

PARKING GARAGE BUILDING COMMITTEE

1 JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
School Board Room

3:30 P.M.

Thursday, June 1, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Councilor Lown, Chair; Councilor Pearson (via phone); Councilor Spear, John O'Leary, Everett Eaton; Nancy Colbert Puff, Deputy City Manager

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ALSO PRESENT: David Allen, Project Manager; Matt Tonello, Construction Manager; Dan Hartrey, Facilities Project Manager; Gary Glines, Project Architect.

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

Acceptance of Minutes

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

Progress Updates

General Update- David Allen

Mr. Allen stated that the final numbers weren't in yet but that Consigli was working with the three bidders on the scope. He noted several project activities that the team had been working on:

- Review was done pertaining to lining the sewer as opposed to relocating it.
- Meeting with the City Manager and Portsmouth Herald Editorial board.
- Final numbers on Site Enabling bid package would be reviewed with the City Manager.

Site Bidding – Matt Tonello, Consigli Construction

Mr. Tonello stated that budgetary numbers were presented at the previous meeting that were based on a schematic design. He explained that Consigli budgeted the job based on what they thought would come in and then decided that they were over budget. He said the subcontractor market was very 'hot' with summer fast approaching, which made bidding the project tough. He said they marketed firm fixed-pricing bids and invited 6-7 site contractors, of which three bidders submitted bids and were their measure for competition. He said the other contractors were too busy. He noted that within the scope

of work were the demolition of the existing buildings and all the site soil remediation. Mr. Tonello said he received prices from Sargent Corporation, from S.U.R. Construction (Soils, Utilities, Roads), and from NorthEast Earth Mechanics and were in the process of evaluating them. He said the bids were coming in below schematic design budget but they were very cautious because the three proposals weren't fully vetted internally. He said they would review each contractor's scope of work and should have a recommendation for award to the City on a low-qualified, best-value award basis by the following Wednesday. He said the next stage was to bid on the precast superstructure. Due to the busy market, they were granting some extensions on a case-by-case basis and could extend it out to the mid-to-late part of the following week to ensure that they had the best combination of scope. He said everything would be presented on a spreadsheet to the City for evaluation. Mr. Tonello concluded that, once they selected the site contractor and did the precast scope, which was 50% value of the work, they would focus on the rest of the project.

Mr. O'Leary asked whether the term 'coming in under budget' meant that the budget included the additional funds. Mr. Tonello agreed, noting that he presented a schematic design cost that was established as a baseline budget and was seeing numbers below that baseline. Mr. O'Leary said that the site work was the area where they had found some concern regarding the cost, and that whatever final numbers Consigli had, it was anticipated that the cost would be more than originally budgeted for that particular purpose. Mr. Tonello said they received the information on how the first budget was established that they were not privy to, i.e. the approval from the Department of Environmental Services. Mr. O'Leary said he used the term 'not previously identified' and that Mr. Tonello knew there would be issues there.

Mr. Tonello stated that one of the strategies they used to reduce the budget to the best possible value was looking at alternate sewer lines. He said the sewer's relocation was in the base scope of work. He said he had thought it would be a significant cost savings but was proven wrong because the contractors weren't willing to put their financial name on a sewer lining effort. He said the contractors looked closely at the soils report in the vicinity of that sewer line, and when Consigli asked for an optional price to line the sewer and work around it, they said they felt significant risk in maintaining the integrity of that sewer line for the project's duration. He said Consigli did enough to evaluate the opportunity to challenge that less-costly option but it didn't turn out to be less costly. They asked all the site contractors to remove from their bids any contingency values for unknown issues below grade and to provide unit prices for removal of that kind of material, which made them feel they had a solid standing with them.

Garage Design Development Update

Project Architect Gary Glines stated that they completed 50% of the design package and that the cost estimate was being developed for the garage itself. He said the site work was already taken care of and that they were in a holding pattern until they saw the cost estimates and other numbers. Mr. Glines said they would do a value engineering session if costs rose above what was anticipated. He said the design had not changed from the

past four weeks and that the only issue was to finish design issues on the site. He said that he and Mr. Allen had discussed the streetscape and the light poles and, because the site was very tight between the railroad tracks and the Adams Building, they were trying to free up the sidewalk by mounting the light poles to the front of the garage.

Mr. Allen noted that the standard lighting for Portsmouth was colonial. He said the sidewalks were only 8 feet wide, so it was better to attach the lights to the building. However, the building was contemporary, so he said that Mr. Almeida of DeStefano Architects suggested something different.

Mr. Glines said they were trying to make the sidewalk as usable as possible, so instead of taking up more space by the light poles, they would put them on front of the flex space, which would work with the structural module of the garage. He said the fixtures were Portsmouth traditional fixtures on a wall bracket. Mr. Glines showed a diagram of the colonial lamp and asked the committee whether they preferred a traditional or contemporary light.

Mr. O'Leary asked how the light would be directed, noting that they didn't want to affect the neighbors with light pollution. Mr. Glines said they had not researched the design fully at that point. Mr. Allen said it wasn't a directional fixture and not dark-sky friendly.

Everett Eaton said he thought there would be an awning on the storefronts. Mr. Glines said they deleted the awning to keep the sidewalk open but had an awning over the driveway entry and exit. Mr. Eaton said the awning was an attractive architectural feature. He asked how the light fixture would be integrated if there was an awning. Mr. Glines said the awning would block the light. It was further discussed.

Mr. Glines said that DeStefano Architects had a series of contemporary light fixtures that could be pole mounted or attached to the wall with a bracket arm fixture. He reviewed different types of contemporary light fixtures. Mr. Tonello asked which light fixture was in the current set of documents. Mr. Glines said it was the Portsmouth fixture but said they may want to do something different on the front of the garage.

