

Library Building Committee: Mary Anne Antonellis, Stephen Dallmus, Brad Foster, Dale Houle, Penny Jaques, Molly Moss, Elaine Puleo Absent: Jeff Quackenbush
CMS-OPM: Neil Joyce, Roger Hoyt MBLC: Heather Backman, Andrea Bono-Bunker OEA: Dominik Wit

Meeting Opened at 7:01 p.m.

Public Comment None

Review of June 17 Minutes

Houle moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Puleo seconded.

Roll call vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Foster-abstain, Houle-aye, Jaques-aye, Moss-abstain, Puleo-aye

Update on construction progress

Antonellis reported that two milestones were accomplished today:

- National Grid installed the electrical pole and anchor.
- The blower door test was successfully completed, with no air infiltration observed. This is a required test and it is important for an energy efficient building. By passing the blower door test, a secondary fog test, which would track down any weakness, was not necessary.

Hoyt provided an update on construction progress:

- Metal roof installation is complete, including a redo of a small area on the west side that wasn't right. The tie-off anchor points for the solar panels are almost done, so solar panels can be installed.
- Drywall is in place and is being sanded in prep for priming.
- 75% of exterior cedar siding is up. Slate shingle installation will start in several weeks.
- Grading around building will be done as sections of siding are completed.
- While electrical pole is in place, conduit from the pole to the building needs to be installed.
- Plumbing and electrical are waiting for walls to be complete so they can do final work. Electrical equipment is staring to go in.

Dallmus: Asked for update on slate installation. Hoyt: The slate test panel showed that contractor didn't have the experience needed to install slate siding properly. CDI has hired a subcontractor who is experienced in installing vertical slate.

Jaques asked about the landscaping window shown on the new schedule, expressing concern that if the timeline was further delayed that the fall planting window could be missed. Leaving the site exposed over the winter is a concern.

Discussion of financial impact of new schedule

CDI's original schedule was to complete building construction July 29. This week they provided a new schedule with a finish date of October 18. While there is no additional cost from CDI for the delayed completion, there are additional costs from both OEA and CMS per their contracts which are fully expended. Antonellis: Many factors have contributed to schedule slip: personnel issues, design issues, weather, management. Joyce: This is the most complicated small building project.

- OEA additional fee to finish: \$30K, which is a reduced rate
- CMS additional fee is \$17K/month for a total of \$50K total
- TOTAL = \$75K

These costs come from the Contingency Fee which is \$400K.

Antonellis moves to approve additional spending for OEA and CMI up to \$80K. Moss seconded.
Roll call vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Foster-aye, Houle-aye, Jaques-aye, Moss-aye, Puleo-aye

Discussion of mid-progress review

Puleo described the DCAM standard contractor evaluation form which Quackenbush, Antonellis and Puleo completed at the 50% completion stage of construction. The form is only sent to the construction company. The group gave an 'average' score in all areas except schedule, which was given a lower score. The result was a total score of 71, with 80 considered 'passing'. Antonellis pointed out that one question is not answerable at the half-way point of construction, thus lowering the total score.

Joyce noted that this job has been challenging and he does not feel the contractor should receive a failing score as it could influence CDI's performance for the remainder of the job. He has only used DCAM when contractor is failing poorly. CDI has made good effort and has been responsive to the owner and CMS throughout project. Moss suggested tabling this for now.

Dallmus said everything was scored as "average" except for schedule. He asked for input from Wit and Joyce about quality of work.

Wit thinks quality of work is very good. The recently completed blower door test is an example a comprehensive test that shows many elements coming together and demonstrating good work.

Joyce noted that CDI has struggled with the project schedule but he would be hard pressed to put his signature on a failing grade for the DCAM form. He asked the committee to consider re-evaluating their responses, so that the score was pushed over the 80-point "passing" threshold noting that some work is "above average". Joyce would then be comfortable signing the form and would re-emphasize to CDI how disappointed the Building Committee is over the delayed construction schedule.

Hoyt added that the contractor has always made sure things have been done right, and that they have willingly redone several things. The reworks have been done for the quality of project and decisions have not been made in the interest of the schedule.

Foster and Antonellis observed that the DCAM report is a problematic form.

Dallmus: Quackenbush thinks not sending form is a loss of leverage. Dallmus agrees this is a complicated building, that the contractor has done a good job on construction. To give CDI a form with a failing grade could backfire and be a disservice to our building. He agrees with Joyce that CDI should receive a passing grade.

Bono-Bunker: This is similar to a performance evaluation - an opportunity to give feedback before giving a final grade. If they are not failing, giving a failing grade does not incentivize them to perform well. She has seen projects where there is real failure; this is not one of them.

Foster: Ignoring the form says they are doing well. Two choices: He suggested either modify the grade or don't submit the form.

Antonellis added that quality has been excellent and that the form is flawed.

Joyce and a representative from Town would sign the completed form, then send it to contractor. Joyce would add comments about concern over schedule.

Bono-Bunker: Is the same form is used to evaluate both 50% and 100% completion? Joyce: Yes.

Resolution: Scores will be adjusted to give a passing grade, with a comment added noting our concerns and disappointment about the schedule.

Discussion of MVP grant

Antonellis gave an update on the MVP grant. The original grant included covering 90% of the cost of solar panels plus and the electric pickup truck to serve as a battery backup. It was determined that the truck would not work and the grant was rewritten to request that battery backup be substituted for the

truck. After a lot of work, we have learned that battery storage will cost significantly more than we expected and MVP won't cover the full cost.

Puleo thinks there will be better, smaller batteries in the future and suggests that we defer installation of battery storage. Antonellis noted that we will already have the pad and wiring. We can decide later to pursue battery storage.

Bono-Bunker asked if building can accept direct solar power. Antonellis: yes

Discussion of pendant lighting being donated by Dallmus and Bills

Dallmus and Linda Bills will donate a white 5-pendant light fixture for lobby. Antonellis suggested that we have the electrician install the lights. This will be a change order. She asked Dallmus to find out how long it will take to have the light fixtures delivered.

Other business

Houle suggested that it is time for another site visit to the library. This is good timing, as painters will soon put samples of the two of each of the color choices on walls so we can see them in place and make final decisions. Puleo will coordinate a site visit.

Next Meeting: Thursday, August 28 at 7 pm

Foster made a motion to adjourn. Houle seconded.

Roll call vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Foster-aye, Houle-aye, Jaques-aye, Moss-aye, Puleo-aye

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 pm