

**TOWN OF SCITUATE, MASSACHUSETTS
PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION**



**MEETING MINUTES
Public Building Commission
Tuesday, November 10, 2020
Selectmen's Hearing Room
Town Hall
7:00 pm**

Meeting conducted pursuant to the March 12, 2020 modifications to the Open Meeting Law made by Governor Baker pursuant to the state of emergency due to COVID-19. This meeting was live broadcast by SCTV.

Commission Members Present: Stephen Shea; Chairperson, John Miller; User Member

Also, in Attendance: Nancy Holt; Finance Director, Briana; SCTV

Remote Participants: Larry Guilmette, Alicia Anthony; Recording Secretary, Steve Kirby; Vertex (OPM), Linda Hayes; User Member, Carl Campagna, Rachel Young; BH + A, Kevin Kelly; Facilities Director, Deputy Fire Chief Al Elliott, Stephanie Holland (called in late)

Commission Members Absent: N/A

Mr. Shea called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Mr. Shea asked all members to identify themselves participating remotely.

Mr. Shea asked the committee to review the October 27, 2020 minutes. He made a motion to accept the minutes as written, which was seconded by John Miller, and voted majority in favor (6-0, Stephanie Holland not present as of yet) to accept the minutes as written by roll call vote.

- **Discuss the Senior Center Project:**
 - **Project update-Vertex**

Steven Kirby spoke on the progress of The Senior Center Project over the couple of weeks. He stated that the Contractor installed railings on stair 2 (an interior stair), with the exception of the wall rail. The contractor has also continued to work on the siding

and installation. They are still waiting on the delivery of thin brick so that the mason can get started. Mr. Kirby said that the second floor is being painted right now and the first floor is being taped. He said that the elevator installation is still ongoing as is the MEPFP's. He state that gas service is in to the building. The Site Contractors have continued with side walk pours around the building. The main entry traffic control curbing has been installed. The old Gates entry has been closed off and granite curbing has been installed. Mr. Shea stated that the granite looks good. Mr. Kirby then stated that the granite was also installed at The Cudworth/First Parish intersection. He said that the generator has been set in place. Mr. Kirby said that they had a very successful and organized meeting with the contractor that went very well. Fencing installation is due to begin next week. The final top coat of paving will begin this Saturday or next. Saturday work has been Ok'd with 8 a.m. starts. The elevator installation is also ongoing at The Recreation Center as well as the plumbing and electrical work. He stated that the main entry canopy steel has been installed and still waiting on the thin brick delivery over there as well. Mr. Kirby reported that there is a leak in the gym that they are trying to chase with roofing contractor who has not been on site yet. He also said that this Thursday he is going to The Planning Board's 6:30 p.m. meeting to review all of the site related changes that have occurred. The change to the apron on The Carriage House as requested by The Historical Commission and the "Right Turn Only" change being one of them.

***Stephanie Holland joined the call.**

Mr. Kirby brought up that the water infiltration issue that's been going on has been greatly reduced. The spray test on the window has yet to be scheduled but had the contractor install sealant under the base lashing as recommended by BEA (Building Envelope Associates).

Mr. Shea asked Mr. Kirby if they still planned to have the spray testing done. Mr. Kirby replied that the contract requires this. Mr. Shea asked what the changes were that Mr. Kirby had brought up to "The Right Turn Only" as he had received emails from some of The Center's neighbors. Mr. Kirby responded that there was more change on the South most island on the radius of the bottom of it because when the consultant did the auto turn analysis, it was realized that the original configuration would not allow a delivery truck to come in without running over it so they softened the radius a bit. Mr. Shea then asked Mr. Kirby how the loam and hydro seed is coming to which Mr. Kirby replied that there won't be any more work on this at this time being out of season. The landscapers will come back in the spring to finish this. Mr. Shea mentioned some notes he saw that said the bushes were too close to the fencing and asked if there was ample room there for the workers to get in. Mr. Kirby said that the landscape architect was there to approve plants and placement. Mr. Shea asked about a blocked storm drain out on the main road and if the storm drain issue was due to the construction. Mr. Kirby stated that he hadn't seen this notice but is following The Planning Board requirements and has been using silt sacks in catch basin socks since the beginning of the project. Mr. Kirby was going to follow up with contractors. Mr. Shea brought up the pathways and walkways during street work, asked if this space is considered a sidewalk. Mr. Kirby stated that the side walk goes up to The Old Gates School entry and that is where it had always stopped. People would use the school property to walk on once the sidewalk had ended. He said what they're maintaining as a pathway is beyond that, the

