

October 6, 2018

West Branch Dead Creek Culvert Replacement on Basin Harbor Road

STP MM 18(6)

Committee Meeting at Bridport Department of Public Works Conference Room

Present: Joan Huestis and David Bronson in person, Jonathan Ashley joined by phone in the later part of the meeting, Dusty Huestis was unable to attend due to a prior commitment

Joan called the meeting to order at 07:15 am

The subject of the meeting was the Otter Creek Engineering, Inc.'s (OCE) proposed 60% Preliminary Plans and proposed construction costs on the project, both dated October 1, 2018.

Both Joan and David agreed there was a significant increase in the possible costs of the project. The proposed project cost in the Town's Environmental Mitigation Grant Application to the State was \$429,060.00. The State's Grant was for \$343,248.00 with the remaining 20% amount of \$85,812.00 due from the Town, which is the amount authorized by the voters at the 2018 Annual Town Meeting. Using the Application's "construction costs with reasonable contingency" cost figure of \$301,000.00 plus 10% more of \$30,100.00 included in the Application's proposed project cost, equals \$331,100.00 as an estimated construction cost. The \$429,060.00 minus the \$331,100.00 would leave \$97,960.00 left of the proposed project cost for other so-called non-construction costs including for various consultants and right of way acquisition. OCE's present construction cost estimate is \$361,767.39 plus a 10% contingency amount of \$36,176.74 for a total of \$397,900.00. This is \$66,800.00 more (\$397,900.00 - \$331,100.00).

Joan was concerned about having to ask the voters to approve of more funding.

David was also but pointed out the following understandings:

THAT the culvert needed to be replaced.

THAT, assuming what was proposed for construction was reasonably needed, presumably the cost of replacement was only going to increase in the future.

THAT, although the administration procedure and costs concerning the State's Grant of Federal money are more complicated and more costly than for a more typical State Highway Grant, such typical Grant would at least normally be only for up to \$175,000.00 versus the \$343,248.00 in this case.

THAT the State could require any Grant money paid out to be repaid by the Town if the project was not completed.

Both were in agreement that it was worthwhile to try to continue with the project.

Joan and David both recognized OCE's present, without contingency, cost for the "PRECAST CONCRETE STRUCTURE" of \$187,090.00 was \$34,740.00 more than the Grant Application's, without contingency, cost of \$152,350.00 for "Precast Concrete

Culvert 16'w x 8'h x 40'l, footings, head/wingw[alls]". David pointed out OCE's present such Structure was bigger "(20'—0"W X 9'—0"H X 43'—0"L BOX)".

David also pointed out OCE's present, without contingency, cost for "MARSHALL BITUMINOUS CONCRETE PAVEMENT" of \$44,502.95 (for 331 tons at a unit cost of \$134.45) was \$38,742.95 more than the Grant Application's, without contingency, cost of \$5,760.00 for "Bituminous Asphalt Pavement" (for 160 "S.Y." units at a unit cost of \$36.00). Joan said the per ton cost was a lot more than what the Town paid for asphalt this year. It was realized that there would at least be some increased per ton cost for a special small paving project. David asked Jon about the possibility of the State allowing the Town to sometime later, like as a part of its usual highway paving, pave the culvert area --- for consideration as a possible savings at least in regards to getting the project done without paving being a part of it. Jon thought there might be a good chance of the State allowing it, although he mentioned the State might want a little more gravel used. The OCE plans call for "4" BITUMINOUS CONCRETE PAVEMENT" on Plan Sheet C-7.

Joan and David both recognized it will probably be less costly if the project can be bid out around January 2019 and constructed in the 2019 construction season. David pointed out this presumably means trying to get voters' authorization at a special town meeting by this December or maybe January 2019 so that the Town could enter into a contract for construction once the bidding is done, which would also allow the contractor to order the precast concrete culvert. Waiting to try to get voters' approval at the 2019 March Town Meeting with the normal right to petition for a revote within 30 days, may well not work. When discussed with Jon, he agreed the earlier timetable would be best.

David mentioned to Joan he thought he had earlier heard the State's April 2018 hydraulic study for this culvert spot might need to be revisited once more information on the culvert spot was obtained. Joan said the State is behind on such studies and it might take 6-months or so to do another one, which would not be good for the above timetable. When we discussed this with Jon, he said it was his understanding it would need to be revisited, including with the last information on what was proposed to be constructed, and that such study would be needed before going to bid. As a possibility, he said sometimes the State has hired out to them or others the doing of such a study when the State was behind. It was also mentioned the environmental review that is intended to go with the OCE preliminary plans and cost estimate to the State, would hopefully be approved just on a State review basis instead of needing to go for a federal review --- since an approved environmental review is also needed before going to bid.

