

MAYOR
JEFFREY A. MACMILLEN

DEPUTY MAYOR
THOMAS ZAMPANO

TOWN MANAGER
MICHAEL P. DOWNES



COUNCIL MEMBERS
BRUCE ABELSON
ROSE MARIE ANGELONI
MARIE E. DIAMOND
WALTER GOAD
VINCENT J. MASE, SR.
NICHOLAS PALLADINO
RONALD PELLICCIA, JR.

TOWN OF NORTH BRANFORD

TOWN HALL, 909 FOXON ROAD, NORTH BRANFORD, CONNECTICUT 06471
TOWN MANAGER (203) 484-6000 TOWN HALL FAX (203) 484-6025

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES Permanent Project Building Committee

Monday, October 30, 2023

Town Council Chambers
6:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Whalen called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

2. Salute to the Flag

3. Roll Call

Present: Chairman Whalen, Vice Chairman Bailey, Member Canosa, Member Fonda and Member Rose.

Present for the NBHS Project: Member Canada and Member Siena.

Present for NBPD Project: Member Palumbo and Member Pietrandrea.

Also Present: Town Manager Downes; Purchasing Agent Fumiatti; Town Attorney Donofrio; Kamil Musial and Brian Grant from Newfield; Bob Banning from Silver Petrucelli; Camil Zuk and Amar Shamas from Gilbane; Jonathan Gombotz with CSG; Rusty Malik and Carson Collier from QA+M.

4. Citizen Statements: None

5. Approval of non NBPD Minutes from 10/23/2023

Motion: Vice Chairman Bailey motioned to approve the non NBPD Minutes from 10/23/2023; seconded by Member Palumbo.

Discussion: None

With all in favor, the motion is passed.

Abstain: Member Fonda

6. NBHS**a. CSG – Report**

Mr. Gombotz shared that he and Purchasing Agent Fumiatti received a response back from the State regarding the reimbursement form. The state had originally said their form or similar, what was sent was similar. The State reimbursement wanted their specific 1046 form filled out. That form got uploaded last week and it is showing as submitted to the State of CT. The next reimbursement should be processed. Finance Director Esposito had mentioned to Mr. Gombotz that the state had been withholding 11% of the reimbursement rate. In the last 4 months it was backed down to 5% and Finance Director Esposito has requested the release of that 6%. The kiln exhaust from Rusty Kiln will be on site tomorrow (10/31/23) to install exhaust kits 12:30 p.m.

i. Cafeteria Table Update

The manufacturer contacted and sent email asking questions about use and movement. He reported to the manufacturer after speaking with Mr. Florio about the usage over the last 6 months. They are engaged in conversation.

The testing report log was updated, there were a few questions for the testing agency and he has revised numbering and is all resolved. The grout reports have not yet been received. The results have been reviewed and there are no major outliers so far.

October invoices to be reviewed as they come in from the different trades and agencies.

b. QA+M – Report**i. EnviroMed Update**

Mr. Malik shared that at the last meeting \$93,000 ATP waiting on response from EnviroMed. The issues have been discussed with EnviroMed. One of the things they identified is that the part of it was caused by contamination from the contractor. The contractor wasn't protecting the soil while working, that resulted in having to remove more soil. There was some cost to be assigned to the contractor over and above what was in the ATP. Mr. Malik asked about the value of this cost. EnviroMed came back with a response and their concern was he reached out to a landfill disposal site to find out cost per ton and reached out to Niagara and Red Technologies and they were not disclosing information to him. There was no breakdown provided. EnviroMed was suggesting that \$12,000 be reduced from ATP as there was cross contamination that occurred due to the contractor not being careful enough protecting that area. This dialog is ongoing as of this time and had not been previously shared with Gilbane. Mr. Malik suggests reviewing this at the next meeting on where to settle.

Member Canosa asked how EnviroMed came up with \$12,000. Mr. Malik shared the response from EnviroMed that because it was not properly managed, and the oversight of the work being done. He was taking overhead from the demo off the cost. EnviroMed couldn't take the disposal cost off as the company won't discuss hauling fees with him. They were trying to demo the Y section and weren't very careful and in essence causing a delay as that section had to be removed as contaminated soil.

Mr. Malik said the difficulty is that QA+M isn't on site all of the time. It's the hazmat staff and the contractor on site all of the time. Member Pietrandrea said the town should have gotten all the scales and hauling amounts, etc. Purchasing Agent Fumiatti did request them multiple times. Mr. Malik asked how often projects take the trucks to the scales.

