



**Town of Plaistow  
Public Safety Complex  
Building Committee  
27 Elm Street, Plaistow, NH 03865**



**PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**MEETING DATE:** Thursday, November 12, 2015 @ 4:00 PM

**PRESENT:** *Chief Kathleen Jones, Chair; Chief John McArdle, Vice-Chairman; Sean Fitzgerald, Town Manager; John Sherman, Selectman; Tammy Bergeron, Selectmen; Bill Query, Pat Schiavone Detective, Gino Baroni, Trident; Darryl Britton; Dave Mermelstein, Alan Brown, Mike Dorman, Building Inspector, and Barbara Kiszka, Citizen Representative*

**EXCUSED:**

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:** 1:05 PM

S. Fitzgerald introduces Dick Latham, retired Plaistow Fire Chief. D. Latham speaks about the history of the Fire Department. It began at the location of our present day Historical Society and was moved to the current location on Elm Street which was once owned by the Lagasse family. He shows a few pictures of the Fire Station at various times. D. Latham believes the footprint of the present Fire Department is different from the LeGasse footprint due to truck size. The present station was moved back 20 feet. When the LeGasses' owned the property it was used for Trolley storage on the right side and on the left side was a large pit approximately 6 feet deep and 20 feet long. The Trolley's were cleaned over the pit. Discussion ensues regarding property changes. The old building was completely torn down before the 1986 building was constructed. There is some concern regarding the renovation of the old foundation and whether oil was stored on the property. The current Fire Department Bay covers the entire area where the trolleys were. The well was in the left rear of the building. Maybe borings should be done in the back of the building to check the content. If any contaminants did exist they probably have been completely covered. The first Lagasse building was made of brick. When the present day Fire Station was construction the Frog Pond was used for drainage. When the Frog Pond was filled in we did have EPA approval.

S Fitzgerald thanks D. Latham for his historical presentation.

D. Latham exits the meeting at 1:30 PM.

***K. Jones motions to approve the minutes of 11/05/15.***

***P. Schiavone 2<sup>nd</sup>.***

***All in favor, motion passes.***

P. Schiavone visited the new Police Department in Sandown. It used to be a funeral home. It was renovated with \$800,000 approved by Town vote. They have a smaller force than we do. They have 1 Chief, 1 Sergeant, 1 Day Patrol Officer, 1 night Patrol Officer, and 2 evening Patrol Officers'. Sandown is a bedroom community with no commercial base.

S. Fitzgerald states we need to frame all conversation effectively as Plaistow residents will want to compare our project to Sandown, in reference to population, size of the police force and the size of the project. Our populations are similar but during the day Plaistow is over populated.

K. Jones states it's a transient population per day.

J. Sherman states Plaistow residents will want to know how our commercial base will contribute to paying for the project. This will need to be approached carefully and we need to be prepared.

S. Fitzgerald talks about the RFP's. We have several good proposals and this should be a working meeting to choose finalists to come before the Board of Selectmen. We want expert input from Gino, Dave, and Alan to help qualify and understand the proposals. Discussion ensues regarding the score sheets.

J. Sherman inquires if anyone thinks we can throw out one company.

***B. Kiszka motions to remove Dew because of ligation issues and a few other concerns. Also, they don't bring anything to the table that the others don't.***

S. Fitzgerald had them listed second to last. He thought they were a good firm but he believes there is some risk associated with their litigation.

Discussion ensues. T. Bergeron, J. McArdle, G. Baroni, and A. Brown listed them as their 2<sup>nd</sup> choice. They have the most public safety experience even though they had litigation. The Committee members give G. Baroni their rankings.

Committee Rankings are as follows:

Aberthaw	5 (is out)	42	Low Score Ranks High
Dew	3	28	
Eckman	4	29	
Harvey	1	21	
Hutter	2	25	

Gino's Ranks:

- 1 Eckman
- 2 Dew
- 3 Harvey
- 4 Hutter
- 5 Aberthaw (now out)

J. Sherman suggests Hutter be discussed because they had a wide range of opinions by the committee. He would like feedback as to why some disliked them.

