

Municipal Building Committee
Minutes of Meeting
24 June 2015

Approved:
July 1, 2015

Location: Room 23, Forbes Building

Members present:

John Arnold
Bob Brown
Dexter Blois
Bob Fryer
Cal Lawrence

Members absent:

George Barrette
Peter O'Neil

Others Present:

Peter Collins, Heery
Jim Malloy, Town Manager

Zachary Schmalz, Heery
Pat Cullen, Fire Department

Mr. Brown called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM.

Open Forum

There were no requests to address the Committee.

Approval of Open Minutes

There were no minutes presented to the Committee for approval.

Fire Station

Mr. Collins and Mr. Schmalz provided an update to the Committee on recent events concerning the removal of the cork flooring. They handed out a diagram indicating Phase 1 and Phase 2 for replacing the damaged cork floor with new cork flooring. Mr. Collins summarized events from the past week. He said that a week ago, after the MBC meeting on 6/17, they visited the Fire Department to observe the manufacturer removing the damaged cork flooring. The manufacturer felt that there appeared to be a lot of moisture in the concrete slab so they drilled a hole in the floor to do a relative humidity test. Mr. Collins noted that they did not consult G&R – which they should have done before drilling in to the floor. The test they performed came back with a reading of greater than 80%. The manufacturer determined there was too much moisture so they left the job site without installing the new floor. Apparently there were some musty odors and a build-up of moisture in the room. It was determined that the threshold to the outside door from the ready room wasn't set properly initially. On or about the same day that the flooring manufacturer was there, G&R fixed and sealed the threshold so no rain could come in from the outside patio area. Mr. Collins felt that the improperly installed threshold may have contributed to the musty odor. Mr. Collins noted that the manufacturer performed the wrong test and should not have drilled a hole in the concrete slab. He pointed out that the concrete that was cast in this area had Barrier One added to the concrete which prevents moisture from migrating to the surface. Mr. Collins referred to the history of concrete and said it was determined that moisture can rise to the surface and hinder adhesion. Today's remedy is to add Barrier One to the concrete to prevent that from happening. Mr. Collins mentioned that if the flooring manufacturer had a concern, they should have done a calcium chloride or PH test. Mr. Collins explained that these types of tests measure the moisture content and are applied to the surface and left on for 60 hours. There is also an alkalinity test that could be performed and applied to the surface when using a product like Barrier One, but you don't drill in to the floor. A notice was sent to G&R as to what took place. G&R researched and contacted Barrier One who called an independent expert who performed a calcium chloride test last Friday. The samples of the test were collected this past Monday and will be reported back to the Barrier One representatives. Mr. Collins noted that Barrier One will warranty against any migration of moisture to the surface. Mr. Brown asked if Barrier One will still warranty the floor after the flooring manufacturer drilled a hole in it. Mr. Collins said they are checking in to that but thinks they will. Mr. Schmalz provided an explanation to the Committee about how the Barrier One product works within the concrete, and Mr. Collins felt that patching the concrete shouldn't be a problem. Mr. Collins pointed out that sometimes the concrete barrier is penetrated with pins when adhering items to the floor, it just needs to be done correctly. He reiterated that the flooring manufacturer should not have drilled the hole without permission. Mr. Collins noted that the flooring manufacturer will come back and apply the new flooring. Mr. Blois mentioned that the question was whether the cork flooring should be reinstalled. Mr. Collins said that he contacted G&R and asked for a price for installing linoleum flooring instead of the cork flooring. The cost was relatively the same - \$13.50 sq. ft. for cork flooring versus \$12.75 sq. ft. for vinyl linoleum, which is about an \$850 difference. However, they heard from Mr. Aylward at G&R, and they said their cost would be \$4,950 for materials

only, and that price didn't include an intricate base or labor. Mr. Malloy felt that we should receive a credit for installing the cork flooring. Mr. Blois asked if it was harder to install cork flooring rather than linoleum. Mr. Collins reviewed what they determined to be the difference in cost for installing linoleum versus the cork flooring in man hours. Mr. Schmalz pointed out that the new cork flooring is already on the job site and came in special order from the Midwest. It was noted that we would not get credit for the new cork flooring since it cannot be returned. Mr. Collins mentioned that if they found it wasn't much of a cost difference to put down linoleum versus the cork flooring, then they would go with the linoleum. However, the cost is high once you add in materials, the intricate base, and the labor. Mr. Malloy thought that it made sense to have them reinstall the cork flooring at no cost since it comes with a 10 year warranty. If there are problems after that, we can always install linoleum at that point. Mr. Collins noted that the original cork floor had issues with curling at the corners due to poor installation and preparations for sealing it, and that is why it was being replaced since it was still under warranty. Mr. Arnold mentioned that a base would need to be installed if changing flooring types since the baseboards were installed ½ inch up based on the height of the cork floor. Mr. Schmalz said the doorways would need to be adjusted too, so there are things that would need to happen if changing the floor. Mr. Brown asked if the Committee accepted Mr. Malloy's suggestion of staying with the cork flooring. Mr. Fryer made a motion to put the cork floor down as planned without any changes and Mr. Arnold seconded. VOTED: 4-0-1 (abstention: Blois). Mr. Blois was concerned with the maintenance of the cork flooring. Mr. Collins pointed out that Mr. Schmalz is in the process of collecting and turning over maintenance manuals to the Fire Department. He said that Heery could put flags on maintenance issues and map out a schedule, for instance what should be done at 3 months, 6 months, 9 months, etc.