grass path between the construction fence and the carriage house. Mr. Kirby then said however they are currently doing the construction that is required for the contract on the street at the two main entrances. They had closed the sidewalk for safety temporarily. Mr. Shea stated that he understood as its all part of construction. He then asked if the pedestrian walkway on the property was still able to be used. Mr. Kirby said that it is and the only effected part was the section dug up by the entry.

*Mr. Kirby shared photo documentation

Mr. Kirby then reported that one of the subcontractors tested positive for Covid-19 but had not been on site for two and a half weeks. Out of caution the drywall subcontractor removed their crew from the site had everyone tested. All tests came back negative and the crew has returned to the site as of today. Mr. Shea asked about delays on the project due to Covid such as the doors. Mr. Kirby said that there still isn't an update on the status of the doors, so it is still mid-December. He said he is currently pursuing the information on this.

• **Discuss/Vote all Change Orders/ Requisitions Old Business**

Mr. Kirby stated that he had Change Order #9 for approval, which totaled \$19,383.07 and is made up of six PCO's and has been signed by both the architect and the contractor.

- PCO #68 is for power to The Recreation Center sump pump that had to be added to the elevator because of the change in the code by the state. The first portion of this was approved for the plumbers work to get the oil/water separator to the piping so they could have the separator ordered. The cost on the electrical power for this pump is \$2,638.40.
- PCO #72 is for the exterior silicone at the base flashing which was recommended by BEA in an effort to make sure there is no water infiltration at the base of the brick and that was done on T&M. The total was \$1,418.81.
- PCO #73 was to add an icemaker to the kitchen as there wasn't one in the original bid documents and this was an owner request. The contractor is supplying the icemaker and it needs electric, plumbing and some ventilation and air conditioning system, and needs to be put up on a platform to facilitate the drainage. The total is \$6,708.71
- PCO #74 was to relocate the meter sockets from the electrical room to the transformer pad location as requested by National Grid. The electrical engineer had them located in the electrical room and there was much discussion on this issue between the engineer (WBA) and a representative from National Grid ending in the relocation of the sockets. The cost is \$1,597.42.
- PCO #75 is for the mechanical equipment panel designation. Essentially some of the mechanical units up on the roof that used the ERB and the makeup air unit were designated to go to a panel that did appear on the original drawings, as there was an error on where it was to go. The electrician didn't own any of the electrical portion so Griffin and WBA worked out where this and another panel would go, essentially buying circuit breakers for these items. These are high amp circuit breakers, bringing the cost to \$6,295.02.

- PCO #78 is to relocate an existing sprinkler head in The Recreation Center that ended up laying out within the new elevator machine room, which by code can have no water in that room. This has it essentially cutting this existing sprinkler head back and repositioning it within the lobby. The cost for this was \$724.71.

Mr. Shea asked Mr. Kirby if he would mark down the electrical equipment panel designation as a missing architecture or mis-design, to which Mr. Kirby agreed that he would. Mr. Shea then asked Mr. Kirby where this leaves things with the contingency budget area. Mr. Kirby stated that he carries a lot of placeholders the things that haven't been resolved yet as well as potential future items. He said they are at the point where he really needs to look at what's left as there is about 11% of the contingency left. He is hoping there will be some other line items in the budget that may be able to be used due to getting some good pricing on some things. He said that as of right now there is about \$56,000 left and that's if everything listed is approved and implemented. Mr. Kirby said as he keeps an eye on things, if something is not of essential, it will probably not be approved. Mr. Shea asked if Mr. Kirby was still carrying the cash for the parking lot, to which Mr. Kirby said he was but it's an estimate.

