

DYIMS BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES



PMA Consultants

PROJECT: Dennis Yarmouth Intermediate MS
LOCATION: Virtual Meeting

MEETING DATE: December 02, 2021

ATTENDEES:

Bldg. Committee: ☒ Joe Tierney (JT) ☒ Sandra Cashen (SC) ☒ Robert Ciavarra (RC) ☐ George Davis (GD)
☒ James Dykeman (JD) ☒ Carol Woodbury (CW) ☒ Chris Flanagan (CF) ☒ Mike Bovino (MB)
☒ Robert Whritenour (RW) ☐ Ann Knell (AK) ☐ Eric Tolley (ET) ☒ Tim Blake (TB)
☒ Jenifer Legge (JL) ☒ Phillip Morris (PM) ☐ Michael Nardone (MN) ☒ Gary Barber (GB)
☒ Greg Rounseville (GR) ☐ Will Rubenstein (WR) ☒ Curt Sears (CS) ☐ Cleon Turner (CT)
☒ David Flynn (DF)

PMA: ☒ Chad Crittenden (CCR) ☐ Walter Hartley (WH) ☒ Mitch Miller (MM) ☒ Nick Hull (NH)
☒ Jon Pope (JP)

PE (Designer): ☒ Robert Bell (RB) ☐ Daniel Colli (DC) ☒ Andrew Hazelton (AH)
Traverse (Site): ☐ Kris Bradner (KB) ☐ John Luca (JL) ☐ Justin Robertshaw (JL)
Guests: ☐ Joe Glynn (JG) ☐ Eileen Whalen (EW) ☒ Todd Brayton (TB)

GENERAL

Item	Action/Due	Notes
01/16:01	SBC Monthly	Call to Order: – Roll Call: 12/02/21: Meeting was called to order at 4:33 PM by Joe Tierney with 15 voting members present.
01/16:02	SBC Monthly	Approval of Minutes: MOTION: Motion for the approval of the 9/30 minutes was made by CS. Second by PM. DISCUSSION: None. VOTE: JT – Yes, JD- Yes, RW- Yes, JL- Yes GR, - Yes, DF- Yes, CW- Yes, PM- Yes, RC- Yes, CF- Yes, CS- Yes MB- Yes, TB- Yes, GB- Yes (14 Yes, 0 No) SC not here at time of voting.

DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION

Item	Action/Due	Notes
01/16:04	PMA Monthly	Master Project Schedule: Update 12/02/2021: Lookahead schedule was reviewed during construction update. PM asks if the project is on schedule and how it is going. MM notes we are still on schedule for our substantial completion date October 14, 2022.
01/16:05	PMA Monthly	Construction Update: Update 12/02/2021: Construction progress photos of the site were reviewed. Completed activities and lookahead schedule were discussed and reviewed.
	PMA Monthly	Design Update: Update 09/30/2021: Synthetic field update: 100% drawings were issued in 9/28/21. Commodore is working on getting pricing finalized. Once ready, the final pricing will be ready to review with the SBC. Traffic Light Update: The traffic light currently included the project was reviewed by the Board of Selectman (BoS) on 9/14/21 since it will be located on town of Yarmouth property and will also control traffic on Stave Ave. The BoS decided to continue the meeting to 10/5/21 to allow more time for public comment and review. MOTION: CS motions to recommend that the School Building Committee recommend to the Board of Selectman to keep the traffic light in the project. GB seconds. DISCUSSION: It was mentioned that the cost of the light is already included in the construction project. The equipment for the light has already been bought by the sitework contractor due to lead times. PMA is also going to present the traffic light information to the School Committee on 10/4/21. VOTE: TB - Yes, GS - Yes, JD - Yes, GR – Yes, AK – Yes, CW – Yes, MB - Yes, SC - Yes, RC - Yes, GB - Yes, PM - Yes, CS - Yes, DF - Yes, CF - Yes, WR - Yes, JT - Yes Station Ave Landscaping Update: The design team issued a bulletin for adding landscaping Infront of field C on Station Ave. The TRC approved the additional costs for the plantings and a layout was presented to the SBC. The design team also issued a new layout for the sidewalk on Station Ave. The sidewalk now has a curve in it to miss some exiting utility poles and drainage structures. It was noted that for safety there is an athletic net on the end of the field and that PMA is looking into options for a fence along Station Ave. to help keep balls in the field for safety.

