

Town of Kingston  
Senior Center Building Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
November 12, 2009

---

1. The meeting was opened at 7:00pm. by Vice Chairman Jack Burrey in Room 200. Other members present were Muriel Boyce, Dave Colter, Linda Felix, and Ron Gleason. Absent were Chairman Paul Gallagher and Phil Burnham. Also present was Dan Pallotta, OPM, of P3.
  
2. Jack Burrey turned the meeting over to Dan Pallotta who reported he had a very busy week meeting with Brad McKenzie, also of P3, on his Civil Engineering Constructability Review, dated November 11, 2009 (**see attached for ready reference**), as well as having meetings with John Catlin, Architect. He also went over some of the Prime Engineering Site notes. On the McKenzie memorandum under the paragraph "Drawing #3 - 4<sup>th</sup> Bullet down - Need specification for crushed gravel sidewalk - vs. crushed stone?" Ron Gleason stated that the Architect has been told over and over again in prior "M-P-E notes.
  
3. Dan went on to say that he has had 3 visits with Catlin and did a "spot check" to see that they are really working toward moving forward. Prime Engineering is owed some money and that also Catlin expects to meet the deadlines we have proposed. He listed his reasons why, when going over the Drawings again. Zade Engineering is working on them as well, and they understand the conditions under which we are working with Catlin. We feel that it will be a struggle to get these finished on time. Catlin has limited staff. Bob Clarke is way over extended. There is a bill here that Dan feels the Committee should approve for payment from Catlin dated November 3, 2009. Design Development is now at 100%. Construction Documents are at 75%. Specs should be further along. They are paying someone to do the Specs.
  
4. Ron Gleason wanted it noted and reiterated again that the Construction Documents are to be ready for review on November 27.
  
5. Dave Colter stated that we have had a hard time getting the work done and then we get billed for it and we should not have to pay Catlin for it first. Ron commented that we may need to pay him but the work is long overdue.

6. Dan asked what would happen if we didn't pay him up front? It was stated that we would have to work carefully with him, Catlin, and Dan thinks we will eventually get to the end of the tunnel but does not think we can get him to go any faster. Catlin does not want to start till March. Dan thinks we will make the schedule and asked, what are Kingston's problems? Sewer sleeves is one thing Catlin knows. There is a lot Dan knows, as we do and we need to keep a close eye on him. He is not blind to what needs to be done and we need to get him focused on these things.

7. Dave Colter said we have no problem paying you, Dan, just need to know what we are paying you for. We have never refused to pay him. He presented us with a whole Site Plan and we didn't even have a Site for his Site Plans. Dan said in the number of years we have been at this, there will be some things that aren't right that we will never catch, just impossible now. Ron Gleason asked Dan if he discussed the "Alternates' List" and Dan said he did. Solar Tubes were discussed here too. Dan went on to say that Catlin's present billing should be paid for it will help us to get out to Bid.

8. Dan said that Catlin told him that Prime Engineering has some change requests to some of the Drawings but Catlin does not agree with them and vice - versa. Jack Burrey said these statements affect our progress.

9. At this point, a **Motion** was made by Jack Burrey and **seconded** by Linda Felix to pay Catlin Architecture \$38,729.60, Invoice #28005-10 and it was **unanimously so Voted**.

10. Dan Pallotta also had a bill addressed to Jill Myers, Town Administrator, dated November 12, 2009, Invoice #1, for Owner's Project Management Services in the amount of \$4,500. A **Motion** was made by Ron Gleason and **seconded** by Dave Colter to pay the OPM the \$4,500 as per his Contract and it was **unanimously so Voted**.

11. Dan said he would like some time to have a couple of more meetings with Catlin before we have another SCBC Meeting in order to check up on Catlin's forward progress, or lack thereof.

12. Ron Gleason mentioned that we still do not have Construction Drawings. Catlin operates much, much too slow but some of it could be due to the present economy. The members agreed to put off our next meeting for two weeks due to Dan's request and in view of the Thanksgiving holiday. Dan does have a schedule from Catlin but it is subject to change.

