DYIMS

BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

☑ Tracy Post☑ Tim Craw



PROJECT: Dennis Yarmouth Intermediate MS MEETING DATE: March 25, 2021 **LOCATION: Virtual Meeting ATTENDEES:** □ George Davis (GD) Bldg. Committee:

☐ Joe Tierney (JT) ☑ Robert Ciavarra (RC) □ Carol Woodbury (CW) □ Chris Flanagan (CF) ☐ Daniel Knapik (DK) ⋈ Ann Knell (AK) ☐ Eric Tolley (ET) □ Phillip Morris (PM) ☐ Michael Nardone (MN) □ Gary Barber □ Greg Rounseville (GR) ⋈ Will Rubenstein (WR) □ Curt Sears (CS) ☐ Cleon Turner (CT) PMA: □ Chad Crittenden (CCr) ☐ Jon Pope PE (Designer): □ Robert Bell (RB) ☑ Daniel Colli (DC) ☑ Russell Higgins (RH) ⋈ Andrew Hazelton (AH) ☐ Pam Perini (PP – Security Consultant) ☐ Justin Robertshaw (JL) Traverse (Site): ☐ Kris Bradner (KB) ☐ John Luca (JL) Guests: ☑ Pat Tompkins \square Lyle Cofflin $oxed{\boxtimes}$ Peter McNulty $oxed{\boxtimes}$ David Fontaine $\hfill\square$ Eileen Whalen ☑ Nasra Nimaga □ John Connelly $\hfill\square$ Dan Broyles ⋈ Kait Johnson ☐ Michael Roach ☑ Rachel Mills

 \boxtimes CTA

GENERAL

| Item | Action/ | Notes |
|----------|----------------|---|
| | Due | |
| 01/16:01 | SBC Monthly | <u>Call to Order:</u> – Roll Call: 03/25/21: Meeting was called to order at 4:02 PM by Joe Tierney with 16 voting members present. |
| 01/16:02 | SBC Monthly | Approval of Minutes: MOTION: Incorrect file was sent to the committee. Minutes from 11/19/2020 will be voted for approval at next meeting. DISCUSSION: none. VOTE: N/A |

☑ Rich Lucht

□ David Jolin

DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION

| | 223idit d Collo Mocholt | | |
|----------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Item | Action/ | Notes | |
| | Due | | |
| 01/16:03 | SBC | Overview of Meeting Agenda: | |
| | Monthly | <u>Update 03/25/2021:</u> The agenda item is to determine if CTA is a responsible bidder. | |
| 01/06:04 | PMA | Master Project Schedule: | |
| | Monthly | Update 03/25/2021: No update was provided. | |
| 2/13.01 | PMA | Focus Group Updates: | |
| | Monthly | <u>Update 03/25/2021:</u> No focus groups were held since the last SBC meeting. | |

PROJECT BUDGET

| Item | Action/ | Notes |
|---------|----------------|---|
| | Due | |
| 2/13.02 | PMA Monthly | Procurement Updates: |
| | | <u>Update 03/25/2021:</u> |
| | | Joe T opened the meeting with a review of recent events. Information was brought to the attention of the |
| | | committee regarding CTA. The committee had a chance to review this new information. JT opened the |
| | | meeting up for discussion. The agenda item is to determine if CTA is a responsible bidder. |
| | | Discussion pertaining to the responsibleness of CTA: WR wants to understand the definition of the word |
| | | responsible. PMA explained that the AGO's opinion is that responsibleness is at the discretion of the |
| | | awarding authority. Definition from the statute of responsibility was given by Peter M. WR asked: to stay |
| | | focused, "competent, workmanship, and financial soundness are the criteria for determining |
| | | responsibleness". GD is looking for clarity of the newly provided information. GD thinks CTA's rebuttal was |