Update 12/02/2021: Synthetic field update: Formal pricing has been received from Commodore as a change order request. PMA, PE and subconsultants have reviewed and sent comments back regarding the costs. Prices came back rather high especially for the sitework that needs to be done. PMA provided two options on how to proceed from here. CC notes that one of the reasons for the increase in pricing is due to the fact that this is a change order now. He also mentions that we had another price submitted for the sitework that was similar to RBO's. CC notes there is a shortage of stone on Cape Cod and the stone is going to have to come from off cape which is driving up cost. CC notes that the value is a real value for the work that is going to have to be done.

MOTION: No motion at this time, pushed to next meeting on 01/06/21.

DISCUSSION: CW asks about possible credit we would receive for the grass work that is not being done. CC notes this cost includes the credit for not including the grass. RD asks about the life expectancy of the fields. CC notes 10-15 years and it depends on the maintenance program and the use of the field. MM mentions the equipment is included to work on the field. GB asks about cost of the equipment and if it is included. MM notes we don't know the exact cost. He doesn't think getting less than 10 years out of a field and having to replace the turf field for 1.1 million is worth it. GB says the town should sublet the work to be performed on the field and take the cost of the equipment and maintenance of the field. JT asks if Barnstable maintained their own field and if the life expectancy to increase? GB says Plymouth got 15 years out of their field and it was professionally maintained. GB suggests professional landscaper work on fields if they stay grass. RC asks about option 2 re-bid. CC notes option 2 isn't recommended since PMA received check-pricing from another major site subcontractor and it came in the same, this would only open the district up to additional liability resulting from possible scope gaps. PM- agrees with GB points and feels like this could be a hot point for the public if not dealt with properly. TB- Understands cost of replacing turf, doesn't want grass field to be a dirt field in less than a year. CW- says that she had a pretty extensive conversation with Steve Faucher and she thinks it would be helpful to have Steve included to decide whether or not to do the work themselves. CW wants to talk to other school districts about possibly joining together to maintain their fields. JT wants to know the cost for an outside company to maintain field. CS mentions true life expectancy is all over the place. Has issues with the million dollars to replace the turf. Notes it is going to be difficult to budget for the maintenance of the field. He also doesn't want to burn up the contingency for this work. DF notes it's a couple of drag machines only for equipment. He thinks it's worth buying the equipment and have an outside company come a few times a year to do top dressing, notes equipment is around 14k. RW doesn't want to make decision based on students on grass field. Agrees with DF that there is no special maintenance for the field, says it's about the consistency of the maintenance, not opposed to having a privatized company come in and do additional work that is necessary. Doesn't think it's wise to turn over the maintenance of the entire field to an outside company. Doesn't want to give up equipment for the school and then be left out to dry by the company maintaining it. JT notes that high school field and track need to be done, hoping they can do turf and they will already have the equipment for it. JT wants to hold off on vote and wants more input from key people. Wants to look into annual cost of outside company. Wants to look at the equipment cost. GB thinks it's foolish to not have the equipment for 14 thousand dollars. DF shared numbers of field equipment of 14 thousand dollars from project in North Attleboro. CW notes the maintenance of the field and wants to remind everyone that it's not farfetched to have this sort of maintenance of these fields 10-15 years down the road. Notes all surrounding schools have turf fields and the beauty of the turf fields is the use that they can take. They have many uses and provide more opportunities than grass fields. In favor of moving vote to January 6th meeting. Also wants to look at contingency money before decision. PM- Notes we have opportunity to build good base. CS says the buzz around town is that field can be revenue source and he believes that the revenue from that should go into the maintenance of the field. JT will push decision to January 6th. JT notes project came in under budget quite some bit and can use that to pay for field. CC notes that the PFA bid amendment brings around 10 million dollars back into the town budget and PMA recommends using this on the field. JT notes we would still save taxpayer money. CS notes that the money is borrowed money.

