wright-Pierce has any challenges currently?

Helen Gordon states that the only concerns right now from Wright-Pierce is the turnaround for reviews. They do have a wish list of a week but it is going to be a two-week minimum.

Chair Harris suggests to plan for that and build it into the detailed schedule from Wright-Pierce.

Helen Gordon asked Wright-Pierce to look at the schedule so we know when they will be submitting. Within in the next few weeks that will all be pinned down.

Chair Harris asked if we schedule a meeting in two weeks to look at the preliminary plans, would Wright-Pierce be able to get us a schedule to look at, even if it's a draft.

Helen Gordon believes we will definitely have a schedule, but the layouts may be a little raw.

Director D'Amico feels we will be reviewing foot prints not anything more than that.

Helen Gordon shares the current schedule on the screen. We are on target with the 30% design. The goal is to maintain that moving forward.

Chair Harris questioned the state and how far behind they are. Are they somewhat back on track or are we going to be in trouble with delayed reviews.

Paul Millett explains they are backed up but they are getting better. We spoke to Wright-Pierce and we are going to try and have some pre-formal submission sneak previews so they aren't surprised.

Paul Millett also states that the bid opening for the Medfield Water Treatment plant will be in the next month, so the reality will be available within a month of the bidding climate. The market is very difficult to predict, so we will have a real number soon. It is a simple structure so that will give us a good data point to go off of. It is only a treatment plant, no garage or admin.

Contract Administration

Helen Gordon explains the Scope of Work responsibilities of Wright-Pierce and Environmental Partners to try and define if there are any gaps. The best way, if you would consider, go through the general tasks and identify who is responsible for what. Then if you want to ask who has what in their contract, that can be explained. Helen Gordon shares her screen and provided a breakdown of Task, Subtask and who is responsible for what (attached to minutes).

Chair Harris expresses that this schedule is going to be big part of our next discussion with Wright-Pierce. From a community standpoint we are going to be looking for preliminary numbers.

Helen Gordon explains that we will have a complete cost estimate based on the preliminary design.

Chair Harris feels that we should start defining potential value engineering strategies as early as that to identify them.

Helen Gordon explains that once we are at the 90% design, is when we start doing the general prequalification and the file sub-bids. It will have gone to the state and received comments. Wright-Pierce will be responsible in putting the packages together and well as the reference checks and both Wright-Pierce and Environmental Partners will both be part of the evaluation of the pre-qualification of the contractors. That happens along with the submission to Mass DEP. In terms of the bidding assistance, Wright-Pierce will prepare all the documents, Environmental Partners will oversee the process. Wright-Pierce will prepare the addenda and Environmental Partners will review everything as it comes through. Both parties attend any pre-bid meetings. Environmental Partners will be responsible for reviewing the bid packages and make recommendations. On Construction Services, Environmental Partners as the overarching management and we will submit all the SRF reimbursements, we provide the

Clerk of the Works and we are leading on things like, change logs, review claims, etc. Shop drawing review, submittals, RFI's go directly to Wright-Pierce, they are the designer and they are the interpreter of the intent of the design and identifying when substantial completion is done. As a team, we prepare a punch list together.

Chair Harris asked with regards to the weekly meetings, coordination sessions, that's all within Wright-Pierce's current scope?

Helen Gordon explains they do have monthly meetings on the construction end of things and she will add it to the list. With regards to the start-up portion, both Wright-Pierce and Environmental Partner's work together with that.

Member Schrader questions the Clerk of the Works responsibilities and if that includes construction observation.

Helen Gordon explains that the Clerk of the Works is the Resident Project Rep., they are out there observing, walking around. They have conversations with Wright-Pierce and Environmental Partners of things that they see coming down the pike that may be a challenge.

Member Schrader expresses his concern and asked if there was going to be a different firm other than the designer being the Clerk of the Works.

Paul Millett explains that the way the RFQ was written by the Town, the Clerk of the Works and RPR work was part of the OPM scope and that's the way it's been.

Helen Gordon explains that Environmental Partner's is very driven to make sure that it's done right. We are the extension of the Town out in the field. Our role is your interest. We work very closely with the Designer on the project and we've had success this way.

Chair Harris asked about the requisition process.

Helen Gordon explains that a pencil requisition comes in, the RPR looks at it and is typically is keeping daily notes. Every week they meet with the Superintendent and generally agree on and try and get it straightened out prior to the monthly pay requisition. It gets reviewed by Wright-Pierce and Environmental Partners, gets signed by both prior to going to the Town.

Chair Harris asked about the miscellaneous third party services.

Helen Gordon explains that the miscellaneous third party services will be covered in the plans and specifications, who is responsible for paying for testing. As long as it's clearly stated in the plans and specifications that the Contractor is responsible for getting a third party and paying for it, then that's what we will make sure will happen.

Chair Harris suggests that within the specifications make sure that Environmental Partners has approval rights to whatever proposed testing agency the contractor proposes as well.

Director D'Amico states contract wise, Wright-Pierce said that they use the engineers joint contract, the Town has not used those before and I don't believe KP Law generally uses those. We usually use the AIA form. Wright-Pierce is going to get us something to look at so we can get that to KP Law so they can review that sooner than later.

The next meeting is scheduled for April 22, 2021 @ 7:00pm.

Member Kenney makes a motion to adjourn at 7:50pm Vice-Chair Foresto seconds. The motion carries unanimously. A roll call vote was taken due to the nature of the remote Zoom meeting.