

**Town of Plymouth**  
**BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**October 12, 2023**

The Vice Chair, David Malaguti called the Building Committee meeting to order at 6:30 P.M. Members present were Eugene Blanchard, Thomas Fugazzi, Tim Grandy, Megan Marble, Tracy Marquis, and Luis Pizano. Members Absent: David Peck and Robert Morgan.

Staff in attendance included: Neil Foley, Fire Chief; Adam Blaisdell, School Administrator; Matt Durkee, Facilities Director Schools; Sandy Strassel, Procurement Officer; Jackie Tobin, Administrative Assistant Procurement.

Guests in attendance included: Rick Pomroy, Pomroy Associates; Yugon Kim, TSKP; Adam Dalessio, Colliers; William McKenna, Lucien Lanoue, Micheal Bollwage, Greenwood; Jason Wagner, GALE.

*Disclosure: These minutes are not verbatim – they are the secretary’s interpretation of what took place at the meeting. – Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A § 22.*  
*All materials presented during this meeting are available in the Procurement Office.*  
*Administrative Business – May include topics not reasonably anticipated by the Chair 48 hours in advance of the meeting.*

**Minutes**

August 10, 2023	Tom Fugazzi motioned to approve, Luis Pizano 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, Tim Grandy abstained. Approved.
September 14, 2023	Tom Fugazzi motioned to approve, Eugene Blanchard 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, Luis Pizano and David Malaguti abstained. Approved.

**Fire Station Updates:**

(Update packet provided)

**Station No 2- Phase II:**

Rick Pomroy (RP): We will be looking for occupancy in mid-December, things are moving along. R.J. Roy has been named the new contractor on site. Work is under way on the new east side concrete aprons and will be ready for paving in two weeks. The focus will then turn to the west side. The emergency generator will be in place in the middle of next week and the docking station was installed today. Final switchover arrangement will start after that. The process will take place over three nights.

The window and glazing system continue to be a problem with the manufacturer, they were approved in October of 2022, and we still do not have delivery of them. We held a meeting on Tuesday of this week with the filed sub bid contractor and the manufacturer and it appears that we will start seeing product in the middle of November. The GC continues to work around this situation, but the reality is they are being delayed. We left them with the direction to get together with their business managers, I am hoping to hear something back tomorrow or Monday.

The interior of the addition continues to move forward, and we are running short on manpower with the tile contractor. Still planning on substantial completion in December.

Change order log 12, line 46 is replacing the mechanic's bay apron on the east side of the building. This was not included in the original scope of the project. We have become concerned about the integrity of the slab. A void has been confirmed below it is 6x6 void. The new slab would be 8" instead of the 6" that is there now. We are recommending CO#9

**Station No 5:**

RP: Site work continues. Storm drainage system is complete in the rear of the site, tight tank is expected towards the end of October and septic structures are expected shortly. The binder pavement should be completed in November for the side road and rear of the site. All the underground plumbing is complete and has passed inspection.

**Station No 4:**

No updates currently.

Invoices and Change Order submitted for approval:

<b>Vendor</b>	<b>Invoice Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Approvals</b>
Seaver (Retro)	Application #4 (Station #5)	\$32,075	Tim Grandy motioned to approve, Tom Fugazzi 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, unanimous approval.
Granite City (Retro)	S009395331.001	\$276	Tim Grandy motioned to approve, Tom Fugazzi 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, unanimous approval.
Seaver	Application #14 (Station #2)	\$364,967	Tom Fugazzi motioned to approve, Tim Grandy 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, unanimous approval.
Seaver	Application #5 (Station #5)	\$171,851	Tom Fugazzi motioned to approve, Luis Pizano 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, unanimous approval.
Saccoccio & Associates	21002-28	\$37,805.05	Tom Fugazzi motioned to approve, Luis Pizano 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, unanimous approval.
Pomroy	PFDSR-028	\$30,422.50	Tim Grandy motioned to approve, Tom Fugazzi 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, unanimous approved.
Amazon	144R-R63M-4HJ7	\$970.71	Tim Grandy motioned to approve, Tom Fugazzi 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, unanimous approval.
Pomroy	CO#9	\$30,601.20	Tom Fugazzi motioned to approve, Luis Pizano 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, unanimous approval.

### **School Roof Updates:**

Matt Durkee (MD): We've had water damage at Indian Brook since our last meeting. All that damage has been repaired. Greenwood is following up with air quality testing within the affected classrooms as well. We are also waiting for tests from the gymnasium from prior water damage.

We held a meeting on September 28<sup>th</sup> at which point we did a walk through on the roof to check Greenwood's work. We identified some concerns from which Yugon created our first general punch list. Greenwood has been working on it in preparation for a final punch list.