Mr. Collins also wanted to discuss the concrete floors. He noted that there have been discussions about the cracks in the concrete – whether interior or exterior – since the building was turned over, particularly in the exposed areas and Apparatus Bays. Mr. Collins mentioned that the cracks are increasing in frequency, size, and width. His suggestion to the Committee was to hire a third party consultant specializing in geotechnical engineering with soil and concrete experience to perform a test and report back with conditions and what to do going forward. He pointed out that the cracks seem to be smooth and there's no vertical separation. He also mentioned that it is the nature of concrete to crack, so it could be nothing. Mr. Collins was concerned with the timeline for getting this done since we are approaching the 10 month substantial completion date. The earlier this information is known the quicker we can react. Mr. Collins noted that if the testing investigation finds no issue, then the client pays. If there is an issue with installation, then we can seek damages against the contractor or responsible parties and put a claim in for the costs. Mr. Malloy asked what the cost of this test would be and Mr. Collins guessed at about \$7,500. Mr. Malloy asked Mr. Collins if he could obtain some estimates for the cost of this testing since he felt it was worth it to get an idea. This issue has come up for a year now and Mr. Malloy felt the testing would provide finality as to whether there is an issue or not. The Committee agreed with Mr. Malloy's suggestion and will wait to receive names and a ballpark price for the testing from Heery at the next MBC meeting.

Mr. Fryer noted that Heery sent out their final bill for OPM services on the new Fire Station. Mr. Collins said that the payment schedule they originally came up with was based on the project timeline. He noted that G&R should have reached substantial completion within 18 months of starting the project, which was February 9, 2015 according to the terms of the contract. Per Massachusetts law, which allows another 65 days from substantial completion, the final completion date would have been April 15, 2015. We are now 70 days beyond final completion and there is still work left to do. Mr. Collins pointed out the penalty cost, which is \$1,000 a day, bringing the penalty to \$70,000 as of today. Mr. Collins said that everyone has been cordial to one another – with the exception of the recent soil issue. He noted that the parking lot should have been done in May and it is still not completed yet. When Heery came on to the project, they were expecting it to take 18 months. Mr. Collins said Heery isn't looking for additional compensation and will continue to work beyond the substantial completion date. Mr. Blois asked if G&R should be put on notice. Mr. Malloy had the same question and asked for this subject to be placed on the next MBC agenda for additional discussion. If we decide G&R should be put on notice, Mr. Malloy will send over a request to Town Counsel to draft a letter to G&R. Mr. Malloy asked about the timeline for the parking lot. Mr. Collins thought that once the soil is gone, that G&R will need 30 days to install the parking lot. He felt it should be paved and striped by August 1st and then they will seed and landscape by September 1st. Mr. Blois reminded the Committee that Mr. Humes needs to provide final designs for the Memorial Park. Mr. Malloy said that once he receives the designs, he will forward to local landscapers for an idea of the cost. It was noted that the Memorial Park should be done by September 11th for the ribbon cutting ceremony. Mr. Collins mentioned that he will be prepared to discuss the soil, cork flooring, and concrete testing at the next MBC meeting.

Mr. Fryer asked about the grounding of the racks and whether that was all set. Mr. Cullen reported that Bay State Wiring came back and completed the grounding but he felt their work was messy and sloppy. He said there were loops of wire and they didn't follow the pathways so it doesn't look nice. Mr. Collins noted that WSP will be back to test the system. He will look in to the work performed by Bay State on the racks and report back at the next meeting.

Town Hall

Mr. Malloy asked about the gutters and also when roof work will start. Mr. Schmalz noted that demo work on the roof will start next week, and he is waiting to speak to Mr. Humes about the wood gutter. There was discussion about the parking lot. Mr. Schmalz mentioned that the brick used on the addition matches the brick on the Town Hall. There was a question about the clock tower and Mr. Malloy asked if the white composite pieces will be cleaned before installing. Mr. Fryer thought that these pieces would be painted. It was noted that this will be double checked with Mr. Humes and also whether anything is planned for the brick stain on the main building.

Old Business

There was no old business brought before the Committee.

New Business

There was no new business brought before the Committee.

Future Meetings

The next Municipal Building Committee meeting will be held Wednesday, July 1, 2015, at 8:30 AM in Room 23 of the Forbes Building.

Adjournment

Having no further business, Mr. Blois made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:43 AM and Mr. Lawrence seconded. VOTED: 5-0-0, with 5 being present.

Respectfully submitted,
Jessica Thomas
MBC Administrative Assistant