David said he had previously mentioned to Jon that of the aforesaid estimated \$97,960.00 non-construction original cost: \$33,838.00 was committed to DuBois & King, Inc. as the Municipal Project Manager and \$35,904.00 was committed to OCE as the Design Consultant, which left \$28,218.00. This balance was also brought up with Jon at the meeting and he said he thought it was in the ballpark of what it might cost for the consultant to inspect during construction. It was discussed that any more money needed for this consultant and for right of way acquisition should be included in figuring

what additional money to ask the voters to approve. Instead of having to hire a totally different consultant, it was also discussed that Ande of the State had previously mentioned this project might qualify for being able to hire one of the already hired consultants as the inspection consultant and Jon said this might save a little money since both already hired consultants' budgets include some inspection time. Jon said he would discuss whether this could be done with Ande.

David also said he had previously discussed with Jon about whether there was any possibility the State would increase its grant. Jon said there might be a possibility particularly if some previously committed federal money had become available. He said he would discuss with Ande.

David also mentioned the following:

1. The State's April hydraulic study recommended a replacement structure "with a 20 foot opening span between face of abutments perpendicular to the flow and a minimum clear height of 7.0 feet would provide a waterway area of approximately 140 square feet." David asked Jon whether OCE's proposed 9 foot high structure was consistent with this recommendation such as for putting in a natural type bottom. Jon understood a natural type bottom was needed and he thought this was consistent but would discuss it with Brent.
2. David pointed out the C-1 sheet of OCE's plans described the Precast Concrete Box Culvert as being "40'—8'" long versus a length of "43'—0'" elsewhere in OCE's plans such as on the C-2 sheet. Jon said he would check with Brent on this.
3. David also pointed out OCE's plans appear to use "\_\_\_\_\_ \_" that OCE's legend on the C-2 sheet says stands for "centerline of road" also for the boundaries of the highway right of way instead of the C-2 sheet's legend of "\_\_\_\_\_ \_" for "boundary line/r.o.w.". Jon said he would also mention this to Brent and thought it was just an oversight.
4. David said at least on the C-1 sheet that the location of the project was given in relation to its distance from the intersection of the Basin Harbor Road with the next northerly road going east as the intersection with "MARKET ROAD WEST" and that the actual road name is West Market Road. This information probably came because the road sign at the intersection incorrectly identifies said road as Market Road West. The other three signs for West Market Road have been changed from when all four signs were mistakenly made when the 911 system was adopted. Joan has this sign on her list to get changed when a new sign order is made. Jon said he would pass on to Brent this information.
5. David also said he understood Tri-Town Water District No. 1 was supposed to get to OCE the location of its main water line on the west side of the Basin Harbor Road that is presumably in an easement area by the culvert. He said he saw nothing on OCE's plans as to its location in relation to the project. He said he presumed it would

be better to know of its location before bidding out the project so that, hopefully, the contractor will be able to know it won't affect doing the project or, if it does, the extent it will affect the project --- all instead of maybe including costs it might affect the project more than it does. Jon said he would also discuss this with Brent.

6. David also pointed out OCE on its C-2 sheet under TRAFFIC CONTROL NOTES said:

“1. THE TOWN OF BRIDPORT WILL ALLOW FOR AN EXTENDED CLOSURE OF BASIN HARBOR ROAD.

A. THE EXTENDED CLOSURE SHALL OCCUR WHEN LOCAL SCHOOLS ARE NOT IN SESSION, GENERALLY BETWEEN MID—JUNE TO THE END OF AUGUST. EXACT DATES CAN BE PROVIDED BY THE TOWN OF BRIDPORT.”

Because of possible increased costs and the wanting to construct the project in the 2019 construction season, the discussion by Joan, David and Jon was that it would be better not to so restrict when construction can be done, although all realized it could interfere with school busing.

Jon said they were still reviewing what OCE had proposed but had found some changes he would discuss with Brent. Unfortunately, he said he had found a couple of things needing to be added and that Jon's last estimate of construction cost without contingency was \$392,412.00. One of the things he mentioned was longer wingwalls. If one added a 10% contingency of \$39,241.00, it would bring the possible construction cost to \$431,653.00. This would bring the increased construction cost to about \$100,500.00 more than the aforesaid about \$331,100.00 budgeted construction cost.

Jon said he would be discussing the above relevant matters respectively with Brent and Ande and including discussing any possible ways of saving money. He did not know how far he would be able to get by Monday evening's Selectboard meeting.

David and Joan also discussed that the end of 2017 General Fund accumulated surplus of \$357,685.00 minus last Annual Town Meeting commitments of

	-\$165,000.00 in Article 30 on Sunderland Bridge
	-\$ 85,812.00 in Article 31 on this project
	<u>-\$ 23,500.00</u> in Article 32 on painting, etc.
left	\$ 83,373.00

Meeting adjourned 9:15 am

Respectfully submitted by David Bronson