

DYIMS BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES



PMA Consultants

PROJECT: Dennis Yarmouth Intermediate MS
LOCATION: Virtual Meeting

MEETING DATE: July 22, 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) ☐ Mark Adrean (MA)
☒ Jon Pope (JP) ☒ Nick Hull (NH)

PE (Designer): ☐ Robert Bell (RB) ☒ Daniel Colli (DC) ☒ Russell Higgins (RH) ☒ 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: 09/30/21: Meeting was called to order at 4:32 PM by Joe Tierney with 16 voting members present.
01/16:02	SBC Monthly	Approval of Minutes: MOTION: Motion for the approval of the 6/10 minutes was made by JD. Second by SC. DISCUSSION: None. VOTE: TB - Yes, GS - Yes, JD - Yes, GR – Yes, AK – Yes, CW – Yes, MB - Yes, SC - Yes, RC - Abstain, GB - Yes, PM - Yes, CS - Yes, DF - Abstain, CF - Yes, WR - Yes, JT – Yes (14 Yes, 0 No, 2 Abstain)

DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION

Item	Action/Due	Notes
01/16:04	PMA Monthly	Master Project Schedule: Update 09/30/2021: Lookahead schedule was reviewed during construction update. JT asks if project is on schedule. MM responds with Commodore has maintained the schedule thus far and we are still on track for the substantial completion date.
01/16:05	PMA Monthly	Construction Update: Update 09/30/2021: 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.

PROJECT BUDGET

Item	Action/ Due	Notes
2/13.02	CLOSED	<p>Procurement Updates: Update 06/10/2021: Electrical Bid Protest Update: The AGO ruled in favor of the low bidder, Annese, and the protest made by Wayne J. Griffin Electric was denied. Glass and Glazing Bid Protest Update: The AGO ruled that the low bid of Kapiloff must be rejected due to the low bid not having the required certification. Commodore is currently in the process with Kapiloff on mutually dropping their contract. Commodore will then award to the #2 bid which will have a cost difference of roughly \$82,000. Discussion: GB asked to confirm if Griffin was the low bid. CCR confirmed they were not and Annese was the low bidder. PM asked if this many protests is unusual to have this early in the project. CCR noted it is more than we would like to have but not unusual at all. Market conditions are probably why we are seeing these protests.</p> <p>Perkins Design Proposal for Turf Field: Review and vote to approve the turf field design proposal by PE. GB asked if this a change order to the job. CCR noted that the proposal is for \$95k and is the design only. CW noted that the fields are always at premium and that the new fields could bring economic growth into the town. CW noted that she would need to leave, and her vote would be yes. TB mentioned that the current field is a desert from the use and it's in terrible shape. TB believes these will be great to the town and school. MB agrees with CW and TB. DC reminded everyone that this was in the project and we took it out. It was removed because the hiatus the project went on with the lawsuits. Felt we were behind and had to take things out of the project to make the budget due to economy at the time. Now we are at roughly \$10 million in bid savings and could put this back in the project. SC asked if they are getting equipment to take care of turf included with the changed? WH noted this could be included in construction change cost if desired. DC stated it is typically included. GR asked do we have a place to keep the equipment, or do we need new areas? SC noted it would depend on the size and TB mentioned they could be covered if necessary and sees them left outside at other sites but covered. PM endorses CW and would like to put this back in the project to make sure there is some attraction for the community. PM left the meeting. CCR mentioned that the contractor moving forward with base contract scope and we would need to know sooner rather than later since this could have cost impacts. WR is looking for clarification on pictures shown in the presentation. The snip shown is the contract drawings. TB noted it is a multi-purpose field, also lined for football. GB asked if these exist in the contract now. WH – yes. In the contract they are sod with irrigation right now. It was mentioned and confirmed that “turf” is synthetic turf and not grass.</p> <p>MOTION: GB makes a motion to authorize the proposal. GR seconds. DISCUSSION: CS asked why pay 30 year note on a field that wouldn't last 30 years? Does not think it is a wise investment. TB asked if grass a better investment? CS noted grass needs maintenance but carpet on turf will need to be replaced. TB noted an existing field is in terrible shape. VOTE: CS- No, GB - Yes, GR - Yes, RW – No, GD – Yes, AK – Yes, CF – Yes, JD - Yes, MB – Yes, WR – Yes, SC – Yes, TB - Yes (10 yes, 2 no)</p> <p>Relocation of Bid Savings: A discussion and vote to shift bid savings from construction budget to contingency. As part of the PFA Bid Amendment it is required by the MSBA for the district to confirm what they will be doing with the bid savings.</p> <p>MOTION: CF makes a motion to the district to reallocate the district share of the bid savings the contingency. TB Seconds. DISCUSSION: RW is looking for some clarification on the bid savings. CCR explained we are roughly \$9.9 million below the projects authorized budget. That savings needs to be negotiated what portion goes to district and what goes back to the MSBA, this is part of the PFA Bid Amendment negotiations. Worst case the MSBA can take 57% per the grant. We typically do much better due to ineligible items. GB asks if the savings stays in project till the end of the project, CCR confirmed that is the vote we are looking for. When we reallocate, we are not borrowing that money upfront. The money is there as an insurance policy. JT – if we vote no the funds where do the funds go? CCR confirmed the funds would go away as if we were back at debt exclusion. CCR noted that it is not the entire bid savings and it will only be the district share. VOTE: CS- Yes, GB - Yes, GR - Yes, RW – Yes, GD – Yes, AK – Yes, CF – Yes, JD - Yes, MB – Yes, SC – Yes, TB – Yes (11 yes, 0 no)</p>

