

**Wachusett Regional School District (WRSD) Building Committee
Meeting
1/12/05**

In Attendance: Catherine Collins, Roger Boddie (URS), Frank Fiore (URS, Construction Manager), Gene Raymond (SHR, Architects), Duncan Leith, Mike McLarney (URS), Steve Penka (WRSD), Joe Raimondo (SHR), Ralph Rondinone, Mike Tsotsis, Emerson W. Wheeler, III, and Tom Pandiscio (WRSD).

I. The meeting was called to order at 6:10 pm.

II. Brian Bullock, Holden Town Manager, was present and asked to speak. Mr. Bullock raised his concern over the e-mail of Suzanne Breen to the Mass Highway Dept. which referred to the altering of the curb for a crosswalk for students in front of the school and Ms. Breen's frustrations with the Town of Holden to do the work on the curb. Mr. Bullock noted the Town never received the request and only received a cc on the e-mail. He said he was surprised there was such request because the BC's engineers said there was no need for a crosswalk. Further, he said Holden can't work on a state highway, the Planning Board required a sidewalk from the signalized crosswalk, but this wasn't done yet. Mr. Bullock was concerned with the e-mail sent suggesting the Town wasn't doing its job. Mr. Bullock asked for an apology to the Town and a letter to the Mass Highway Dept explaining the e-mail was wrong.

The BC made it clear to Mr. Bullock that Ms. Breen was not part of the BC, did not express the position of the BC, and that the BC knew nothing of the e-mail until Mr. Bullock described it at this meeting and the members of the BC were then given a copy of it. Tom P. noted that Ms. Breen worked in his office, but that he had not seen the e-mail before tonight. He agreed that a memo like this shouldn't have gone to the MHD. Tom said he was aware that Joe, an employee of the MHD, suggested the Town be contacted to cut the curb since it was the Town's sidewalk. Steve said he asked Dennis Lipka regarding the process to initiate a curb cut, costs, and who would pay for such work. Steve said he hadn't seen the e-mail either. Tom said he would write a letter tomorrow. Mr. Bullock said the Town of Holden is not trying to harm the project, but that we can't have this type of communication. Mr. Bullock then left the meeting.

III. Approval of prior meeting minutes from 10/27 was deferred to make sure all members received the revised minutes. Ralph will resend the minutes to Mike T. for circulation to the committee.

IV. Architect Update.

GC review. URS reported that work on buildings A & B is going slow; there is some issue with communications between TLT back to SHR and some issues on the site work – water on the existing field and drainage. The erosion control meeting took place and they are working to control the site. Revised rear access to the parking areas to prevent blasting is being done. Dan Nason, Holden Town, put it on hold to think further on the

slope and other issues with the engineers. He is also working on other non-school issues that are taking up his time.

b. Schedule – dates for completion and recovery schedule – URS is having someone look at the schedule and determine if it needs any changes.

c. Intel Equipment -- Gene and Chuck (URS) are to discuss having a salvage contractor see what they can do with the equipment. Gene will contact Chuck again.

d. Staffing – staffing with SHR was raised and whether there was sufficient staff on the project. Gene said he would be on the project 2 days a week, and would be on site to deal with the issues starting tomorrow (Tuesdays & Thursdays, going forward). Gene said Bill Ryder is still involved with the project, but not on site. Joe R. is not on the site daily, but is in the office doing the paperwork. URS is on the site daily, 1-2 people daily. Ralph R. questioned whether we had sufficient coverage on the site. Gene said the project requires an architect on site, so he will make sure he is on the site. He admitted that Joe R. needed help and that was no fault of his own, but that the project needed more help for Joe from SHR and Gene was going to provide that.

V. Construction Manage Update – refer to the material passed out by URS. URS reviewed the construction progress. The 1/05 upcoming work is taken from the contractor's schedule. Roger (URS) reviewed the milestones schedule, which is updated from TLT's latest schedule. URS will be meeting with TLT soon. URS will add the original contract schedule date in the latest chart so that we can see where TLT is off with the work schedule. As to winter conditions, and TLT's position with the schedule, these were discussed by URS. The winter conditions affect masonry. URS has been asking TLT for a recovery plan or schedule since 9/04 in order to get back to where we want to be.

The TLT letter on their position needs to be responded to and URS is working on the response. SHR said the big issue with TLT is the exterior work. SHR unofficially said to TLT that TLT owns the exterior, but not C. And, SHR said with A, we all need to work together to move it along. F is "on line" per TLT. A is not an issue with winter conditions, but does delay the schedule. Tom P. said the issue is the presence of unsuitables and then the impact on the schedule that provides reason for TLT to change the schedule. TLT made the decision to start or delay the project by 3 months and then we ran into a time problem with the unsuitables.

TLT told us there would be no scheduling impact with the late start. URS and SHR are working on the response to TLT. The BC will see the letter before it is sent out. URS said TLT started the building and ran into unsuitables, which was unexpected, and then had more unsuitables on the 2nd and 3rd buildings. TLT will run into more unsuitables on the next building. URS stated that in each change order we were never asked to consider and we never considered any time extensions. One thought is to consider doing a "no contract cost time extension" where the builder is "fined" if the project ends late. These items need to be considered.