Mr. Shamas shared that the base contract called for 42 cu yards of PCB soil to be removed and disposed of. That was set up as an allowance in the contract documents from Fuss & O'Neill. Fuss & O'Neill did the design and EnviroMed was managing the construction. At the time that 42 cu yards represents 1 ft off the face of the building plus 6 inches. Gilbane did a takeoff from that, and if you exactly cut 6" time 1 foot and a lot of it was asphalt and concrete. Gilbane came back to the committee when they ran into additional PCBs, and it was authorized to continue. Member Pietrandrea said Gilbane failed by methods and means. Mr. Shamas said that is based on whose interpretation. Mr. Shamas asked where the scientific backup is for that math, and they were only making an arbitrary statement.

Mr. Malik said part of the problem is the hauling companies won't disclose the amounts. EnviroMed is trying to come up with a way that if there was cross contamination as it was noted in previous conversations, there is some cost to bear on methods and means.

Mr. Shamas said if EnviroMed saw cross contamination on the project while he was overseeing the construction, he should have stopped it. Mr. Zuk said he did stop it for abatement. Mr. Shamas said this is an arbitrary statement.

Member Canosa said to follow up on EnviroMed, are they able to quantify the point that Gilbane was having cross contamination, why didn't EnviroMed stop the work.

Mr. Malik stated that the timeline was to get through the Y as quickly as possible. It needs further discussion.

Member Pietrandrea said if the town pays for the testing agent, no other contractor talks to the testing agent unless it comes from the town. We don't want anyone making it tougher for them.

Mr. Malik stated that there is continued progress on the job.

One thing to bring up is the columns in the cafe that have blemishes. The question that was raised is what can be done? QA+M has come up with a solution that will fix the issue. There are three options to fix it. One option is to take the product in a clear coating, it has several layers, and it can be damaged and then the film can be replaced. This is an additional wrap to the existing columns. Another option is to remove all the paint and have a stainless-steel finish added to it.

One of the samples presented to the committee has a clear film on it as a protective covering on the columns.

Mr. Malik shared there will be a cost associated with using the 3M wrap as it was not a specified product. This is an addition to the product. The reasoning is that the product came in damaged.

Member Canosa asked what if we leave the aluminum the way it is and it sits there for two years and there is scuffing that comes after; is there an easy way to fix it? Both examples have a clear cover, what if you put the clear cover on after there is scuffing.

Mr. Collier said the issue is that the clear coating requires the columns be refinished so you don't have the blemishes. If we went the clear route the columns would need to be refinished, as they can't be easily touched up. If we went through the purple sample, it's a solid piece and is not dependent on a sub coating finish. This is a total cover, but it will need to be clad around each of the columns. It could be purple or the stainless-steel covering.

Member Fonda asked how high the damage was? Mr. Malik said it is 5 feet. Mr. Collier said his concern with the paint is that the samples are more of a tint vs paint. The cafeteria columns top out around 9 feet, and the second-floor ones are around 8 feet. Prior to the large patches were from construction. The ones downstairs are since the students have been in the school. Mr. Malik said when they were delivered, they were unprotected and there were scratches noticed. It would be at no cost to the town to fix them, but to wrap them there would be a cost.

Member Canosa asked, what is the longevity of the wrap? Mr. Collier said if the approach is what they want, he will reach out to other manufacturers' durable longevity. That clear film is provided by a signage company that uses 3M.

Member Fonda asked how they would get the finish off? Mr. Collier speculates that they could use a paint thinner to remove the paint portion but could clarify.

Member Palumbo said for his company vehicles the company he uses puts a clear wrap and there is another layer on it that can be removed as they are damaged.

Motion: Member Palumbo motioned to have all columns removed and redone and once they are redone give them back and install them at the school; seconded by Member Rose.

Discussion: Member Fonda asked if they are removed, when they are installed, who would do that? Member Palumbo stated that the company would have to install them once they are wrapped (if that's the decision of the board). Member Rose asked if the columns are two halves? Mr. Collier confirmed they are made up of two sections. Member Pietrandrea complimented, as you are unable to see the seam on it.

With all in favor, the motion is passed.