01/06:09	SBC Monthly	Key Dates/Next Steps: Update 09/30/2021: 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 \$8.285, 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.

MISCELLANEOUS

Item	Action/ Due	Notes
3/5:01	SBC Monthly	<p>New Business: Update 06/10/2021: It was discussed that the updated district roster needs to be sent to the MSBA. It was noted that the board of selectman need to vote members to the SBC as special designation employees.</p> <p>Technical Review Committee: The process of the TRC was reviewed including defining discretionary and necessary changes. If a change is under \$10k it will be reviewed with the TRC. If a change is over \$10k it will be reviewed with the SBC. The TRC will be SC, GB, CW and CS.</p> <p>MOTION: CS made a motion to approve the TRC and to amend the authorization amount from \$10k to \$25k. PM Seconds.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: The members of the TRC will need to attend weekly project meetings. Weekly TRC meeting with A/E and PMA to review changes. Gary would like to assign a person with a limit to approve certain change orders. GB notes it was \$50K at CCT project he was involved with. CW asked what PMA thought about the dollar value. CCR mentioned we are ok either way. GR has questions for GB – how many times did it go over \$10k at CCT? Do we want to consider \$25k if there are a lot of items that fall between? GB – probably a dozen that the controller approved.</p> <p>VOTE: CW - Yes, CS- Yes, GB - Yes, GR - Yes, PM - Yes, RW – Yes, GD – Yes, AK – Yes, CF – Yes, JD - Yes, MB – Yes, WR– Yes, SC – Yes, TB – Yes (14 yes, 0 no)</p> <p>Roof Warranty: Reviewed proposed options to upgrade roof systems and change the roof systems.</p> <p>MOTION: GB makes a motion to accept the options. CS second.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: The recommendation is to accept options 2 and 4 which would cost \$16k but would double the warranty of the contract roof. GB – is that for labor and material. DC – depends on the issue. But generally speaking, yes. CS – what about option 1 going to 190. AH – it is over specified for pull out rating (150 vs 190) and 175 is standard value. GD – does the warranty diminish over time? DC – many do not diminish, but we should look at the Saranfil specifications. Is there a service requirement to maintain warranty over the lifetime of the roof? CS – if solar is added will the roofing company void the warranty because solar panels would be added? DC to send the warranty to PMA for distribution.</p> <p>VOTE: CW - Yes, CS- Yes, GB - No, GR - No, PM - Yes, RW – No, GD – Yes, AK – No, CF – No, JD - No, MB – Yes, WR – No, SC – No, TB – Yes (6 Yes, 8 No)</p> <p>MOTION: GB makes a motion to rescind the last vote to readdress the motion. JD seconds.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: None.</p> <p>VOTE: CW - Yes, CS- Yes, GB - Yes, GR - Yes, PM - Yes, RW – Yes, GD – Yes, AK – Yes, CF – Yes, JD - Yes, MB – Yes, WR – Yes, SC – Yes, TB – Yes (14 yes, 0 no)</p> <p>MOTION: GD makes a motion to accept options 2 and 4. JD seconds.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: None.</p> <p>VOTE: CW - Yes, CS- Yes, GB - Yes, GR - Yes, PM - Yes, RW – Yes, GD – Yes, AK – Yes, CF – Yes, JD - Yes, MB – Yes, WR – Yes, SC – Yes, TB – Yes (14 yes, 0 no)</p> <p>Update 09/30/2021: No new items at this time.</p>
2/13:03	Record	<p>Public Comment/Questions: Update 09/30/2021: No new comments at this time.</p>
01/06:10	Record	<p>Adjournment: Update 09/10/2021: MOTION: CW motioned to adjourn made at 5:11PM. GR seconds. DISCUSSION: None. VOTE: 16 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. Next Meeting date: TBD</p>

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: Mitch Miller, PMA Consultants LLC

DATE: September 30, 2021