Community Preservation Committee

Friday, September 16, 2011, 6:00 pm at the WPA Building, Scituate, Massachusetts

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman John Bulman, Mrs. Lisa Fenton, Mr. Harvey Gates, Mr. Paul

Scott, Mr. Frank Snow, Mr. Bill Limbacher

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Penny Scott Pipes

I. CALL TO ORDER at 6:09 pm

II. ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

MOTION by Mrs. Fenton, SECOND by Mr. Scott, and UNANIMOUSLY VOTED 5-0 to accept the agenda as submitted.

III. New Business

1. Gannett Road Path Supplemental Funding: Mr. Scott spoke about the project being put out to bid at \$343,500.00. What they are looking for funding is a total of \$430,000.00. Mr. Scott discussed the breakdown with the board. The DPW is concerned that with all of the CPC projects coming up, there isn't enough staff to work on all of them. Mr. Scott looked over the charges presented and stated they seem reasonable to him. Mrs. Fenton stated that the \$300,000.00 was voted in the initial appropriation at the prior ATM, on so that the balance would of \$130,000 is the amount being requested by DPW. The special town meeting article would be presented to supplement the original appropriation of \$300,000. Mr. Snow stated that the project was supposed to be looking to other funds for nay costs in excess of \$300,000 previously voted. They were originally looking at other options so that there would be supplemental funding in addition to CPC funding. Mr. Limbacher mentioned that Mrs. Lydon came back a few times to CPC for additional monies. Mr. Snow stated the breakdown of the requested approval from DPW for Mr. Bulman. The breakdown of the request was: (i) \$343,500.00 low bid from Russell Jones on construction; (ii) \$24,500.00 for Horsely Whitten (H&W) to provide oversight, etc. (not design and permitting per Al Bangert despite emails form Kevin Cafferty – all design and permitting was supposed to be complete before even Phase 2 was constructed); (iii) \$35,000 for 10% contingency; (iv) \$25,000 construction oversight (in addition to H&W above); and (v) \$2,000 for advertising and miscellaneous. The DPW is telling us because they are so busy, they cannot oversee the project and someone needs to fund the oversight of the project. DPW had a problem this summer with staffing. Mrs. Fenton spoke after reading an email from Al Bangert. Mr. Bulman joined the meeting and said he had spoken with Al Bangert. He stated that, per Mr. Bangert, that the \$24,599 indicated as design and permitting by Mr. Cafferty was actually for construction oversight and other

construction support services per Mr. Bangert and that Mr. Cafferty had used the wrong words. . Mr. Bulman stated he is an advocate of the project getting finished, however he does not support the additional funding amount requested by the DPW. He is ok with adding the \$24,500.00 for H&W construction oversight, inspection and field layout etc., but contingency on the sidewalk isn't something that he believes is required or that CPC should fund. Mr. Bulman stated that he believes a short term paving contract which is totally designed and permitted should have no real escalation or other such construction issues if the contract is written properly (ie. They can go around trees and pave over ledge etc. and H&W had reviewed all obstructions during site visits at design Phase 1). Mr. Bulman stated that the design should be sufficient and there shouldn't be a problem going forward with the PATH. Mr. Scott said that there is a good breakdown of the \$24,500.00 for H&W. He is concerned that there is no residential engineering service in the project. Mr. Bulman stated that the \$24,500 does include layout and weekly inspection services per Mr. Bangert. The low bidder should enter into a contract for the bid price based upon that complete design, then the inspection is done once a week, and if there is an issue, the Contractor should be held responsible for the problem and to make it comply. Mr. Snow stated that CPC money looks like "free money" to the Town so anything that we do needs to be overseen properly and the approvals need to be followed and contactors held accountable. He does not believe the contingency amount requested of \$35,000 is justified, or the additional oversight of \$25,000. Mr. Limbacher said that there was a significant amount of time spent by DPW on site with H&W, inspecting the sidewalk during the design and permitting in Phase 1 and there should be no surprises justifying this contingency. Mr. Snow questioned whether or not we should support any additional money to have on-site supervision on the project. Mr. Bulman mentioned the problem of Hatherly Field construction, and during the ensuing discussion it was pointed out that this project we did not fail due to lack of supervision, but rather it was managed by the DPW. Mr. Bulman said that this time we have complete design plans and specifications that should be followed as a part of the contactors bid. There isn't a need for more supervision, and the weekly inspection should hold the contractor accountable to perform or correct any deficiency without additional cost. . Mr. Snow asked to make a MOTION to appropriate an additional \$80,000.00 to this project for the following: (1) \$43,500 additional construction costs; (ii) \$24,500 for H&W oversight and inspection services; and (iii) \$12,000 for construction contingency, advertising and miscellaneous.. If approved by CPC, this will need to be voted on at Special Town Meeting, October 25, 2011. The Motion was SECONDED by Mrs. Lisa Fenton. In the discussion that followed, Mr. Scott stated that he supported the project and would support the motion, but that he would like the record to show that he tried to add the \$25,000.00 requested by DPW for additional supervision.. After discussion it was VOTED 5-1 to approve the additional \$80,000 in funding for the items set forth above, with Mr. Limbacher dissenting.

At 6:37 pm there was a MOTION by Mr. Scott to adjourn, SECONDED my Mr. Bulma	ın.
There being no further discussion, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED 6-0 to adjourn.	

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa J. Potts