Member Rose asked if once these columns are taken apart will they fit together with the seams. Member Fonda who is the contractor? Mr. Collier said Eastern Metal Works is the contractor. Mr. Collier shared QA+M did a quick summary sheet for the upcoming ATP's. Mr. Gombotz put together a general timeline for when the kilns will be installed, etc.

c. Gilbane – Report

i. General Construction Update

Mr. Zuk shared that they commenced gym acoustical tech, which is the last part of the steel detailing of the roof. The decks for A and B for the second floor have been handed over as of today.

The south roadway fence was installed late last week, milling the roadway and cutting grade 4 ft cut has commenced. The North roadway grading is in process. The underground plumbing was installed today. There is some electrical work left, but it is expected to be complete on Thursday with the exception of footprint in gymnasium.

ii. ATP's

ATP-0178 PR-67 CMU changed to 12-inch CMU walls at Gymnasium.

Member Canosa asked why they changed from 8 inch to 12-inch CMU. Mr. Malik said it was for bracing the wall. Mr. Collier said they are going from an 8-inch block to a 12-inch block, so it is a larger block. On the corridor wall of the gym, there are some diagonal cross bracing members that span between column grades. Those plates are ½"- 3/8 " thick and in the drawings, they will need to cut it on either side of the block and adhere them together with the mortar vent to stack that up at those areas where it is in conflict with those cross bracing members. The fact that we have an 8" block, there isn't enough meat left on the masonry, based on where those cross members are located on the grid line to make things structurally stable. going to a 12 in block gives them enough meat to make this more structurally sound.

Member Pietrandrea asked if this would fall under CM Contingency. Mr. Malik said No.

Member Canosa says a lot of the increase is the labor, so wouldn't there be less masonry with a larger block because you are doing less grouting? Mr. Zuk said the 12" block is more about the width. Mr. Malik said the material cost is more as it is a larger block. It takes longer to install it.

Motion: Member Rose motioned to approve ATP- 0178 not to exceed \$4,765.00; seconded by Member Fonda.

Discussion: None

With all in favor, the motion is passed.

ATP -179 Kiln Power Adjustments

This ATP is in response to ASI-024 for the Kiln power adjustments. Mr. Malik said that there is no doubt that the electrical drawings called for a different power component than what the three-phase kiln was identified in the specifications. It also states that the contractor is responsible to make sure the right power goes with the right equipment. It has been flagged on submittal and sent back and there was supposed to be coordination there. There were concerns that the kiln wasn't going to come in on time. It was decided to take the kiln out of the GES scope. They still have the kiln that was going to go in there. The \$4,600 change order was presented, and position was they own the coordination of the two pieces and change order was rejected. In hindsight at time of bid they probably went by single phase on schedule and the front-end documents state they need to be coordinated, that should be a material cost. Apparently, the single-phase kiln installed has 100 amps and there is only 80 amp electrical installed.

So where does responsibility lie? It was identified early enough in the process that what was installed was not what was needed.

Member Fonda stated, looking at the timeline, the electrical contractor put in a proposal to change it and it was rejected. In his opinion the electrician did his due diligence. Mr. Zuk stated that the electrical was installed in May of 2022.

Mr. Malik said that when the electrician submitted his proposal and came before the committee at the time, we were talking about a three phase kiln; what was installed was a single phase and 50 amp. Member Pietrandrea asked if it was installed in pipe or cable. Mr. Malik said he believes it's in the pipe. Member Pietrandrea said if it's in the pipe. He has to go with 1¼" pipe in order to get a 50 amp. So, the electrician needs to take out the wire that's in there and put in a new pipe. We need to know what was piped. Member Fonda said the electrician used 1" pipe and went to 1¼". Member Pietrandrea said the electrician should leave the 50 amp.

Member Pietrandrea said you bought two kilns at 50 amps a piece, did you run it by the engineers to add an additional 50 amps to that panel? Mr. Collier responded that the sketch that was issued as part of the ASI provided by Gilbane was reviewed by our electrical engineer.

Member Pietrandrea said the engineer approved the two 50-amp kilns but now you'll be running two 100-amp kilns. Mr. Collier said he will check in on it.

Member Rose shared that the wording for both Gilbane's ATP and QA+M's comments don't match up.

Motion: Member Rose motioned to table ATP -0179; seconded by Vice Chairman Bailey.

Discussion: None

With all in favor, the motion is passed. ATP-0179 tabled.

ATP-0177 Unforseen rock removal by mechanical means.

