From:	Rob Law
То:	Adams Fenelon; Andres Rincon; Ellen Anselone; Jim Alexander; mholt@samiotes.com; mzirolli@samiotes.com;
	mkayserman@samiotes.com; sgarvin@samiotes.com; Mark Bedard; Peter Cherichetti; rjames@oconnells.com;
	ppraderio@oconnells.com; Walsh, Catherine (DCP); D"Alelio, John (DCP); Ben Downing; Aaron Kraemer;
	ssanger@copley-wolff.com; Carrie Havey; Doyle, Conor P.; Olson, Jennifer L.; kristopher.horn@stvinc.com;
	liam.mchale@stvinc.com; michael.camoscio@stvinc.com; Roy, Andrew M.; Mark Kalin; Hession, Paul (POL);
	Hanlon, James (POL); Coppenrath, Leonard (POL); Jennifer McClain; Oliver Beacham
Cc:	Mulla, Altaf (DCP)
Subject:	POL1303 DC1 - Meeting Minutes 52
Date:	Monday, June 8, 2020 11:45:40 AM
Attachments:	image001.png
	image002.png
	image003.png
	2020-06-01 POL1303 DC1 - LBB Meeting Minutes 52.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from a sender outside of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts mail system. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

See attached.

Robert J. Law, AIA Associate

FINEGOLD ALEXANDER ARCHITECTS

77 North Washington Street, Boston, MA 02114

Office: 617.227.9272 x 312 rlaw@faainc.com www.faainc.com

Follow us at:



Finegold Alexander Architects

Meeting Minutes

Project: Lower Basin Barracks (POL1303 DC1)

Meeting No.: 052

Meeting Date: June 01, 2020 (Microsoft Teams Video Call)

Prepared by: Robert J. Law, AIA

Attendees/Distribution:

Attendees:	
Catherine Walsh, PM	DCAMM
John D'Alelio	DCAMM
Paul Hession	MSP
Maj. James Hanlon	MSP
Capt. Leonard Coppenrath	MSP
Ellen Anselone	FA
Rob Law	FA
Andres Rincon	FA
Adams Fenelon	FA
Mark Bedard	DOC
Paul Predario	DOC
Ryan James	DOC

Next Meeting(s):

- Project conference call – Monday June 8th @ 1:00

Attachments:

- None

Lower Basin Barracks:

Item	Description	Action
51.00	DOC presented 3-week Look-Ahead	DOC
	<u>Schedule</u>	
24.00	<u>Permits</u>	
24.03	MWRA 8(m) Permit:	
24.07b	01/20 – CW, JD, PP at MWRA offices during	DOC/DCAMM
	meeting to discuss BMC scope and next	
	steps. Will report to team later today.	
	- DOC in process of obtaining 2 nd	
	vendor (SAK) safety plan and identify	
	if they can provide a price from video	
	documentation alone.	

77 North Washington Street Boston, MA 02114

> 617.227.9272 www.faainc.com

T	
2/10 – Warren/ DOC to submit revised PCO	
for pre-construction inspection and video for	
500' of the BMC, safety plan, and 3 rd party	
extraction crew at two points of entry. Paul	
Hession to inquire about MSP providing police	
detail at no cost to the project. Work will be	
done at night.	
2/20 – MSP will provide police details as	
described at no cost to the project. DOC	
submitted costs for the documentation to	
DCAMM. Work to be scheduled pending final	
approval. DOC to schedule safety briefing	
with MWRA and W.E. a couple weeks prior to	
conduit inspection.	
3/23 – Warren to update safety plan for pre-	
construction inspection. DOC provided revised	
schedule.	
3/30 – Third party safety plan review is	
underway. Supplemental guidelines for	
COVID-19 to be included in submission.	
4/6 – Warren to meet on site to inspect upper	
lock area entry point between 4/15-4/17.	
4/13 – DOC is waiting confirmation from	
Warren.	
4/21- MWRA meeting to be held on 4/23 to	
review BMC access.	
4/27 – Inspection / Video setup for next	
Tuesday 5/6 pending weather. A&W to	
submit safety plan by Wednesday of this	
week. DOC requested all comments back by	
Friday of this week. DOC to revise PCO for	
inspection to occur during normal working	
hours.	
5/4 – Inspection still a go for tomorrow. DOC	
to revise PCO, will discuss with DCAMM.	
5/11 – Inspections was successful. DOC	
reported that the team did not observe and	
major surface damage to the BMC. Ground	
water penetration was evident as was some	
surface cracking, but in pretty good shape	
per DOC.	
- Video was taken using MSP provided	
drone, will be circulated to the team.	
- A&W report expected this week.	
	L