They discussed whether the lights would stay on or would be occupancy-activated, particular late at night. Mr. Allen said the occupancy-activated light might lean toward a more contemporary fixture that was directional and could be controlled. Mr. Glines said one particular fixture was a good candidate because it had internal directional elements and was used on parking garage roofs at the entry and exit so that it didn't spill into the neighborhood.

Ania Rogers suggested putting the lights under a canopy to prevent them from going into the neighborhood. Mr. Glines said that lights mounted under a canopy would be lower and would have to be spaced closer together, necessitating more light fixtures. Mr. Allen said the City was standardized for ease of maintenance and that Public Works would have to be involved in the decision. Mr. Glines said they were also considering decorative lighting on the garage itself to lighten its features and give off some life at night.

Report on Percent for Art Program Meeting – Councilor Pearson

City Councilor Nancy Pearson (via phone contact) stated that they did not have a meeting because they were finalizing the RFP. She said they would present the RFP to the committee and then decide whether they wanted another public input session. She said they were on schedule for June or July.

Other Business

Mr. Allen asked the Committee whether they should reconvene in a week or two to review the bid numbers. Mr. O’Leary said the site work had to be done first and asked whether the timing of the building could be adjusted to save money. Mr. Tonello said it was a good idea. He noted that they had also made internal decisions to make an adjustment to the RFP during the bidding process of four to ensure that more contractors didn’t pull out by giving them the choice to start mid-July per Consiligi’s schedule or start on an alternate schedule. He said that, out of three bidders, one contractor proposed a delayed start and the other two contractors wanted to maintain the proposed mid-July start. He said the contractor who proposed the delayed start would have pulled out otherwise. Mr. Tonello said it was a method to secure a third bidder, and that pushing the site work out would push everything else out, which would be beyond the fall completion date. Mr. O’Leary asked how value could be achieved by adjusting the timing. Mr. Tonello said they would continue vetting the numbers but were on a tight schedule. He urged the committee to move fast on construction so he could ask the bidders to book the job. He suggested meeting after the precast numbers were in so they could decide whether to remove some elements of the job to keep it under budget or deal with finish changes. He said the third or fourth week of June would be a good date.

Chairman Lown suggested that the Committee meet on June 22.

Mr. O’Leary said the Committee had to figure out what options they had to get the project paid for. He noted that they could get money from the City Council, fundraising, and value engineering. He said he wanted a functional facility but thought the Committee should consider things such as keeping some of the existing façade or having one elevator instead of two by doing their due diligence. He said they needed to see what was out there and work together to make it fit.

ACTION ITEM: Councilor Lown asked Mr. Tonello to prepare information for the committee.

Councilor Spear stated that people had asked him why the project was over budget and why the revised estimates were higher than the original estimates. He said he couldn’t explain it to them.

Mr. Allen explained that the bonded amount was put together in 2015, when the finalized negotiations on purchasing the property and environmental and geotechnical work

weren't done. He said they came up with a safe number that provided some flexibility to build the garage, the typical roadway, the cost, and so on, which was before there was any investigative effort. He said there was no investigative geotechnical work regarding the middle school and that a lot of the additional costs were similar to what the Committee would pick up and be comfortable with. He said the garage project was complex and detailed, e.g. the five different levels of contaminated soil, and that they had narrowed the uncertainty. He said if they had simply gone through a standard garage design and bid and not done the geotechnical and environmental work, bids would have come in before the fact. He said they would have a solid feel for the cost and would have eliminated a lot of uncertainty in a few weeks.

Councilor Spear said there was still a gap from two years before, when the number was based on normal assumptions. He asked whether the gap was due to the site contamination. Mr. Allen said it was the site soils and the geotechnical items. Councilor Spear asked why the items hadn't been flagged on the 2015 estimate. Chairman Lown said he thought they had, which was the reason they negotiated a reserve.

Mr. Allen said the soils and the geotechnical were beyond the standard and that they based the cost on the standard early fill. He said the environmental and geotechnical issues as well as inflation caused the high estimate. He said they estimated \$25 million on the water treatment plan, but the market crashed and they built it for \$ 21 million. He noted that the timing was important. He said the garage structure was coming in for about what was anticipated and that the roads and utilities were more than anticipated.

Councilor Spear said that people thought the City knew about the sewer. Mr. Allen said there were soil issues because the sewer had to be relocated, which meant deeper excavation. Ms. Rogers said that another reason for the cost increase was because the original quotes were three years old and national construction costs rose 20% or more.

Councilor Spear said there were accusations of mismanagement and incompetence by the City, and he hoped that the gap would be narrowed but felt that a good explanation was still needed. He said it was important to present options to the City Council because of the extra amount of money needed for the project. He suggested that one option was for the City Council to give them the money, and the other options could include land-banking the project and waiting two years for another recession. He asked the committee to think of options before the next meeting. Ms. Rogers said the public needed to know that construction fees had risen.

Mr. Tonello said that Consigli had done eight parking garages in the past six years and had to do a metric about what garages were going for in other markets. He suggested paying over what typical garages for. He said they had to measure a parking garage structure against another parking garage structure, not one with a significant site analysis burden. He said they could strip out the site enabling work and do a structure analysis and could work with Walker Parking. He recommended that the road construction aspect move forward quickly so that the viable site contractors weren't lost. He said the superstructure could be done first, with the site clean-up afterwards.

Next Meeting

It was decided that the next meeting would be June 22, 2017.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault
Secretary