Member Palumbo asked Mr. Malik if this work was from 15-16 months ago, is there a timeframe that the contractor has to bring us an ATP. Mr. Malik said there are instances that a legitimate change order is there and for some reason there is paid work and it wasn't processed; that may be the case here. The bigger issue is there is no way of verifying that this is accurate. Had this been brought to everyone's attention sooner, it wouldn't be an issue. Member Pietrandrea said if it's from 16 months ago, there isn't anything to talk about, we can't verify it or justify using taxpayers' money on it. Member Fonda said the state has rules on reimbursement. Mr. Malik responded that the state has a 6-month rule for reimbursement.

Member Rose has been studying the pictures and there is nothing showing there was 4 feet of rock that was being removed. There is a small section where there could've been 2 feet of rock. all of the other trenches are only a couple feet deep.

Member Rose asked Attorney Donofrio about this ATP for work that was done over 16 months ago and now they are asking for payment for. They can't verify the work, the yardage. Attorney Donofrio said it's not timely. If the work was done 16 months ago you won't get reimbursed on it.

Motion: Vice Chairman Bailey motioned to reject ATP-0177; seconded by Member Rose.

Discussion: None

With all in favor, the motion is passed.

iii. Punchlist – update

Mr. Zuk spoke with Custom Electric about the K2/K4 lights. They have begun unboxing the lights. So far, they seem to look pretty good, there are some that came damaged and will be getting sent back. Custom Electric wanted to get a jump on it next week while the students have Professional Development Day, and he will coordinate with Mr. Florio to see if that is possible. The remainder not completed next week will be completed during Christmas break. Member Pietrandrea asked if Mr. Malik hasn't seen the lights yet, and Mr. Malik responded no. Member Pietrandrea states that they should be reviewed before the lights are put up as this is a pretentious topic.

Mr. Zuk stated that Gilbane has received a pricing request #69 for the under-slab gas lines in response to RFI460 on Wednesday (10/25/23) P & D and the roofer are working on pricing for it. The underground work has become hot with wanting to pour concrete in the next few weeks. They should have a price to bring back next week to be approved.

Mr. Collier states that the coordination item on that is, the plumbing drawings showing gas service coming from the ceiling above a teacher demo station in the culinary lab. It is an island configuration; we have no provisions or concealed drop coming from that ceiling with no way to really brace it or support it. The added cost for an additional chase dropping down doesn't really look well and would be more of an obstruction. The intent for the overall layout is to have gas service from underground to provide that. So, the PR is to vent and insulate that under the slab.

7. Approval of NBPD Minutes from 10/23/2023

Motion: Member Palumbo motioned to approve the NBPD minutes from 10/23/2023 with the corrections noted; seconded by Member Pietrandrea.

Discussion: Chairman Whalen suggested correction on page 5 where it says the farmer was able to address, should read “the framer”; Page 7 in the approval of the NBPD minutes within the discussion there is a hanging sentence that will be struck from the minutes. Page 6, where Member Pietrandrea had a sentence and then it says Mr. Banning said, but Mr. Banning was not at the meeting. Member Pietrandrea clarified that he had spoken to Mr. Banning that sometimes with the boiler plate they cut specs and they piece things together.

Mr. Grant shared some correction requests: on page 4 under the stone veneer to have the sentence read “He wanted to help expedite the process as he is aware of the basis of design lead times.” Also on page 5, on the top of the page within the motion, Member Palumbo motioned to keep the outside of the building, the stone pillar sign and mortar and the inside the same color “and pattern”. Also, on page 5 Horton came up with an 18” box beam, it should be an 8” box beam. The third paragraph of the construction update, There is a plan to pour the foundations on Thursday, to have the addition “pour the Butler Building foundation”. Butler is being prepped for the concrete aprons and taking some soil to the neighbor.

Mr. Banning requested a correction in the minutes from the 10/16/23 minutes. Mr. Banning shared the correction that USG verified that the basis of design could be built. This will be a very important point down the road. USG is the cold form manufacturer that Horton’s office has been coordinating with during the Elevator hoist way design. They did verify that they could provide a stacked wall frame construction for the elevator shaft.

Chairman Whalen said due to it not being from the last meeting’s minutes it can be added to the record during his report.

With all in favor, the motion is passed.

Abstain: Vice Chairman Bailey and Member Fonda.