DOC noted and report is issued that	
- DOC noted once report is issued they	
can proceed with construction loading	
analysis.	
 Meeting to be held with 	
DOC/DCAMM/MSP/A&W/Design Team	
to discuss report and findings. To be	
scheduled later this week or early	
next week.	
- Meeting with MWRA to be held	
afterwards.	
5/18 – No change to previous week action	
items. DOC waiting on final report and video	
from A&W.	
 DOC's will complete BMC construction 	
loading analysis once documents	
received from A&W. DOC noted	
analysis will take +/- 2 weeks to	
complete once inspection report	
received from A&W.	
 DOC noted that the existing GMP 	
amendment does not carry any costs	
associated with bridging over the	
BMC for construction vehicles. Will	
alert DCAMM if this scope is required	
pending the analysis.	
5/27 – DOC has received A&W report and	
forwarded to DCAMM.	
- DCAMM to review and comment.	
Once comments finalized DOC to	
forward to MWRA. DCAMM and DOC	
to review comments after today's	
meeting.	
- DOC has received RT Groups	
preliminary structural construction	
loading report, final report ongoing.	
6/01- DOC to have call with RT	
group tomorrow, will send structural	
construction loading analysis this	
week to the team. Will review next	
Monday.	
 A&W report has been updated, 	
DOC to send to DCAMM for final	
review prior to sending to	
MWRA.	
- Target date for 8M heavy permit	
anticipated to be 6-8 week	

	review time from time of	
	submission.	
	- DOC to put together a tracking	
	list of outstanding required	
27.04	permit items.	
35.01	Dept. Public Health	FA
	Ongoing – FA to send detainee area layout to	
	DPH for review and acceptance. This will not	
	be required until shortly before building	
	permit application.	
	2/20 – FA reached out to the DPH and	
	confirmed their review will likely have a 1-day	
	turnaround. FA will issue package prior to	
	100% CD set. Item to remain on notes until	
	that time.	
	4/21 – PH reached out to contact at DPH to	
	review preferred MSP layout Option 4. FA to	
	request cost implication statement from	
	Seamus and SFC/DOC will carry layout as	
	alternate cost in upcoming estimate. Initial	
	thoughts are that this change will not add	
	additional cost to the project.	
	4/27 – FA requested DCAMM formally direct	
	the design team to proceed with this change.	
	5/4 – FA will resend email to DCAMM for	
	authorization to proceed.	
	5/11 – Authorization received, FA and	
	consultant to proceed with revising detainee	
	area.	
	- DPH submission will be submitted at	
	end of CD's.	
	5/18 – No change, FA will submit	
	required documents to DPH at end of	
	CD's.	
35.03	<u>Eversource</u>	Ongoing
	CW and STV to continue pushing Eversource	
	for update on power design to serve the site.	
	01/20 – DOC and STV working with Jude at	
	Eversource on temporary power design.	
	Eversource also evaluating scope and costs to	
	bring power from the jail to our site.	
	Eversource has all info needed and team is	
	waiting on them at this point.	
	- Eversource noted that 300kw service is to	
	be provided, DOC noted that anticipate	
	230kw usage max.	

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	- Bill Gode sent DOC/Team email noting he	
	believes power to stop plank garage is routed	
	through old panel in lower lock area. DOC	
	responded they recommend site meeting with	
	DCR electrician to cut power at this panel to	
	confirm. DOC also responding to DCR	
	concern of location of temp shed interfering	
	with SPG garage door at the rear. DOC to	
	coord. Final location of shed with DCR.	
	01/27 - DOC will organize an electrical	
	-	
	shutdown with MassDOT and all applicable	
	parties to determine where the Stop Plank	
	Garage and Upper Gate House is fed from.	
	02/03 – Meeting scheduled for Wednesday	
	this week.	
	02/10 – Electrical shutdown took place on 2/5	
	and CORA, DOC, DCR, MassDOT, STV and FA	
	were present. Refer to attached email	
	summary from STV sent on 2/5 at 3:44PM.	
	2/20 – DOC has continued to push	
	Eversource on temporary power design.	
	3/23 – Ongoing	
	3/30 – Ongoing: FA to have STV contact	
	Eversource about permanent power,	
	Eversource doesn't seem to have a work	
	order.	
	4/6 – Eversource provided PCO of \$6,000 to	
	cover their costs only to switch temp to	
	permanent power. DCAMM to approve and	
	release them to start work order.	
	4/13 - DCAMM to approve and release them	
	to start work order.	
	4/21 – Ongoing	
	4/27 – DOC received approved PCO this	
	morning. FA to ask STV to contact	
	Eversource and inquire about site lighting and	
	primary scope work order status.	
	5/4 - STV followed up on both site lighting	
	and full building. No response from	
	Eversource. Will keep trying. Electrical site	
	lighting is currently shown in the 60% set.	
	STV did not provide power or conduit	
	drawings.	
	5/11 – DOC to follow up on Eversource costs	
	as noted in their estimate. Will be discussed	
	at reconciliation meeting.	

