

## **PARKING GARAGE BUILDING COMMITTEE**

1 JUNKINS AVENUE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
School Board Room

3:30 P.M.

Thursday, April 20, 2017

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Councilor Lown, Chair, John O’Leary; Mark McNabb;  
Nancy Colbert Puff, Deputy City Manager

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Councilor Pearson. Everett Eaton; Councilor Spear

**ALSO PRESENT:** David Allen, Project Manager; Matt Tonello, Construction  
Manager; Peter Rice, Director of Public Works; Dan  
Hartrey, Facilities Project Manager; Chris Brennan, Walker  
Parking; Nick Cracknell, Planning Department

Councilor Lown called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

### **1. Acceptance of Minutes**

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** by a unanimous vote to accept the minutes of the March 16, 2017 meeting.*

### **2. Progress Updates**

Mr. Allen introduced Construction Manager Matt Tonello of Consigli and noted that Chris Brennan of Walker Parking was also present. Mr. Allen stated that the schematic design was delayed because the last few weeks had been very busy. He noted that additional Geotechnical and environmental information was incoming. He said that Consigli was on board and was developing and reconciling the costs.

Mr. Allen said that the estimates would be presented and noted that Consigli met with five site contractors the day before and received bid specifications, which would result in real numbers. He turned the presentation over to Mr. Brennan.

Mr. Brennan said they did additional studies to mitigate costs. He said the draft Geotechnical report was issued and that they were waiting for final recommendations. He said they received some final environmental reports and that the groundwater management plan was issued. He said the site management bid plan was issued the previous Friday and that they were in the process of bidding, and that design development was ongoing and that they planned to deliver it with a precast bid package on May 5.

Mr. Tonello discussed the environmental report and the delineation of different materials on site. He showed slides related to site and design and also showed some of the bid documents that were being prepared for them. Mr. Tonello gave a schedule update, noting that they had just finished the schematic design estimating and had gone through a reconciliation process, which he explained.

Mr. Tonello said that Walker Parking was moving along with the design development phase and would deliver it around May 5, around the same time that Consigli would send documents out to bid for site contractors. He said they would then present numbers and make a recommendation for contract award. He said that, as they got into the construction phase, they would begin the environmental work, the demolition, the excavation, and so on. He said when Walker Parking finished the superstructure design, they would prepare bids for precast contractors and that eventually the costs would be closed down and commitments would be made.

Mr. Brennan stated that the precast packages would not be 100% construction documents (CDs) on May 5 but would include the documents at the level of completion that would facilitate bidding. Mr. Tonello agreed, noting that the precast contractor would work with the site designer. He said they would price every last scope of the 100% CDs, which would go out in July.

Chairman Lown asked Mr. Tonello whether he was aware that the Council wanted \$23.2M for the project. Mr. Tonello said he was and said it would be discussed. Mr. McNabb asked whether the macro level was \$30 million, and Chairman Lown said it was \$23M, plus 6M. Mr. Allen said they had the \$23.2M and that \$1.2M was intended to go toward the road construction, plus \$894k for the bond premium going before the Council. Mr. Rice said that roughly \$2M would be authorized for the water and sewer aspects in addition to the \$23.2M. Mr. Allen noted that it would ultimately be \$25.7M.

Mr. Tonello discussed where they were in the project. He said the first piece was Walker Parking and the completed design period.

### **3. Total Project Cost**

Mr. Allen further reviewed cost estimates. He said that the garage estimate was broken out as well as the utilities, environmental, road and land acquisition. He said it would cost an additional \$41K for the air rights for building code flexibility. He said that the preconstruction costs were costs that were either encumbered or had been spent for Legal, land purchase, Walker Parking's fee, and project management fees for salaries.

Mr. O'Leary asked whether those amounts included the Gray property, and Mr. Allen indicated that it did. He said it was everything known to date that had been spent or planned to be spent. He said the garage construction costs were based on Consigli's estimate and the construction administrative costs were handled by Walker Parking. He said the City was responsible for the tipping fee and that they had contingencies of less than 2 percent. He explained that the tipping fee was the cost for the City to dispose of

contaminated soils and that the contractor was responsible for the trucking. Mr. O'Leary noted that the legal fees on both cases were \$53,231. Mr. Allen said he split it. Mr. Allen said that the engineering would be done mostly by Tigie Bond, who also did the site design. He noted again that there would be fees for Walker Parking, environmental, project management salaries. He mentioned that the land acquisition for \$36K was the Gray partial acquisition. He said the construction costs were \$4.2M, which included the road, utilities and site work.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Tonello to review the environmental costs, including groundwater treatment. Mr. Tonello said they were stabilizing the lead impacted soils on site, but not included in those numbers was the fuel oil remediation for the Deer St. parcel furthest on the right of the site. He said they would look for an alternate price and offer it to Deer St. as reimbursement to the City. Mr. Allen said that the construction administration costs had been split between the garage and the roadwork. He said the tipping fee for the City would take care of the soil disposal.

#### **4. Construction Costs**

Mr. Tonelli stated that Mr. Allen had been challenging Consligi and RBL on the numbers. He said they had numbers for the parking garage's superstructure and foundation. He said they completed a site estimate for the topography, the garage boundary, and the path to a relocated sewer line, noting that they had just done an estimate for the site work outside of the garage boundary and received an updated environmental report and Geotech report, which put a premium into the site work component of about \$2.5M. Mr. Tonelli further discussed the soil and trench and said they wanted to be confident that the line workers didn't have to get into HAZMAT suits, which would add a significant cost. He said they discussed whether it would make sense to spend that kind of money on a sewer line and whether they should line the existing sewer line. They decided that they would look at the numbers from that point forward to lock down the total \$4.2M site contract risk. Mr. Tonelli said they were getting an alternate design for lining the sewer at the end of the week and would do another comparison on retaining the sewer line and abandoning the excavation.