Some of the sites where the landscaping was not what we wanted has been improved upon. For the HVAC units on all three roofs needing to be brought to the industry standard of eight inches is what brings us here today.

Yugon Kim (YK): Greenwood has addressed a lot of the issues on the punch list. We've broken the list down into various issues, aesthetics, safety, warranty and obviously contract addition, there is a mix of all these issues.

- Smoking at the sites.
- Pooling water around the skylights.
- Roof drain sump pump size (Small).
- Membrane bubbling.
- Settling issues.
- Gravel/Construction debris under the membrane.
- Pooling water on the roof.

The Versico Rep (Roof manufacturer) signed off which we agree with. Versico's solution is not to cut the membrane open in areas of debris but to add a patch on top. That is their standard approach, but the question is how many of these areas there actually are. Greenwood has agreed to address the pooling water.

Lucien Lanoue (LL): The issue with that is sometimes when it comes to pooling water, we tend to just move a puddle. We will try to get rid of most of it but sometimes you just have shifting.

Tim Grandy (TG): What would be your solution to that HVAC unit? (Unit shown in Yugon's slide).

William McKenna (WM): Yeah, that's been done. We installed a cricket and it's performing quite well but not 100%.

YK: In some areas it's normal to have pooling water that evaporates, the concern here is the quantity of the water. Greenwood did take care of that, so we are waiting to see how it performs.

We are documenting debris on the site, like this blade (slide shown during meeting) out of concern for the longevity of the roof.

The new roof edge fascia around all the buildings is not fully connected so Greenwood said they will go back to ensure it is fully connected in all locations.

We've had some ADA and OSHA concerns that they are planning to resolve as far as stepping between the annex roof and the main building at Indian Brook. Also, an issue with some electrical components not being secured yet but Greenwood has stated they will take care of that as well.

A few windows have been replaced. Some installation tolerance issues up in the metal panel, we have not come to a resolution on that.

LL: No, I'll have to look at that one personally. We will correct it if it's something that was not done right.

YK: There is some question as to if the trim needs to be fully sealed on all the perimeter, it's still under discussion.

LL: What do you want us to do there, caulk it?

YK: There are spots of perimeter trim with larger gaps that we would want done.

The documents called out to have insulated jackets around all drains. We notice that some were not installed. With drains being installed sometimes there's corrosion and things that have now been leaking since the bulb was installed and reconnected, there is some question as to who is responsible for that. The school did not have leaking before.

That was our list for the pre punch, we will do a full punch list when the project is fully completed. There are still some scope issues that are incomplete.

MD: At our walk through one thing that was made clear was by the roof manufacturer is where the warranty ends. It is at the turn bar and that has been my concern with that flashing height. In some locations that bar is only an inch to two inches. We will have the warranty but if snow is over two inches and leaks into the RTU the warranty has nothing to do with that.

LL: My only comment on that Matt, these units see prevailing driving range, right? If the unit is not tight it's going to leak. So, the height of the snow doesn't matter, it's going to be a gasket.

MD: Both companies I spoke with their opinions, it does matter. Piled compacted snow will make its way into those units when its melting.

YK: We've been trying to understand the gravity of the situation. Greenwood has gone through and provided high and low dimensions of the units. Next step is to understand the extent of the low because it is a tapered roof so there are heights that we would not recommend maintain but there are some that are more acceptable. The real reason we are all here is because of the ongoing conversation about the height of these units.

Tracy Marquis (TM): None of these units were disconnected or raised during this process?

YK: Not at this time. This is why we are all here. On average its about eight large units and then Indian Brook eight smaller on the annex.

Yugon showing the drawings in his slides.

They all go to detail seven. Detail seven which notes an eight-inch curb, it is however noted as an existing exhaust fan not as existing equipment. Then detail eight is a typical curb detail both showing additional blocking and raised units. This one explicitly says raised and reinstalled existing curb on wood blocking. In our mind both show and outline raising and blocking.

TM: Is there anything in the MEP scope that addresses disconnecting and reconnecting the units?

YK: There is some but, this kind of language in terms of extending exists. It does show the eight-inch minimum curb. Greenwood does not feel that they own this curb height.

LL: It doesn't tell me to raise the curb. It calls out blocking, but it doesn't say new. You have notes that say new blocking, references say as noted on the drawing. There are details that say no new blocking and no blocking.

TM: Everything is new unless noted otherwise.

Tim Grandy (TG): Can you blow up number eight a little bit more.

#8 Raise reinstall existing curb on wood blocking.