VOTE: No motion/vote. Item has been continued to January 6th meeting.

Traffic Light Update: The light was approved by BOS. There are some changes coming to the light like cameras instead of ground loop sensors. Also wanted to include a post construction review 3 and 6 months. Need PE proposal approved by TRC. If over 25K SBC will need to approve.

PROJECT BUDGET

Item	Action/Due	Notes
01/06:09	SBC Monthly	Key Dates/Next Steps: Update 12/02/2021: Construction continues, and the next SBC will provide another construction update.
07/09:01	SBC Monthly	Cashflow Update: Update 06/10/2021: Paid to date is \$8.285M, Cashflow will increase once construction invoices are received. PFA Bid Amendment is ongoing with MSBA at this time. Update 9/30/2021: Paid to date is \$17.052M. Cashflow has started to increase with work picking up in the project. Update 12/02/2021: Paid to date is \$26.087M. Cashflow will continue to increase as more trades have been on site.

MISCELLANEOUS

Item	Action/Due	Notes
3/5:01	SBC Monthly	New Business: Update 12/02/2021: FFE/IT: Due to the lead times on products PMA wants to begin FFE/IT discussions. MOTION: To allow the TRC to authorize and issue purchase orders. The committee will be notified by email on the decisions being made. CS motions to accept this and PM seconded. DISCUSSION: CC notes we need to order network switches soon. MM notes long lead times on these that help get mechanical systems up and running. Need authorization to release purchase orders. CC notes superintendent typically gives ok on PO's but we need to know how to get approval to issue PMA recommends appointing a person to sign off on this or a small committee. CS asks if this is in budget. CC notes it is in soft cost budget. CC reassures CS that the money has been planned for. PM wants transparency in this process and wants to let the people know what authorizations are being made. He wants to endorse decision making process and help with any decision being made. CS suggests wrapping this into TRC. JT wants to keep people into the loop. CS notes we could notify committee by email to object. CC says this will include small decisions and recommends monthly FFE/IT budget updates during SBC meetings. PMA will track these PO's into the project's master budget. PMA just needs someone to authorize these decisions. TRC could do this process. VOTE: JT – Yes, JD- Yes, RW- Yes, JL- Yes GR, - Yes, DF- Yes, CW- Yes, PM- Yes, RC- Yes, CF- Yes, CS- Yes MB- Yes, TB- Yes, GB- Yes, SC- Yes, (15 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain)
2/13:03	Record	Public Comment/Questions: Update 12/02/2021: Joe Glynn- Martha's Vineyard did a study and did a cost benefit analysis and wants the committee to look into this. Notes everyone is doing a great job. Notes 300,000 was maintenance cost and their costs were around 7 million for several fields. Study compared other fields and towns. RW notes he was involved with the turf on MV. He noted the primary concerns with the study were the environmental impact of the fields.
01/06:10	Record	Adjournment: Update 12/02/2021: MOTION: JT motioned to adjourn made at 5:29PM. CS seconds. DISCUSSION: None. VOTE: 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. Next Meeting date: January 6, 2022.

PMA Consultants assumes, to the best of our knowledge, that the above content of these Meeting Minutes depicts all that transpired during this Project meeting. All attendees are required to address by memo or via e-mail, any omissions, errors or inconsistencies in the reporting of these Meeting Minutes, to the writer, within two (2) business days of receipt of these Meeting Minutes.

PREPARED BY: Nick Hull, PMA Consultants LLC

DATE: December 2, 2021