Mr. Shea made a motion to approve Change Order #10 from Delphi Construction including six PCO's; 68, 72, 73, 74, 75 and 78, in the amount of \$19,383.07, which was seconded by Carl Campagna and voted majority in favor (6-0) by roll call vote; UNANIMOUS.

Mr. Kirby then said that there isn't a requisition from Delphi as he had thought he would have. He said that they had been going back and forth with revisions to the requisition #10 and there was some additional comments where it was thought to be their final yesterday but they have not responded as of yet so this will have to be deferred to the next PBC Meeting.

Mr. Kirby stated that the next item he has for approval is a monthly invoice (#24795) from BH+A in the amount of \$18,643.60. This invoice is for construction administration, bring it to 82% of the contract and FFE to 92%.

Mr. Shea stated that he had looked at this invoice earlier and it looks like a standard bill, looking pretty consistent with what has been seen in previous months.

Mr. Shea made a motion to approve BH+A invoice #24795 for services performed through October 31st, in the amount of \$18,643.60, bringing the contract administration to 82% and FFE work to 92%, which was seconded by Larry Guilmette and voted majority in favor (6-0) by roll call vote; UNANIMOUS.

Mr. Kirby brought up Vertex Invoice #136526. For the period of September 27th to October 31st, totaling \$36,559.88. He said that there are a couple of minor HVAC commissioning invoices that are included on this as well. Mr. Shea stated that this invoice also looks consistent with what has been being seen.

Mr. Shea made a motion to accept Vertex Invoice #136526 for October services in the amount of \$36,559.88, which was seconded by Carl Campagna and voted majority in favor (6-0) by roll call vote; UNANIMOUS.

- **Exterior signage review – BH+A**

Mr. Shea invited Rachel Young to speak. Ms. Young started off by stating that she had sent over some photos of signage and elevation earlier today, as at the last PBC meeting the possibility of putting signage on the west forage was discussed, as it made most sense and in addition would be visible as approaching from First Parish.

She then stated that the second piece of signage being proposed was some kind of signature design to know the difference of the main door. Rachel and Linda Hayes had a chance to review that second piece together, and Ms. Hayes proposed that instead of doing the Scituate seal, that it would be preferred to use the new logo that The Senior Center had just had designed. Ms. Young included that revision as well in the email sent to the board this morning. In addition to that, Ms. Young stated that she also sent two photos that show the building as being approached from both the east and the west, as at the last meeting it was discussed what visitors to The Senior Center see if coming to The Harbor, and whether any signs could be visible as well as if there could possibly be confusion on where to turn into the property. Ms. Young said that what the photos show is that while the building is tall, there is actually quite a bit of the building disappeared by either landscaping, the perimeter fence that will be put in, or the existing stone wall. With that said, she said that it leaves a few areas of candidates for the signage, one being the one just noted in the center. A second location possibility would be on The Bay that is approaching the building from the west, and the third location possibility would be as it is approached from the east, the harbor area, there is a little left area that could be a prime area for signage. Ms. Young then stated that she'd like to note that any additional signage that is added to the north elevation would be an additional cost of the project. This may give it new consideration. Ms. Young said that Ms. Hayes had mentioned in the last meeting that including street signage to the effect of "Scituate Senior Center 100 feet on the left". Ms. Young agrees this is something that's worth pursuing, as the benefit of this type of signage is 1. The visibility because having it on the street will help, but 2. It will also help identify the entrance to the building as the building doesn't seem like an issue to find, but the difficulty would be in finding the entrance.

Ms. Linda Hayes stated that although she was not present at the last meeting, she thinks the lettering had been proposed in the same way that the picture is showing rising east, after the abutters that are facing the entrance/driveway side, and potentially the sign in the proposed middle single building. She then said that she was also noticing, driving from the harbor side, that there is some land where the plantings are in front of the abutters. Ms. Hayes referred to this as similar to what the library has on their grounds. She then said that it's hard to say now where we might be able to put something later that would help but feels it is a priority at this point as it's something that is wanted on the building. Mr. Shea then said that he thinks a sign like that or a sign of the whole letter would open up a whole new can of worms with approvals. Ms. Hayes said she had always felt she needed to wait to mention the possible need for additional signage or something more eclectic for The Senior Center, but for now finding the best location on the building will do it justice. It was then mentioned not to forget that this is a scenic road, so getting signage approved is not a guarantee. It was also mentioned that part of the discussion during design was putting a monument on the property but it was