Page 1 of 4 PMA Consultants LLC

well worded. TB stated what he was read concerning. CS stated that the documents were lengthy. CS is more concerned about the recent (past 3 years) documents than he is the older documents. GR was impressed with CTA's response to the documents. GR mentioned only 1 DCAMM failing grade in the update statement. Another failing grade is currently being reviewed. CF asked what is the time frame in terms of deciding responsibleness today? More time to digest all the information. JT would prefer to move this along. PMA stated this project is 190,000 sq ft, everyday does counts in terms of schedule. Another consideration: filed sub bids have to hold their bids for 30 days which ends today. TB asked if 1 failing grade could possibly be 2 failing grades? JT said that is his conclusion. CW repeated her comments from the last meeting. The amount of litigation is concerning. CW is very concerned about the number of direct payment claims. JT reached out to the Millbury School District. Has not received anything back yet. JT said that an 8-month project with CTA took 2 years to complete in Dedham. PM has 55 new pages of negative information and 91 pages of rebuttal from CTA. Peter M responded to Phil M regarding liability. The AGO states that DY is on reasonable ground to consider the decision of responsibleness. Phil M would ask PMA about their working relationship with CTA. WR followed up on Phill M question. A lot of the committee members have spent 4 years to get to this point in the project. WR would like to get the opinions of PMA and Perkins Eastman. TB noted that problematic issues were listed. WR would like PMA and PE to say anything that they legally can say. Bob Bell mentioned that PE has CTA experience but not he nor Dan Colli have CTA experience. JD followed up on WR comments. At the high school project, the Turner Construction clerk of the works warned them of the issues that they would find with Alexandra. Phil M echoed some of JD's observations. Phil M is confident in the consultants to deliver a good project. Robert C has done OPM and Clerk work on much smaller projects. He is not surprised that \$100m jobs have arguments. SC voted for CTA but when she received the information, she felt that it was another high school type project all over again. CW asked if looking at the next lowest bidder (\$540,000) difference in bid price, would it be possible that you could run up bills just from constant turmoil? CW asked if this would be "penny wise and pound foolish?" CF asked if this committee finds CTA not responsible, is the provided information sufficient to back up the decision. CF is concerned about a dispute process. JT stated that it is up to the awarding authority to interpret the information as they see fit. GD asked about timeframe, he made the point that choosing the GC is the single most important decision of the project. If a few days could be bought to make a better-informed decision GD would prefer going this route. JL wanted to clarify that today is the last day for the filed sub bids. 30-day period for filed sub bids to hold their bid prices. CS stated that the second lowest bidders do not have to hold their bids either. CW asked PMA if CTA is determined not responsible, would the next lowest bidder information be reviewed? Yes. School committee has a meeting scheduled for tomorrow at 5 to rescind CTA approval and award the next lowest bidder if need be. JT would like to let CTA chime in and then more discussion can be had. Pat Tompkins of CTA spoke. An occupied phased renovation with Perkins Eastman was discussed. This was a successful project and CTA has a letter of reference from PE. Background on CTA was given. Pat T and Lyle C are two of the original founders. CTA decided not to re-sign with the labor unions. When CTA did this the unions started spreading packages of false information. Pat T believes CTA can provided the highest quality of workmanship. Of the items in the package the "cherry-picked" issues are sometime erroneous or false. Tahanto project had to go to arbitration. Pat T mentioned 32 successful MSBA projects. Open lawsuits mostly stem from the renovation of a 127-year-old building. DOT project got off to a challenging start. DOT did finish on a successful note. Staffing changes were made. CTA wants to reinsure the committee that this will be the best project DY and the cape have ever seen. CTA will utilize open shop subcontractors. JT asked for any questions regarding CTA. Phil M asked if the prevailing wage legislature applies to this job. Yes, prevailing wage rates apply. Any other discussion? WR made a motion to rescind the recommendation to the school committee to award to CTA. SC second. WR withdrew his motion after Peter M suggested clarity of the motion.

MOTION: WR motion to find CTA not responsible. CW second.

DISCUSSION: None.

<u>VOTE</u>: TB yes, SC yes, BC no, GB yes, GD no, JD yes, CF yes, MB yes, AK yes, JL no, PM no, GR no, WR yes, CS Yes, CW yes, JT abstain. (10,5,1)

MOTION: WR motioned to rescind the recommendation to the school committee to award the contract to CTA. CS second.