Also, 3 issues need to be dealt with: environmental erosion issues, unsuitable soils, and the late start date. There is a cost to extend the finish date.

As to the critical path, see the URS report; as to Budget, see the report, and see the project phase as to what was spent, where, and how. URS is concerned about the contingency because of the unsuitables, ledge and boulders. The final grading drawings for the redesign of the softball field will be given to TLT on 1/13/05. The “savings” will be money not spent.

As to URS’s prioritized list, Chuck was at the 12/22/04 meeting and proposed a top 5 list from URS. #1 – erosion control – a finalized plan is needed, who owns what, and when they owned it, especially if any changed conditions occurred. TLT will say the Dist is the applicant and is responsible for all costs with violations. Was it spec’ed correctly, built correctly, and designed correctly? This is the basis for our position going forward.

The BC then raised these questions that URS noted. Were the specs right? URS said no, SHR said yes. Was it built right? URS said TLT owns an erosion control plan; SHR has been providing it because TLT didn’t do it and will send a letter to TLT to this effect. SHR said the applicant is not responsible for the erosion control. TLT controls the site and SHR has no control over the site, TLT has to secure the site. SHR will coordinate a letter to TLT with URS concerning unsuitables, erosion control, winter conditions, and the schedule.

#2 field redesign, #3 schedule – we need to hammer it out with TLT and we need credit for things not started yet, which will save on the winter conditions. #4 the change order process – URS needs to see the back up for the change order before the BC meetings. Therefore, at the first monthly BC meeting, URS will have the change order. The pay application for approving the change order will then be handled at the second meeting within the month. The “process” from the BC’s point of view is to have everything go to the Superintendent first, for approval, and then, to the BC and the BC talks with the Superintendent, as needed. #5 URS will work more with SHR for more technical directions from SHR.

SHR noted that RFIs aren’t a problem from SHR’s point of view, but the redesign was not done within the 3 weeks by SHR as promised, and this has been a problem for URS, which was duly noted by SHR.

VII. Building Committee Issues. a. Done

b. A revised schedule for BC meetings was handed out. URS and Mike T. to meet on the days of the BC meetings, but earlier in the day. (See Exhibit #2).

VIII. Budget Review – SHR – needs to be updated.

IX. Old Business

a. Nike – no information yet per Tom. He is awaiting a response.

- b. Peer Review – no update.
- c. Modular Buildings (Exh. #4) the District is to dispose of the buildings and TLT is responsible to pull the foundations.
- d. Construction issues – information dating back to 12/04
 - i. Erosion control problems –
 - see DCR attachment
 - DEP – no resolution yet
 - ConCom – Mickey Marcus is working with this.
 - Wetlands Restoration Plan – will probably need to do one, but nothing further discussed.
 - Detention Basins – the 2 at the bottom of the parking lot will have to go away at the end of the project
 - Wilson abutting property – the site permit plan requires 50 feet of buffer in natural vegetative state. The site special permit requires this.
 - Other property abutters – Peter Towele – this is being worked out with the abutter.

SHR – Dennis Lipka gave TLT the Mickey Marcus bills totaling \$17,000. TLT is passing the bill on to the BC for payment. The BC passed this issue on to Leo McCabe for his review. The District will call Dennis to let him know our attorney is reviewing the matter.

TLT received the letter of the abutter on headlights and the temporary lights. TLT response – we’ll be working with you, but contact the architect.

- ii. Move issue – SHR has not report at this time.
 - iii. Water Service – Town of Holden bill to TLT for TLT’s break in the water main and the loss of water. This will be TLT’s to take care of.
 - v. Lighting – the football fields should not be a problem; 4 lights will take care of the necessary lighting, 6 lights will not be needed.
 - Temporary lighting – non-issue.
 - vi. Natural Gas Supply/line – awaiting a letter from the gas company.
 - vii. Additional Fill identified – already discussed earlier in the meeting.
- Exh. #7 – Leo McCabe’s letter on the legal significance of the reservation of rights language used in the payment of certain bills was reviewed. He has stated this does preserve the District’s rights to make claim for damages.
- #14 TLT’s letter regarding unsuitables.
- ix. The commemorative plaque is on hold.
 - x. Technology bid – Exh. #8 – the RFQ and letters were discussed and are in the package.
 - xiii. The curbing issue – TLT decided to submit a price for the whole job. Thus, a cost credit may come through on the curbing. Granite will still be used all around the front of the building.
- Exh. #9 – Letter of TLT to abutters

X. New Business - Exh. #10 – Letter regarding the modulares to be reimbursed by the state – to be part of the SBA calculation.

b. Jersey barriers – the District will handle the purchase of them. The purchase order was already issued.

XI. Correspondence –Exhs. #11 and #12 letter(s) from WRSD to SHR and URS were briefly discussed.

The BC then went back in the Agenda to go over item #VI. Payment Authorizations. 2 bills: 12/04 bill of URS for \$18,000, which is in accordance with the contract per Steve. **MOTION:** To approve, made by Duncan, seconded by Emerson, unanimously approved.

Leo McCabe’s bill for \$4,070. for work on technology, the TLT issue, the unsuitables, and the reservation of rights issue. **MOTION:** To approve, made by Emerson, seconded by Duncan, unanimously approved.

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting; made by Duncan, seconded by Emerson; unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:35 pm.