



TOWN OF RICHMOND
RICHMOND TOWN CENTER
203 Bridge Street, P.O. Box 285
Richmond, Vermont 05477



MEMORANDUM

Date: December 7, 2017

To: File

From: Geoffrey Urbanik, Town Manager

RE: Notes on West Main extension session of November 17, 2017

As noted in the specification for the West Main Utilities Extension, a mandatory prebid and site meeting was held on November 17, 2017 at 9:00 AM. Those in attendance were:

Geoffrey Urbanik, Town Manager
Jeff Forward, CESU facilities manager and Richmond Energy Coordinator

George R. Shortsleeves, ECI
Jonathan Ashley, Dubois & King, Inc.
Christopher Galipeau, Civil Engineering Associates
Lindsay Vincelle, Munson Earth Moving
Michael Drescher, J. Hutchins
Benjamin D. Heath, Hamlin Consulting Engineers
Eric Freehart, Munson Earth Moving

I noted that due to a delay in publishing the notice, I added another prebid and site visit for December 8th at 9:00 am. This was an either/or prebid, it was not mandatory to attend both.

After introductions, I gave an overview of the project and provided some information on where the online information could be found to clarify the project. Green Mountain Engineering had done a substantial amount of work on a preliminary engineering report that outlined what the town wanted to do. This solicitation was for phases 1 and 2 only, from the edge of the system to the Mobil station on Route 2.

Following the project overview, questions and comments were heard:

Questions asked were:

| <u>Questions</u> | <u>My Answer</u> |
|--|--|
| If we choose a design/builder will the project definitely go forward? | I said we were interested in moving the project forward but it was likely that a vote of the expansion area would be required prior to our committing to construction. |
| There was a feeling that we were asking every contractor to invest \$10,000 to \$15,000 on estimation before we chose our contractor, and that they would like us to proceed differently by selecting a qualified contractor based on a concept and then design build after they are hired (this represents less risk and cost to the bidder). | I didn't have an answer at that time, this is a board discussion. |
| Why hasn't the town completed a final design on their own, for contractors to bid on? | I explained that the Water Commission felt that there may be options left unexplored by GME that would yield a lower project cost. |
| Jeff Forward asked if there was an easement necessary for CESU | I said that was something the boards can discuss. |
| Will the design-builder obtain easements? | I explained that the town would be responsible for obtaining easements |
| Is there Act 250 Jurisdiction on the school property? | We did not know, Jeff Forward said he would check into this. |
| Can we push the response date off until January 5 th ? | For the board to decide. |
| When will vote be for expansion owners? | I didn't have a firm vote date set. This is a chicken/egg – do we vote first, on what? Do we wait for pricing first, and risk losing builder interest? |
| | |
| <u>Comments</u> | |
| There were several questions on the viability of the project, particularly around cost and willingness of the property owners to pay. | |
| They requested a utilities map be sent out, with sizing. | I believe we already have this and can send it out. |
| There was an error in the RFP, noting “all three phases” | Should just be Phases 1 and 2; I'll issue a correction. |
| Feeling that with a contingency, would not likely be less than \$1 million. | |
| I think the schools injected themselves at the beginning, not to be discouraging of contractors, but to state their interest as | |

| | |
|---|--|
| property owners. I don't know how well that went over. | |
| Again, the final issue was they all felt that we were not going about it the right way and that we should first select a qualified builder based on a concept and then proceed to final design and construction costs second. | This is a new direction and a start-from-scratch issue – this RFP does not do this and we would scrap it, rescind it and re-do it on a new timeline. |

The group proceeded to the field and met at the Phase 1 site of Bob and Joy Reap, and viewed the existing start-point of Camels Hump Middle School, the RLT property and the Reap property. Moving west through the Gateway required no further explanation from me. A few questions were answered but it was more important for the group to see the lay of the land on site.

The Richmond Water Commission discussed these questions and comments at their November 20th meeting. The board did agree to amend the due date to January 5th and to alert the property owners/residents of the Gateway expansion area to a special meeting on the subject for January 29, 2018.