8. NBPD

a. Silver Petrucelli – Update

Mr. Banning wanted to have his correction on record. USG originally specified the elevator shaft design wall framed but stacked instead of single story and that’s not the design we are going with now. they did verify that it could be done.

Member Pietrandrea said approximately 9 weeks ago Silver Petrucelli was supposed to get a price from Siemens for the surge protector to be put in the unit vs going external and installation. Mr. Banning said Siemens has not been responsive to it. He is still awaiting a resubmittal for the change order and will hound them again. Member Pietrandrea said Silver Petrucelli will need to tell the board that Siemens gear (whatever the number is) is built into the unit number and then buy a remote one for a supply. 9 weeks later this guy is going to be putting in the gear generator shortly and Mr. Banning isn't able to provide a number. Mr. Banning said he will get a number from Siemens. This will be for the remote one and the one that will be going into the gear.

Mr. Banning continued stating that they were waiting for a letter from Horton. They were generally happy with what they saw and didn't see anything that had a red flag. There was a subsequent visit on Monday, and they want to combine their findings into one document that should be presented shortly.

i. Revised Roadway Scope approval

Mr. Banning shared that the roadway scope was provided to Newfield on 10-24-23 and learned at the owners meeting they had not received it and thought that Mr. Washburn had uploaded it to Pro Core. They are now evaluating if there is a change order for that.

b. Newfield**i. Construction Update**

Mr. Musial shared that Horton was on site today to look at overall framing that was completed so far. They are awaiting the report from the last two visits. The person on site was satisfied with what was happening on site. They are continuing with the exterior framing and roofing; the exterior framing should be completed within a week and a half. The carpenters working on the detail in the southwest corner. They are starting to build the box beam in stair 1 and build staging to continue the rafters above the stair. The roofer was able to put plywood over most of the slope on the east side of the roof. The roofer came on Saturday to put the first layer of underlayment to keep most of the building weathertight. We are at 60% weathertight of the building. Within the next 3-4 weeks the building should be 100% weathertight.

Hocon gas dropped off tanks today and pressurized them, they needed to sit for 24 hrs. under pressure. The building inspector will come on Tuesday (10/31/23) to check the gauges. They started installation of egress there. The site contractor was on site today and brought materials to continue the work. You can see some of the light poles are energized to see how the building will look in the future at night.

Last week they had a contractor spray the concrete and the seawall system for the concrete walls. The Masonry contractor will be starting the stone veneer soon. The date for the drainage mat on site is still to come.

They had internal meetings with the trades and shared Vice Chairman Bailey's concern about the hangers. The trades understand the concerns HVAC contractor and before he starts, he was also spoken to about the hangers. They are working on scheduling a meeting with the commissioning agent later this week or early next week.

Vice Chairman Bailey had a question in regard to the building being weathertight. If you don't get the roof on above the sally port in the mechanical room, want to poly off the side and encapsulate that so then the building will be considered watertight? Mr. Musial said the walls still need to be completed but in the next couple weeks it should be done.

Vice Chairman also stated to Mr. Musial, the Butler building foundation and the perimeter is all poured, but Butler needs to come back to the site to retrench the center footings, will that cause any delays? Mr. Musial said that will not cause any delays. The concrete guy was done with this part and will go over to the trade beams this week.

The tanks and the gas lines there was a 1" conduit line in the pit that was hit with the bucket. the way it has bends in it should there be a continuity test to make sure it is still valid? Mr. Musial will speak with the building inspector as well.

Mr Banning asked Mr. Musial if they have started installing the snow melt system? Mr. Musial said not yet.

Chairman Whalen asked Mr. Musial what is the status of the driveway binder? Mr. Musial said right now they have received from Butler they are on the waiting list with Cocchiola. Cocchiola said they will need 3 days' notice to prep the trades. Butler is going to address the back field area around the Butler building. The other option is to have Butler reach out to another paving contractor that could review it with them.

Member Fonda asked what they are doing for temporary heat? Mr. Musial and Mr. Grant shared, they are using propane. They own a bunch of dual fuel tanks for heating.

Vice Chairman Bailey said at the owners meeting it was discussed about possibly moving the flagpoles. Mr. Musial said he was talking with Mr. Banning that he was able to come up with some as built for the corner of the building and will send to Mr. Banning sketch where there is a single flagpole and there was a suggestion to move it closer to the parking lot. It will have a marked up sketch. Mr. Banning said once they figure out the utility conflict is, it will show them how much they have to move. When speaking with Jim Pretti, it was felt that they shouldn't be moved closer to the front sign as they should be on higher ground. This will be left to the decision of Deputy Police Chief Lovelace and Town Manager Downes to decide on the placement.