determined that it wouldn't be able to be seen from the street because of the stonewall. It was agreed it's best to stay away from this option. Mr. Kirby mentioned that in the sign by laws, it states that you can put directional signage up, but it would still have to go through The Planning Board as well as DPW with the possibility of other departments. Ms. Hayes mentioned that Kevin has done this for a couple of other building and that there's a sea Scituate, which is a little bit of an Economic Development Commission campaign, but it's also identifying some of the public buildings consistently. Mr. Shea responded to Ms. Hayes saying that where we're at in the project, at this point getting the already approved sign on the building is what needs to be done. He stated that field conditions speak volumes, and Ms. Young made good effort to put the sign where the board thought it would look appropriate, but unfortunately now that the building is built it appears the signage isn't going to work in this location. Mr. Shea said that the two spots that Ms. Young has located are probably the spots. All agreed that putting the sign in the middle of the building wouldn't be visible with the leaves full of trees and the eight foot fence that is being installed soon. Mr. Miller asked if the areas being considered were being decided on one or if both areas would be used. Mr. Shea responded that this would include both areas, with one being a cost add, as the board decided something was needed to identify the building come from both the east and the west. Mr. Shea then asked Ms. Young if the main sign was on a board or singular letters. Ms. Young responded that the main sign would be made up off individual letters. The same lettering will be on the side. Mr. Shea stated that he thinks this all looks good and makes sense. Mr. Miller asked about the numbering, to which Mr. Shea informed him that Deputy Fire Chief, Al Elliot had already signed off on those decisions. Ms. Hayes asked what was wrong with putting the signage on just the door side. Mr. Shea stated that if someone is driving west they wouldn't be able to tell where the building is. Ms. Hayes then said that she feels it's a reasonable solution to have a sign at the driveway. Mr. Shea responded that to make that happen there are abutters, historical issues, and the right hand turn only, to deal with. Ms. Hayes asked if this would really be disputed as it would be on the property to which Mr. Shea said he thinks it would. Ms. Young stated that she doesn't feel this is needed as if someone is looking for The Senior Center or 333, they'd see this building and know it's there. Ms. Hayes asked if anyone has seen the new library sign that is in front on Branch Street. Mr. Campagna replied that there is a lot more frontage there. He then asked if a standalone sign at the driveway entrance would be acceptable as this building will be used mostly by Scituate residents. Mr. Shea stated that this driveway has everything going against it to put a monument sign up on the road. Mr. Guilmette stated that the signage has come after the siting of the building, the elevation, its proximity to the abutter, the eight foot fence and all of the landscaping. It's unfortunate that there is a need for some sort of signage but putting something at the top of the building, someone heading eastbound is extremely likely to not see it. Signage and marking where it is, is a real problem with this building. Mr. Shea then asked him if he had any suggestions. Mr. Guilmette then responded that he doesn't think if he were looking for a building that he'd think to look up and behind an eight foot fence for a sign. Mr. Shea stated that that was a good point, and that it does look like an odd place for a sign. Ms. Hayes stated that her opinion is that something on the building is needed because aesthetically it looks nice and it is a way to identify the

building like many others in town. She then said that a directional sign could work at some other areas that are going to bring people there. Ms. Hayes stated that she feels the building deserves some type of identification that is visible to the public. Mr. Guilmette responded that he agrees with all of Ms. Hayes had said but thinks that at looking at the western elevation, taking it all the way to the top might not flatter the building at all, when once entered on to the site and coming up to enter this really nicely designed building. Mr. Shea stated that everybody had signed off on the sign on the front of the building, and asked if shifting the singular sign to that peak and leave it with that one sign on there could work. Mr. Guilmette replied that he doesn't know how effective it would be as an informational graphic. Mr. Shea agreed and said that this is more about naming the building. Mr. Shea mentioned that with the sign being on the peak of the brick building coming from the Town Hall area, on the First Parish side, both gets the point across and is what was originally started with. Ms. Young agreed with this and stated that anyone who is using The Senior Center or wants to find it, lives in town and knows where it is. If not, most would have it punched in to their GPS, saying that she doesn't think the other side would make sense. Mr. Miller stated that he thinks the benefit this way is that it faces First Parish, to which Mr. Shea agreed saying that this is the road it's on. Mr. Shea said if someone was looking for it and drove down the road a little more, they'd know to turn around.

