

**Permanent Building Committee
Minutes of September 28, 2016**

Present from the Permanent Building Committee: Ellis Neofotistos, Phil Thibault, Harvey Gagnon, Michael McNamara and Doug Dooley. Recording Secretary Samantha Carver. The meeting was held at the Historical Society Building 1660 Lakeview Avenue, Dracut, MA.

Absent: Paul Jussaume

Also present: Steve Broadhead & Paul Kalous of Hill International
Andrew Graham of Dracut Public Schools.

The Chairman opened the meeting at 4:46 p.m. Mr. Broadhead stated that Mount Vernon Group apologizes for not being present but they had another commitment.

Rooftop Dunnage

CCD#1 – Mr. Broadhead reported that they do not have a figure on CCD #1 from the contractor.

Mr. Graham stated that he feels the town should not be paying for this item anyways. They drew the plan with the railing interfering with the hatch door and no platform to stand on. The consensus of the committee was that the Architect should have caught this at the time. There were no unknown conditions.

Mr. Graham also discussed the budget from last meeting and stated that he would like to revisit some of the items that they held off on because of concern for the budget.

Invoice

Mr. Broadhead presented an invoice from Hill Associates in the amount of \$7,275 for project management services for the month of August 2016.

The Committee questioned who Robert Bradley was and Mr. Kalous stated that he was on site during the dunnage project when the crane was brought in and he supervised some of the dunnage installation.

Mr. McNamara made a motion to approve Hill invoice #82 in the amount of \$7,275 for project management services for the month of August 2016. Mr. Thibault seconded the motion. The motion carried with four in favor and Mr. Dooley voting opposed.

Evaluations

The Committee began the review of the evaluations. The subcontractors who were reviewed were Amanti with a score of 83 and West Flooring with a score of 92. Mr. Neofotistos asked if the Committee members had any comments on these evaluations and the Committee did not.

The Committee began its DCAMM review evaluation on CTA Construction. The committee went through each question and each member scored the Contractor individually and then they took the average of the five scores to come up with the overall score.

The following was the average score for each category:

1. Quality of Workmanship
 - a. 24,24,24,26,24 – Average Score: 25
2. Project Management: Scheduling
 - a. 7,7,7,7,7 - Average Score: 7
3. Subcontractor Management
 - a. 6,6,6,6,6 - Average Score: 6
4. Safety and Housekeeping Procedures
 - a. 8,7,9,9,7 - Average Score: 8
5. Change Orders
 - a. 7,7,7,3,6 - Average Score: 6
6. Working Relationships
 - a. 5,5,5,5,4 - Average Score: 5
7. Paperwork Processing
 - a. 2,2,2,5,3 - Average Score: 3
8. On Site Supervisory Personnel
 - a. 7,3,10,7,10 - Average Score: 7

Some of the comments by the committee:

#2 – Mayhem, slow, sporadic, missing deadlines, poor coordination, lack of updated schedules, contract behind schedule, contractor always promised schedule and did not deliver

#3 – Management poor, not well run job, subcontractors left to self-coordinate which led to delays, Subcontractors verbally complained about schedule and coordination; one subcontractor came to the Town to file a delay claim

#5 – Relationship with subcontractors affected change orders; claim for extra's for winter conditions unwarranted

#7 – Paperwork constantly not available, issues in all aspects of the project; constantly behind schedule on completion of paperwork and scheduling causing delays

#8 – Poor knowledge on management skills for size and scope of project; inexperience on project this size; Turnover of personnel on project created more issues

Hill International will type up the final version of the evaluation and email it to the secretary for a final review by the Chairman and then have the Town Manager sign it as the Awarding Authority.

The Committee began its DCAMM review evaluation of the Architect. The Committee used a similar method by everyone giving a score and then they will calculate the average of the scores to come up with the final score.

- Question 1 – 3,3,3,3,3, - Average $3 \times .20 = .60$
- Question 2 – 3,3,3,2,3 – Average $2.8 \times .10 = .28$
- Question 3 – 2,2.7,2,3,3 – Average $2.5 \times .10 = .25$
- Question 4 – 2,2.3,2.5,2.5,2.5 – Average $2.4 \times .05 = .12$
- Question 5 – 1,2,2,2,2 – Average $1.8 \times .40 = .72$
- Question 6 – 3,3,3.5,3,3 – Average $3.1 \times .10 = .31$
- Question 7 – 3,3,3.5,3.5,4 – Average $3.4 \times .05 = .17$

The total score was: 2.45

Budget Discussion

The Committee revisited the budget and Mr. Kalous noted that the final amount was a little more than what had been discussed last week. The last submittal to the MSBA by the Town Accountant was April 2016.

The Committee discussed with Mr. Graham what items he would like to get for the project. Mr. Graham discussed the tables and receptacles for the courtyard at approximately \$15,000; the projector for the library which would be approximately \$30,000 or less and they're looking to construct a school store which he may just be looking for the materials for a cost of \$20,000.

Mr. Graham also mentioned that the Superintendent would like to get some more technology for the school. There was a discussion from the Committee about getting solid quotes to bring back to the committee and also that Mr. Graham will have a conversation with the Superintendent to see what his intentions are. Mr. Graham noted that he would rather use the money set aside for the coils for the heating on something else. He does not have the ability to store the coils and he believes that if one or two went during the heating season at \$600 a piece he could absorb that in his budget. This would free up another \$33,000 for other things at the High School. The Committee stated they will close the purchase order for the coils.

The next Permanent Building Committee meeting will be in two weeks on October 12, 2016 at 4:30p.m. The Committee will discuss the field house project and go over any quotes that Mr. Graham was able to obtain.

Field House Project Update

Mr. Graham stated the Contractor has been on site and they have the footings and frost walls in and they are starting the trenches. He said they did some damage to the sprinkler system and

some wiring but they assured Mr. Graham they will repair it. He stated there is nothing being done yet with the water or sewer departments. While Mr. Graham was at the meeting he received a call from the Architect Jay Mason stating that the Contractor would like to have a meeting on site at 11:00 a.m. Friday. Mr. Graham also mentioned that they may be going with the steel roof versus the shingles. Mr. Graham wasn't too happy they weren't able to do the overhang but the concrete is poured so that they could add this later.

Minutes

June 22, 2016 – Mr. Thibault made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Gagnon seconded the motion. The motion carried, Mr. McNamara abstained.

July 13, 2016 – Mr. Thibault made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Gagnon seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

July 21, 2016 – Mr. Thibault made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Gagnon seconded the motion. The motion carried, Mr. Dooley abstained.

August 10, 2016 – Mr. Thibault made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. McNamara seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Adjourn

Mr. Thibault made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:44 p.m. Mr. McNamara seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.



Michael S. McNamara

Permanent Building Committee






