

**Present:** Hugh Guilderson, Chief Ronald Fisette, Harry Terkanian, Jay Horowitz, Sean Donoghue, Lt. Michael Hurley (alternate).

Regrets: Dan Hoort, Davis Walters, Mark Vincent.

**Also present**: Rick Pomroy, (Pomroy Associates), Todd Costa and Pete Goudreau (Kaestle Boos).

Harry Terkanian called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

- 1. Minutes of Previous Meetings. The minutes of March 8, 2017 were presented for approval. On motion of Chief Fisette, seconded by Mr. Guilderson the minutes were approved as presented by a vote of 5-0.
- 2. Project Meeting and Project Schedule Review. Mr. Pomroy briefed the Committee on the project meeting held earlier that afternoon. The contractor has provided a first draft of an overall project schedule. The architect and project manager have not reviewed the schedule. More detail is required for it to be useful, including the addition of a critical path. Mr. Guilderson asked if the substantial completion date was realistic. Mr. Costa indicated that it was, but the contractor appears to be a bit behind schedule. It may be necessary to require a recovery plan if the contractor gets too far behind. Mr. Guilderson also asked if the contractor had confirmed schedule dates with the subs. Mr. Costa reported that this is assumed to be the contractor's practice, but the contractor is not customarily asked to confirm this. Mr. Pomroy will inquire of the contractor. The two-week look ahead shows the temporary facility to be completed by March 31 and a "hard move" by the Department on April 5 or 6. The architect and by the project manager expressed some concern that the actual delivery date for the temporary facility might slip based on the current state of progress. Mr. Pomroy expects to have a better sense if this by the end of the week. The Committee reviewed Pomroy Associates draft plan for the Department move. Based on the changes discussed at the construction meeting the plan will be updated on March 23 and circulated to the Committee. Unresolved critical elements include Verizon, County Sheriff's Department (radios) and CJIS cutover, all of which rely on action by third parties.
- 3. Change Order review. Mr. Pomroy reviewed the change order log with the committee. PCO #6 is for flooring in the constructed part of the temporary facility. Flooring for the purpose built portion of the temporary facility was omitted from the contract drawings. Mr. Terkanian reported that in accordance with the Committee's March 8 delegation of authority, he and Chief Fisette have approved PCO #6 in the amount of \$4,835.51. PCO #7 is for constructing cubbies for each officer in the temporary facility at a proposed cost of \$4,933.94. On motion by Chief Fisette, seconded by Mr. Guilderson PCO#7 was approved (5-0). PCOs 6 & 7 will be merged into a single change order (#3). PCO#8 has been withdrawn, as the underlying issue was resolved between the contractor and sub. Mr. Terkanian raised the issue of the Committee being in a reactive mode and having to respond to change orders on an emergency basis as was the case with PCOs 6 & 7. Mr. Pomroy told the Committee that the recent short deadlines on PCOs was due to the need to get the temporary facility ready so that work on the permanent facility could begin and that he expected much longer lead times and therefore less of a "reactive" posture for the Committee in the future. Mr. Terkanian requested access to Submittal Exchange so that he can monitor exchanges between contractor and architect that might lead to future change orders. Anticipated change orders for which as of this date no PCOs have been generated include: (1) concrete slab removal (the architect and contractor differ on whether the contractor owns this work under the contract documents); (2) construction fencing around the temporary facility ("provided by owner and maintained by contractor" in the contract documents, actually provided by the contractor); and (3) water meter (since the Town is not

Approved: April 5, 2017

- requiring a meter, is there a credit for this?) Categorization of change orders was discussed. Mr. Pomroy customarily categorizes them as "unforeseen", "upgrade" or "design error." Normally he does not consider changes which do not require corrective work as design errors, e.g. and item whose cost is included in a change order which but for the omission would have been included in the base bid is not treated as a design error since there is little or no effect on the overall project cost.
- 4. Budget update. Through March 22, the net change in project cost is \$11,630.50 represented by change orders 1, 2 & 3. Mr. Terkanian requested that the project budget also track items provided by owner by purchase order so that the total project cost can be monitored.
- 5. Pending Purchase Orders. None at present. There was discussion about using state contracts for some items instead of using a procurement process. Mr. Terkanian noted that some state contracts require multiple quotes so state contract terms should be reviewed and followed when used. The Committee did not see a need to for a formal Chapter 30B process where state contracts are available. IT was also noted that the contract with Barnstable County for radio services is an intergovernmental agreement and is therefore excluded from Chapter 30B requirements.
- 6. Schedule of Values. The architect's review of the contractor's schedule of values is not yet complete. "Until review is complete, the architect will not be approving payment requests for items in excess of \$25,000 (except large equipment purchases) without supporting detail. Consideration of the schedule by the Committee was deferred.
- 7. Elevator. The lift height variance has not been submitted. Mr. Costa determined that further review of the code and application language was necessary to insure that the variance request complied with the variance requirements in the code. He expects to submit it by March 23. The next elevator board meeting is March 28. Mr. Costa understands that he Elevator Board approves "routine" variances without hearings and expects that this variance will be treated as such. Asked about the impact on the project schedule, Mr. Costa stated that since demolition work is expected to continue to the end of April, if there is quick action by the Elevator Board there should be no impact.
- 8. Next Meeting. Mr. Pomroy raised the issue of timely processing of invoices and noted that meetings on the fourth Wednesday of the month did not permit timely processing of invoices, which, by statute, must be paid within 15 days. In order to process the March invoices a meeting on April 5, 2017 will be necessary in addition to the Committee's scheduled meeting on April 26, 2017, both at 4:00 PM. The April 5 meeting will be for invoices and unforeseen items only and the architect is not required to attend.
- 9. Adjournment. On motion by Chief Fisette, seconded by Mr. Guilderson, the meeting was adjourned at 5:27 PM. (5-0)

Approved: April 5, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

Harry Sarkis Terkanian, Chair

## <sup>1</sup> Public Record Documents

- 1. Project change order log through March 17, 2017
- 2. PCO#6
- PCO#7
- 4. Project budget through March 22, 2017