YK: The way I see it, we represented all the RT units. We placed all the weights of the RT units, and sent it to a detail. It shows an exhaust fan curb detail, it is showing language that the ductwork should be extended. There is a convention that when blocking has the X in it that it's new blocking. So, there is language and the minimum 8-inch height that the detail is sending it to. Greenwood assumed that this detail was incorrectly tagged, you can't just ignore that.

LL: Yes, we brought the issue to everyone's attention early on in the project. A representative for the town was at that meeting, I was not there so I can't speak for her, but she said just get me what satisfies the warranty.

TM: Who was that?

LL: Christina

TG: Was there an RFI?

LL: It was discussed at the meeting. Should it have been followed up with an RFI, I agree it should have been. It was noted twice in the meeting.

Adam Delesio (AD): They spoke about it at the meeting but from there, no follow up as far as it was an RFI or a new detail.

LL: My main concern is at this late point in the project why is it only being brought up now at the end?

YK: It wasn't only at the end.

LL: I would disagree because why was it not asked when are we raising the units?

YK: We had, and I'm sure it is reflected in our meeting minutes that there were many weeks when we requested the detail and the warranty information. I agree that Christina said it was something she would be open to, but it was always part of the discussion that we wanted to see the alternative detail and it didn't come for a number of weeks.

LL: The letter stating you could obtain the warranty came quickly.

TM: Do you have the detail, can you show it to us?

YK: The detail did finally come, and it did not reflect the existing conditions. We kept asking for more. The detail represented was not accurate, it gave more of an average. We again requested and now finally have the highs and lows. I don't think Greenwood can just ignore the scope.

LL: We are here to work with everyone. But if you go to detail 19, which is the Annex, I don't think it tells me to do anything.

YK: This one shows an eight-inch minimum and wood blocking. We need to do the work and find the acceptable height. Industry standards are 8 inches. With some projects there is leeway. I can go to the site, and then provide an acceptable curb height.

TG: So roughly 24 units, how many need to be raised?

LL: I don't believe the ones on the gym are an issue at all.

TM: They might say there is tolerance, a minimum. Maybe five, not two or three?

TG: I don't see any documentation that states that. That would need to come from the architect and the manufacturer or the rubber.

Tom Fugazzi (TF): I'd like to hear from Colliers, they are the project supervisor. It seems like we have a ton of problems, including raising these units. They were supposed to be watching this for us.

AD: We were watching, so again we talked about it early on with a Town representative about getting the letter from the manufacturer about the warranty. Even the two units that they agreed on as part of the contract have not been raised yet. We have been waiting for all of this to settle.

TM: So that is a reduction in the scope, is there a credit identified to go with it?

AD: We are going through our list of PC's and if they are not going to be raised then what is the credit. We are working through it now.

TF: GALE, fill us in with your opinion.

Jason Wagner (JW): We have been commenting on the flashing height issue. In short, the industry standard is eight, we're looking at the proposed detail for the RTU which shows the 8-inch flashing height. We identified it months ago and asked if you're not doing it what is the plan? And so began the waiting process of what is the proposed detail. We continued to say we want you to do the 8-inch flashing height because that is what is called for. The roof manufacturer may say we will let that go but it doesn't negate the need to do it. Typically, from the shop drawings, Greenwood or the roofing contractor will take the details and verbatim just copy them and say this is what we are going to do. There began to be some discrepancies in terms of what do they own or not own. From our perspective, you want to maintain the eight-inch flashing.

TM: Clearly across the board this needs to be rectified. The project team, including the contractor, the OPM and the architect need to come up with a solution on how this is going to happen, including a schedule. Once this plan has been signed off on bring it back here to the building committee. The key is to get to the next step. I make a motion to instruct the project team to develop a strategy to move forward to raise these curbs to meet industry standards. It should include agreements on details, cost, and a schedule of implications and to present that to us at our next meeting, November 9<sup>th</sup>.

TG: I second the motion.

Unanimously approved.

YK: Thank you so much we will come back with a plan.

Invoices submitted for approval:

<b>Vendor</b>	<b>Invoice Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Approvals</b>
Colliers	0000887360	\$49,278.39	Luis Pizano motioned to approve, Tracy Marquis 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, unanimous approval
TSKP (Retro)	210703-23	\$3000	Tracy Marquis motioned to approve, Tom Fugazzi 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, unanimous approval
TSKP (Retro)	210801-23	\$4292.30	Tim Grandy motioned to approve, Tracy Marquis 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, unanimous approval.

TSKP (Retro)	210902-23	\$3000	Tracy Marquis motioned to approve, Luis Pizano 2 <sup>nd</sup> the motion, unanimous approval.
--------------	-----------	--------	--

Next Meeting November 9, 2023, at 6:30 P.M.

Adjourn 8:13 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Jackie Tobin*

Administrative Assistant – Procurement

Minutes Approved 11/9/23