13. It was mentioned that Town Counsel and the Town Administrator have their copy of the "Front-End Specs".

14. For information, the outstanding Minutes now are July 29<sup>th</sup>, August 19<sup>th</sup>, September 3<sup>rd</sup>, September 9<sup>th</sup>, September 16<sup>th</sup>, October 14<sup>th</sup>, October 23<sup>rd</sup>, October 30<sup>th</sup>, and these dated November 12<sup>th</sup>. The Minutes of August 26<sup>th</sup> and September 28<sup>th</sup> were approved at the October 30<sup>th</sup> meeting through **two Motions**, both brought forth by Jack Burrey and **seconded** by Phil Burnham and were **unanimously so Voted**.

15. There being no other business to come before the meeting, a **Motion** was made by Ron Gleason and **seconded** by Dave Colter, to adjourn the meeting, it being 8:15pm. and it was **unanimously so Voted**.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruthann Cassidy, Secretary

Atts. - 3



## Project Planning Professionals

150 Longwater Drive, Norwell, MA 02061  
Tel. (781) 871-3136 Fax (781) 871-9805

---

**Date:** November 11, 2009

**To:** Senior Center Building Committee

**From:** Bradley C. McKenzie, P.E., P-Three, Inc.

**Regarding:** Civil Engineering Constructability Review

---

### Drawing # 1

N/C

### Drawing #2

N/C

### Drawing #3

- Radii of curbing should be specified.
- Specifications for brick patio in rear of building?
- Cape Cod berm scales to 2' width; detail on Sheet 6 indicates 12" width. Also, clarify that 24' dimension for lane width is from face of Cape Cod berm to face of concrete curb.
- Need specification for crushed gravel sidewalk – was the intention to spec crushed stone? Crushed gravel would result in issues relating to insufficient access due to instability and erosion, etc.
- Specifications/details for light poles/fixtures?
- Is 16' wide lane intended for 2-way traffic circulation?

### Drawing #4

- Rim elevation of CB-3 shown as 35.10; should it be 34.10 instead? (located between "35" contours)
- According to Rinker Website, Stormceptor 450i's should have 24" min. from rim to crown of pipe. CB-1 and CB-2 only have +/- 1.5'. If CB-3 rim is intended to be 34.10, then it will have only 1.83' from rim to crown.
- Slope of pavement to rain garden at front of building is <1%. The slope of 0.5% in this area will be difficult to pave and will most likely not drain properly.
- More spot grades at and around the "H" shaped parking island to the west end of the parking lot would help to clarify and resolve any drainage issues and prevent any water being trapped by the island.

- Grading to rear of building needs to be reconsidered to ensure positive drainage towards the wetland without altering wetland. Contour "34" is shown behind building yet the elevation in portions of the wetland is 35.
- In general, more spot grades are needed at proposed handicap parking spaces and ramps to ensure compliance with AAB Regulations (521 CMR).
- More spot grades are recommended at the parking area located in the northeast portion of the site near the Animal Shelter.
- Top and bottom of wall elevations for the retaining wall adjacent to crushed gravel walk are recommended.
- General note #5 indicated removing unsuitable soil and replacement with clean sand in accordance with 310 CMR 15.255(3). Does this note relate to the subsurface infiltration systems? If so, is there soil test data available within the footprint of the proposed systems so that the contractor has some indication of an approximate quantity?
- The subsurface infiltration systems using 12" ADS pipe appear to show a manifold at the inlet end of each system. However, it is unclear from plans and details how to construct this. Some of the systems also show a manifold at the outlet end.
- Guardrail posts will have to be driven inside the back edge of pavement at modular block retaining walls since edge of pavement is shown at retaining walls. Posts should be driven deep enough at retaining walls so that there is no chance of the posts being pushed over by snow plows or cars.
- Add inverts and/or min. pipe slopes to roof drains to insure flow to infiltration systems. Also add pipe sizes.
- No information relating to where wastewater will be pumped has been provided.
- In general, forebays for detention facilities may not be necessary to meet the 80% TSS removal required under the DEP Stormwater Regulations in that the basin accepts overflows from the subsurface infiltration systems which have Stormceptor units for pretreatment.