Kevin then stated that on the peak facing First Parish Road, single, individual, attached letters on brushed aluminum, it may look very nice on the brick. He said although it wouldn't all fit in one row, it would probably be much more visible as well as more attractive. Ms. Young said that not using brushed aluminum is also an option and there are the striking glass windows, and using a black pine would stand up nicely on the clapboard. Stephanie asked if that would be going against what the other buildings had and Mr. Shea stated that he doesn't think there is any signage standards. Stephanie responded that on both the library and The Gates School lettering on brick was used. Ms. Young asked if it was brushed aluminum, and Stephanie responded that it's not brushed aluminum but the same color as. Ms. Young gave another idea of instead of having the lettering in the pediment, it could be moved down to above the windows but in the bricks. She then stated that her concern is that in addition to just identifying the building, is providing direction to the entrance. She said that she thinks in both directions, the entrance isn't clear until you've passed it. Larry said that he agrees with what Ms. Young is saying as well as Ms. Hayes's earlier assessment. He said that some type of wayfinding is going to be needed at the entrance to the building. Also, saying that he knows that there isn't a lot of landscaping there as well as abutter concerns, but there is wayfinding at other town buildings and all of the new buildings have the "Sea Scituate" logos and they look nice. These also have the capability to have information about the building on them such as where the business parking is and field out back, stating that after looking at Mr. Kirby's pictures, there appears to be enough room on the grass space near the opening heading towards Ronnie Shones. He then said that he doesn't think this is something that is going to be decided on now but does think something is going to be needed to identify the entry. Saying next that like Mr. Shea said that a decision has to be made tonight as this has to go to The Planning board on Thursday. He then stated that as a committee they all agreed on the original design and there wasn't any talk about a monument sign at that time. He said doing it at this time

is probably cost prohibitive. Members of the board agreed that tonight they need to decide on identification for the building and deal with other things another day.

Mr. Shea made a motion to approve the site signage naming to be placed on The First Parish side of the building, on the white pediment, in the font and design that was put forth by the architects of BH+A, which was Seconded by Stephanie Holland, and voted all in favor (6-0) by roll call vote; UNANIMOUS.

- **Furniture bid review and vote – BH+A**

Ms. Young reported that ORI was lowest bidder although all of the bids were pretty close and didn't change much from the first bid that went out. ORI returned a signed contract today. Mr. Shea asked what the final cost was. Ms. Young gave a total of \$173,949.45 after setting a budget of \$180,000. Ms. Young also reported that there were no substitutions. ORI did give suggestions on how to reduce the price, but it was elected not to go with those. Feb 1st is now the target installation date. ORI's Project Manager agreed to this date and told Ms. Young that his one concern was that West Elm has been seeing some delays and there are a number of products from their commercial line to be delivered to The Senior Center, but even those should still be on time. Ms. Young feels that the town's relationship with ORI should be good. Mr. Shea asked if the bid included the delivery and installation. Ms. Young replied all the bids were turnkey and included those items. Ms. Holt asked for the range of bid to be announced to which Ms. Young said that ORI came in at \$173,949.45 with the lowest bid, and the highest bid came in from Creative Office Pavilion at \$186,863.

Mr. Shea made a motion to approve the furniture bid to ORI who came in with the low bid of \$173,949.45 for the process out of four bids sent out. There are no substitutions and this price is inclusive of delivering installation, with the projected install date of February 1st. This motion was seconded by Stephanie Holland, and voted all in favor (6-0) by roll call vote; UNANIMOUS.

- **Review any open old/new business items**

None to discuss.

Mr. Shea made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:16 p.m., which was seconded by Carl Campagna and voted all in favor (6-0), by roll call vote; UNANIMOUS.