DISCUSSION: None.

<u>VOTE:</u> TB yes, SC yes, RC no, GB yes, GD no, JD yes, CF Yes, MB yes, AK Yes, Jen L No, PM yes, GR no, WR yes, CS yes, CW yes, JT abstain. (11,4,1)

JT asked CCr what the next steps are. The number 2 bidder information will be presented. Screen share was requested. Commodore's bid was reviewed. \$83,843,640. Discussion to determine if commodore is responsible. CS asked if due diligence was done. Yes. **MOTION:** CS made a motion to find commodore responsible. WR second. **DISCUSSION:** RC asked a comparative question, and these cannot be answered. JT asked about the 2020 safety mod. CCr explained a lower number is better. Below 1 is great. CS asked about safety mod being tied to workers comp. Yes. WR asked if Perkins had any experience or history with commodore. Andy H completed a \$30m project and had an excellent experience with them. JT asked PMA if there are any other opinions to be shared. PMA will not share any opinions. WH has not worked with commodore on a project. JT motion on the floor. VOTE: GD left the meeting. TB yes, SC yes, BC yes, GB yes, JD yes, CF yes, MB yes, AK yes, JL yes, PM yes, GR yes, WR yes, CS yes, CW yes, JT yes, Unanimous. 15,0,0. **MOTION**: CS motioned to recommend awarding the project to Commodore. **DISCUSSION:** None. <u>VOTE:</u> Tb yes, SC yes, BC yes, Gb yes, JD yes, CF yes, MB yes, AK yes, JL yes, PM yes, GR yes, WR yes, CS yes, CW yes, JT yes, unanimous. 15,0,0. WR thanked peter M for his efforts. Joe G asked about the 30-day sub bidder pricing. PMA responded that this should not be a problem. CS commented the zoom link to be sent out for the School Committee Meeting. Motion to adjourn CS, CW second. 5:48 pm. **MOTION:** Motion to adjourn CS, CW second. 5:48 pm. **DISCUSSION:** None. VOTE: Unanimous. **Key Dates/Next Steps:** Update 10/29/2020: 22Sep20: 60% Design Submission to MSBA 20Nov20: 90% Design Submission to MSBA SBC 01/06:09 13Jan21: 100% Construction Documents Complete Monthly 14Jan21 -> 17Feb21: Bidding (added one week to durations due to holiday) Update 03/22/2021: 16Mar21 -> 01APR21: Contracts executed & construction permitting (SWPPP, NOI, CGP permitting, etc.) Building substantially complete Oct 14, 2022. Ready for occupancy January 2nd, 2023. Update 03/25/2021: No new update at this time. Cashflow Update: Update 03/22/2021: Paid to date \$7.025M, Cashflow will increase when construction starts. PFA bid SBC 07/09:01 Monthly amendment will be next milestone. A Schedule of values will be reviewed with the GC. Update 03/25/2021: No new update at this time.

MISCELLANEOUS

| Item | Action/ | Notes |
|----------|----------------|---|
| | Due | |
| 3/5.01 | SBC Monthly | New Business: Update 03/22/2021: JT asked for new business from the committee: WR expressed his condolences about the loss of Ken Jenks. Technical Review committee: PMA would like to make a recommendation for a 3-person review committee to expedite the execution of potential change orders. WH explained how and why this committee will be formed. JT asked if we need those three persons to be recommended and voted at the next meeting (yes). CS is interested in being on that TRC as well as Gary Barber. Update 03/25/2021: No new update at this time. |
| 2/13.03 | Record | Public Comment/Questions: Update 03/22/2021: Public comment: none. Update 03/25/2021: No new comments at this time. |
| 01/06:10 | Record | Adjournment: Update 03/22/2021: |

| MOTION: CS motioned to adjourn made at 5:48PM by PM, second by CF. DISCUSSION: None. |
|--|
| VOTE: 15 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstain. The motion carries. |
| Next Meeting date: TBD |

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 email, 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: Mark Adrean, PMA Consultants LLC

Page 4 of 4 PMA Consultants LLC

DATE: April 06, 2021