Mr. McNabb asked whether the \$2.5 million was included, and Mr. Tonelli agreed. Mr. McNabb asked if the lining was to support the garage or the integrity of the sewer. Mr. Brennan said it was lining for the integrity of the sewer. Mr. Allen noted that it wasn't a big cost difference until they received the additional Geotechnical and environmental, so they considered just running around the sewer.

Mr. Brennan said that the final delta wasn't known, that the numbers were mid-step. He said they spoke to DES about a clean corridor and also wanted to be accurate in their decisions, in light of all the new information coming in. He said they were in the process of considering strategies to ensure that they got the most competitive bid for the base bid, e.g., the soil support, and wanted to mitigate those requirements if possible. If they could not mitigate some of the soil issues, he said they could go back to Stage 1 and look at the cost savings in keeping the sewer. Mr. McNabb asked whether it would be possible that

the additional \$2.5M on the soil could be only a million, or whether they knew what the alternative could be. Mr. Tonelli said they would get a specification on Friday. Mr. Brennan said they were working on something they could bid and were already addressing the foundation.

Mr. Rice noted that the pipe was shaped like a tear duct and became harder with conventional lining systems. He said they would get a new pipe in there and that he preferred from an operational standpoint that they get it out from under the building. He said it could be a million-dollar delta, though. It was further discussed.

## **5. Cost Reduction Strategies**

Mr. Brennan discussed the cost reduction strategies. He said that by bidding the site work, they were identifying risk in terms of what the cost was. He said they were doing something similar for the precast for the same reason, at about 50% of the overall cost of the project. He said the site work was the most volatile issue at that point. He said they were talking to Geotechnical engineers and asking whether they could alter the methodology during excavation; they would look at methodologies and maybe lighten the overburden. He said they tried to get permission from the State to re-use some of the soil and were considering rehabilitating the existing sewer but would not modify anything above grade.

Mr. Brennan said they knew that there were things they could do that would not affect the scope of the garage and that could bring the project amount to where they wanted it. He further discussed it, noting that they could reduce the pile quantities about 20-30% and could build two shafts and perhaps put just one elevator in. He said they would look for various strategies when they got the numbers in.

Mr. O'Leary said his concern was that, in a lot of projects, there were things that could be addressed, like heating systems, but here they had a basic structure. He said they had a delta of about \$4M and that he would rather not change the structure of the garage, i.e., if the garage was going to have 600 spaces, he wanted to get there and wasn't overly concerned about how the garage was finished. He said the main focus was to get it built and functional. Mr. Brennan said he didn't think the architectural façade of the building was at a point where there would be significant savings. He said they felt strongly that they would get the 600 spaces and that the design was very efficient and appropriate for the City. Mr. McNabb said he would discourage anyone from grabbing meaningless stuff and thought they would make or break the budget by the environmental.

Chairman Lown said he thought the Council should be informed of those numbers soon and suggested the next meeting. Mr. Allen said there was a \$4M number based on estimates and that it seemed that no decisions could be made until those bids arrived in about four weeks. Mr. O'Leary said it wasn't a place they wanted to be but that it wasn't unusual. He said they needed to present the case in an appropriate way and give all the answers, then let people who allocate the money deal with it. Chairman Lown agreed.

Mr. McNabb said that he thought forewarning was a good thing. He noted that they had significant environmental estimates. He said he didn't think the bids would be low and thought they would be closer to \$4M than \$2M. He said the information should be forwarded so that it wasn't a surprise later.

## **6. Next Steps**

Mr. Brennan said the design development was where they identified all the scope in the project. He said the documents would be under Design Documents (DD) and that the site documents were at 100%, but that the intent was for the entire scope to be identified and detailed to a level where it could be estimated. For about 50% of the scope, he said they would go through a similar cost estimating exercise with others and reconcile, which would take about 3-4 weeks. He said that the precast numbers would be included in the cost reconciling and that once they released the CDs, it would be a footrace. He said if the construction manager needed the foundation package for the Building Inspector, they would be capable of breaking out that package and delivering it sooner.

Mr. Tonello noted that there was an adjustment to Item 6.B. He said the site bids were due on May 5 but felt that it was a tight bidding envelope. He said there were five active proposers who had asked for more time due to the complexity of the project, and he felt that the deadline would be around May 19.

## **7. Upcoming Meetings**

Mr. Brennan said the precast bid package hadn't gone out yet but that they were looking at June 7. Mr. McNabb said they were talking to all four precasters to prepare them and that they were very interested in the garage.

Mr. Allen suggested meeting on June 1. Mr. O'Leary asked what would happen to the Happny proposal if they didn't do the trench and the new line. Mr. Allen said it would go forward but that the corridor would be left open. Mr. O'Leary asked about updating the Council and whether they would do the 30,000 feet and then come back with action items. Chairman Lown said he had asked Deputy City Manager Colbert Puff to put the committee on the schedule with the Council for an informational meeting.

It was decided that the next meeting would be June 1 at 3:30 p.m.

At 4:00 P.M., Councilor Lown adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault  
Recording Secretary