Member Palumbo shared a concern about paving. Mr. Grant said the paving is all weather dependent. Mr. Grant said the original plan was to do the paving in the spring, but they are trying to get a jump on it if the site is ready for it. There is still some more grading needed on the site before the paving could occur.

Vice Chairman Bailey said if the fence needs to be elevated just so it could open and close, would that be part of the change order? The grade won't start until after the gate.

Chairman Whalen said there were some communications that came to the committee CMU block.

The committee members discussed this at length regarding the various options available.

Motion: Member Pietrandrea motioned to approve the CMU not to exceed Item #2 \$38,962; seconded by Member Palumbo.

Discussion: None

With all in favor, the motion is passed.

Abstain: Vice Chairman Bailey

Mr. Musial shared this was previously discussed by Deputy Chief Lovelace on site. He asked Newfield to quote the motors for the overhead doors in Butler building. Right now the spec calls for manuals. The amount for this quote is around \$12,000. Member Pietrandrea said we cant have them be manual as it's a liability of someone getting hurt. Deputy Chief Lovelace shares it will make sense to do it all at once and be done with it. The idea is to match the motors for the doors with the sally port doors.

Motion: Member Pietrandrea motioned to approve the quote for the electronic overhead motors for the Butler Building not to exceed \$13,500 4 doors with motors on the side wiring and controls by the control guy. seconded by Member Palumbo.

Discussion: None

With all in favor, the motion is passed.

Abstain: Vice Chairman Bailey

Mr. Musial stated another item of discussion is the finish for the egress stair. Deputy Police Chief Lovelace raised a concern that the spec calls for painted epoxy. Deputy Chief Lovelace states his concern is that the staircase on the end of the building is going to be epoxy sealed concrete. That beautiful stairway in the EOC is going to get the most traffic. What's coming in from the outside is going to deteriorate the stairs coating. Instead of having the rubber coating on the back stairs and putting the rubber on the egress stairs. The regular finish concrete on the back stairs won't really be used. On the bottom floor is 4x4- 2x2 squares carpet and everything gets trapped at the bottom instead of a recessed entry mat. It would be something cheap to replace.

Mr. Musial shared the final item of discussion is about the roof hatch in the fire pump room RFI sent to Silver Petrucelli asking if we are moving forward on building the hatch or leaving as designed for now. Member Pietrandrea said Mr. Banning was going to provide an option for a split shaft instead of a single shaft. Mr. Banning said two weeks ago it was confirmed that it was a single shaft. Member Pietrandrea said that they do also make a split shaft.

ii. PCO(s)

Motion: Member Rose motioned to approve PCO #022; seconded by Member Pietrandrea.

Discussion: None

With all in favor, the motion is passed.

Abstain: Vice Chairman Bailey

Member Fonda asked if there are any mechanicals coming from cold form steel, the piping, etc.? Mr. Musial said they included it in their engineering. Vice Chairman Bailey asked if they ever got an answer for the trapeze for the sprinkler. Mr. Musial said they have not.

c. COTW- Shared within Newfield's construction update.

9. Legal

Member Rose mentioned that over the last few months it has become apparent that the builders and committee have asked and there have been issues with the design team. A few weeks ago it came to a head and the committee had a conversation about how to proceed and get the answers in a timely manner. Member Pietrandrea shared there are concerns of the architects controlling the project and not getting information back. They already asked Mr. Banning to inform his Errors and Omissions Insurance. It is pertaining more to the design team going back to Newfield. There are questions about changing things. Member Pietrandrea stated that the committee notified Mr. Banning to report to the insurance company on errors and omissions about 3 weeks ago.

Town Attorney Donofrio stated the main issues are the timing of the design team's response to RFI's/ PCO's? The committee stated its overall ultimate decision making. Member Palumbo said the committee is concerned with the direction of where we're going, whether it's short staffing at Silver Petrucelli.

Mr. Banning shared that the overriding feeling is based on the issues with the long duration of the elevator shaft discussions and steps took longer than anticipated and there were a lot of things to go through. One of the issues was about the Jim Pretti sketch. You all are a very hands-on committee but Jim Pretti sent the sketch to Mr. Banning and he didn't know why it was sent and reached out to Jim to verify it was reflecting everything that was asked and then he thought it had been loaded to Pro Core. There are times where things are being discussed when the design team isn't there.