#### **Drawing #5**

- "Type 1-1 Bituminous Concrete Pavement" detail doesn't specify gravel subgrade material, is there a specification for this?
- "Wood Guard Rail Detail" shows 24" from face of "face board" to edge of pavement. This doesn't coincide with the layout as shown on Sheets 3 and 4.
- "Stormceptor 450i Detail" should specify cast iron frame and grate model.
- "Concrete Dumpster Pad" detail does not show concrete slab thickness or reinforcement.
- "Earthen Peninsula detail should specify material and minimum side slopes.
- "Concrete Sidewalk" detail should; specify gravel subbase material.
- "Precast Concrete Curb" detail should indicate cement concrete backfill at face of curb.
- "Detention Basin Spillway" detail should specify size of crushed rock for bedding. Rip Rap is shown as 400-500 pound stone...is this correct?
- Cape Cod Berm and Gravel Shoulder detail specifies a 6" reveal – a 4" reveal would be more "plow friendly".
- "Wheelchair Ramp" detail shows "level land 2% slope for drainage" but is contradicted by "8.3% slope" label. If the level landing area is 2% or less then the adjoining slopes should be 8% max. not 10%.

## **Drawing #6**

- “Cross Section Perforated HDPE Pipe” detail shows 12” HDPE pipes laid directly adjacent to one another. In this configuration the backfill between pipes will be difficult to place and compact. Improper backfill at or below the springline of the pipes could cause the pipes to flex or fall completely and then cause the pavement above to fail. We generally recommend that any perforated pipes or infiltration units in a subsurface infiltration system be encompassed by a 1 ½ to 2” envelopes of crushed stone surrounded by filter fabric to provide additional storage and protect against siltation and eventual failure of the system.
- Pipe types, slopes, and inverts should be shown for roof drains.

## **Drawing #7**

N/C

## **Drawing #8**

N/C

## Drawing #9

N/C

*John Burrey  
 Paul Decker  
 David Colton  
 Linda M. Full*

**Catlin  
 Architecture**

November 3, 2009  
 Catlin Architecture Project # 28005  
 Invoice # 28005-10

Mr. Paul Gallagher  
 Chairman, Building Committee  
 26 Evergreen Street  
 Kingston, MA 02364

**PAY ONLY \$ 38,729.60**

RE: Architectural Services for Kingston Adult Community Center

Phase	Total Fee	% Fee	% Complete	Total
Schematic Design	\$ 41,496	15%	100%	\$41,496
Design Development	\$ 55,328	20%	90%	\$49,795
Construction Documents	\$ 110,656	40%	75%	\$82,992
Bidding & Negotiation	\$ 13,832	5%	0%	\$0
Construction Administration	\$ 55,328	20%	0%	\$0

**Total Fee** \$ 276,640

Total Fee Billing to Date for Architecture  
 Less Previous Amount Billed  
 Current Fee Billing

\$ 174,283.20 ✓  
 \$ (135,553.60) ✓  
 \$38,729.60 ✓

**TOTAL CURRENT FEE DUE** \$38,729.60 ✓

NOI	\$ 6,500.00	100%	Complete	\$ 6,500.00
Wetlands Replication (Design)	\$ 6,450.00	100%	Complete	\$ 6,450.00
Less Previous Amount Billed				\$ (12,950.00)
Current NOI Fee Billing				\$ -

**TOTAL AMOUNT DUE** \$38,729.60 ✓

*M. Boyce  
 Oh I P...  
 "P3"*

November 12, 2009

Jill Meyers, Town Administrator  
Town of Kingston  
26 Evergreen Street  
Kingston, MA 02364

**Re: Kingston Senior Center**

**Sub: Owners' Project Management Services**

Invoice # 1

FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED

For professional services provided for the Kingston Senior Center Project in accordance with our contract with the Town of Kingston.

	<u>FEE</u>	<u>% COMPLETE</u>	
Services	\$45,000	10%	\$ 4,500.00
Less Previous Invoices			\$ - 0 -
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT DUE THIS INVOICE</b>			<b>\$ 4,500.00</b>

Thank you for the opportunity to be of service.

Sincerely,

  
Daniel A. Pallotta  
President

  
  
  
  