J. McArdle states he was not happy with their presentation but he knows North Andover is happy with their Hutter project.

J. Sherman agrees that they were not well prepared with the OPM presentation but he is in favor of the idea that they do self performing of the subcontractors which helps keep costs down and it gives them more control over the project. Hutter does have several projects ongoing at the present time and they are the largest firm.

G. Barino states there are pros and cons to self performance.

D. Mermelstein looked at the Hutter team members that want to be on our project and they did not have Public Safety experience. Public Safety is more involved than a Walmart for example. D. Mermelstein recommends we make sure the team described in the Proposal is the actual team that works on the Plaistow project. The Hutter proposal states this team of people has to be on another job.

A. Brown states Dew should not be dropped. Dore and Whittier have worked with Dew on several projects for many years and they have never had a problem.

S. Fitzgerald states Dew has some strengths as far as their cost management report and commission overview but they also have risks especially due to the number of litigation cases.

Discussion ensues regarding the 4 remaining proposals (Aberthaw is no longer in the running).

S. Fitzgerald states if we interview the top 4 companies it will be hard to get it to 3. He suggests reviewing their financials.

G. Baroni passes out the firm's financials.

We had cost estimates of \$6.6 million with Dore and Whittier.

S. Fitzgerald states no money has been approved yet.

S. Fitzgerald inquires of G. Baroni if there are any surprises with the firm's numbers. G. Baroni responds yes, with the pre-bond numbers, they vary from 4K to 12K. For pre-construction all firms are in the same ball park.

GMP ( Gross Maximum Price) contract

- 1) Settle fee percentage - that is Contract Manager Percentage.
- 2) General conditions – G. Baroni agrees it's OK with a specification forum as you cannot change values when it's a forum.
- 3) Hourly Rate

G. Baroni states fees and General Conditions are important to look at while the pre-bond vote and post bond vote are less important.

Hutter is discussed next and some members of the committee felt they were not well prepared for the Plaistow project. Hutter did not know enough about Plaistow. Some responses were inadequate.

S. Fitzgerald states Hutter did respond appropriately.

G. Baroni agreed although he thought they were not a boiler plate. Hutter does self performing of subcontractors. This gives them more control over the project. However, there are pros and cons for self performing.

Discussion ensues.

S. Fitzgerald states we should move on to the numbers, what they convert into. Eckman is the closest.

B. Kiszka states Harvey and Eckman are good for the pre-bond rate.

S. Fitzgerald believes that can be negotiated. We need to look at the Contract Manager Fee and general conditions.

G. Baroni states Eckman will not negotiate pre-bond. He worked with Eckman on the Phelam Fire Station.

G. Baroni recommends 3 firms to come back to meet with the BOS.

D. Britton is not concerned with litigation because he is in court 4 days a week and that is the way it is these days. The larger the company, the more litigation there seems to be.

B. Kiszka inquires about lead certification, should this be considered.

G. Baroni states that would cost more. It is understood it is lead provided but you do not want to pay for lead certifiable. It comes down to collaboration between the architect and the construction manager.

***J. Sherman motions to have Dew, Eckman, and Harvey selected as the 3 finalists to be interviewed by the Board of Selectmen. T. Bergeron 2<sup>nd</sup>.***

***All in favor, motion passes.***

Are there any objections to the three? No objections.

T. Bergeron inquires if the financials should be included in the presentation to the Board of Selectmen. It is agreed not to present financials.

The Public Safety Expansion Committee is encouraged to attend the BOS meeting on Monday November 16<sup>th</sup>.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

***K. Jones motions to adjourn. D. Britton 2<sup>nd</sup>.***

***All in favor.***

Next meeting – to be determined.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Meeting adjourned at 2:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Gayle Hamel  
Recording Secretary