Member Pietrandrea asked, "What about the switchgear?" Mr. Banning was asked 9 weeks ago to get the pricing on the switchgear. As the engineer of record, it doesn't take that long to get a price on the gear. We have a remote surge protector going in, and the details are not being provided.

We had asked for communications on the rooms and the ceilings, etc and there are no drawings. We asked to have one of the rooms and the price back and one of the rooms to be possibly taken out and take the ceiling to make the EOC bigger. Mr. Banning said those drawings were handed over a month ago to Newfield and the committee at a meeting. There was a meeting about to continue weather to continue with the flat ceiling, and the ducts. They asked for a design as there are 2 beautiful windows and steel beams going through it. We just made a change order with shades, what good are the shades with beams on it.

Member Palumbo stated that some of the main concerns are the timely manner of getting information to the committee and Newfield. Member Pietrandrea said to Mr. Banning that the original design cost the town \$33,000.

Member Rose and Member Palumbo took a lot of time to get Jim Pretti to go out on site to get that sketch done.

Member Rose asked Newfield "Do you have all the information you need for the project?" Mr. Musial said regular RFI's are open. Typical clarification ceiling on 2nd floor roof hatch and moving along the elevator issue. proceeding. wanting to start prepping contractors. Now they are getting information in the timely manner, but before there was a longer lead time.

Member Rose said with the changing of the elevator roof framing, do you have all those drawings? Mr. Musial said with the elevator roof framing not much changed credit coming back from the framer as we expected. He still had to put in box beams, so he could move forward with the rafters. They do not have the drawings for the CMU. They do not have CMU details yet.

Member Palumbo asked if there will be an impact to the schedule in general. Mr. Grant said it is still being assessed at this time. We are still deciding on the shaft. Right now, the lead time is 16-18 weeks of releasing the shaft in late February estimated.

Member Pietrandrea said he had records of 8-9 weeks in delays just in site work problems.

Attorney Donofrio asked if there is a log of change orders and errors or omissions. the measure of damages on an error vs an omission.

Mr. Banning stated he ran the numbers earlier today, and we're at about \$188,000 in change orders which is 1.5% of the original contract. \$12 million is the contract budget. We are currently \$4.3 million into a project, and 35% complete. If the change order rate continues that would be 4.3% in change orders.

Member Canosa shared that the feeling is that there isn't much commitment to the project. There were some outside meetings with the high school project. We haven't been seeing that with the NBOD project. The questions that have been presented. Construction has two major factors: time

and money. The concern is that we don't want to get to 60% in the project and we just gave up 6-7 months of time for things we are waiting on. We are trying to express our concerns and have our concerns addressed as quickly as possible. The concern is we will be stuck. Newfield is getting positive traction. If there are issues, we need to have a log. Attorney Donofrio requested a working log and send him the first draft. He is unsure if how much of the \$188,000 of change orders is attributed to E & O. The concern is everyone is being diligent, and we are cognizant of that. Things seem to be moving along and we value their support but want to make sure silver Petrucelli is as committed as Newfield is. It seems there has been a lot of turnovers in their office as well. Mr. Banning said the primary architect for this project is no longer with the organization, and that was a big change. Mr. Banning acknowledging the concerns and revised drawings and elevator shaft. He agrees the team needs to do better.

Deputy Police Chief Lovelace said on the 2nd floor landing from the lobby there's an exposed beam there. it will be seen from the lobby.

There will also be something coming down the pike. The dispatch furniture, where the wiring is on the elevator wall and has to be on the opposite side, the plugs, etc. will need to be moved. The dimensions of the room were provided, and the drawings are being worked on.

Member Pietrandrea said for the EOC room, it took 4 weeks to get layouts for 4 plugs and at the last minute we went to the core board.

Vice Chairman Bailey said there is another thing to discuss, the warehouse shelving, the chief was asking for heavy shelves in the evidence room. Mr. Banning brought to Deputy Chief Lovelace. Member Pietrandrea asked, where is credit for what was designed? We had paid \$90,000 for filing cabinets that we aren't even going to use.

10. Adjournment

Motion: Member Palumbo motioned to adjourn at 9:04 p.m.; seconded by Vice Chairman Bailey.

Discussion: None

With all in favor, the motion is passed.