	- PH had a conversation with Jude at	
	Eversource and the permanent design from	
	Eversource is nearly complete.	
	- STV has attempted numerous times to	
	contact Eversource with no response.	
	5/18 – online meeting with Eversource held	
	this past week. Eversource indicated that the	
	existing lines that feed the site will have	
	enough capacity to provide the power	
	required for temp and permanent service and	
	separate the MassDOT bridge power.	
	- DCAMM requested that STV comment to the	
	team if anything indicated in the 60%	
	electrical drawings would change based on	
	the discussion with Eversource.	
	- DCAMM requested an MEP/FP workshop to	
	be held this week to review scope and cost	
	questions from the 60% estimates. FA to	
	schedule meeting for Thursday 5/21.	
	- Follow-up estimate meeting occur shortly	
	thereafter.	
	5/27 – FA reported STV did not see any costs	
	impacts based on Eversource meeting.	
	 MEP/FP Workshop was held last 	
	week. Discussion revolved around	
	aligning the estimates with the	
	correct MEP Scope. STV provided	
	comments to DOC and FCS to	
	incorporate into updated estimates.	
	6/01 – DCAMM has requested a memo	
	by STV outlining exactly what the	
	design teams believes are the	
	responsibilities of Eversource and DCR	
	for the entire project.	
24.10	<u>Schedule</u>	
	4/27 – Upcoming Deliverable dates:	DOC / DCAMM
	- 5/11/20 cost Estimate for 60% CDs	
	due from DOC and Seamus.	
	- 6/1/20 100% CD's	
	- 6/15/20 100% CD estimate	
	- 6/16-6/22 DOC budget review and	
	approval team/DCAMM	
	 These dates to be discussed, FA will 	
1		
	need a one week to address review comments.	

5/4 – Week added to schedule for FA to	
-	
address 100% review comments. New Dates	
as follows.	
- 6/1/20 100% CD's	
- 6/15/20 100% CD estimate	
 6/16-6/22 FA to address review 	
comments.	
 6/23-7/3 DOC budget review and 	
approval team/DCAMM	
5/11 – DOC sent out revised schedule update	
this morning. FA requested additional 3	
weeks added to design period in order to	
address all DOC and DCAMM review	
comments. Updated schedule will be	
discussed next week at schedule update	
meeting.	
- DCAMM to provide 60% review	
comments by this Friday.	
- Scheduled 9/29/20 Notice to Proceed	
date for full building package is	
impacted by the delay of NTP for	
Early Bid Package #2 by 3-4 weeks	
as of today. Team to review at next	
week schedule meeting.	
5/18 – Revised schedule dates discussed.	
EKA noted that FA still requires an additional	
3 weeks to complete the documents. This	
date will be reflected on next schedule	
update from DOC. New 100% deliverable	
date is 6/24.	
- EKA noted to the team that the	
design schedule runs parallel to the	
- ·	
DOC schedule and that the team should be clear that the 3-4 week	
delay on the NTP will impact the full	
building NTP and final occupancy	
date by 3-4 weeks. All acknowledged	
this point. DOC will look for ways to	
make up schedule time. DCAMM	
working with DOC to complete	
paperwork to provide NTP for EBP#2.	
5/27 – DOC noted that the NTP date moves	
the schedule an additional week. DCAMM	
working with DOC to finalize GMP and give	
NTP go-ahead for EBP#2.	
6/01 – DCAMM noted a NTP meeting	
with DOC is scheduled for tomorrow.	

	 4/27 - Team noted that EBP#2 bidding #'s to be noted in 60% estimates. FA to forward info to Seamus. 5/4 - \$428,000 Demo low bid number and other various PCO's from Mark to be sent by DOC to Seamus to include in his estimate. 5/11 - MB will forward these numbers to FA today after meeting. Team would like to hold budget reconciliation meeting Wednesday or Thursday this week. 5/18 - Reconciliation meeting was held last Friday. See separate meeting notes for further info. DOC to provide meeting commentary to Seamus for estimate discussion and both sides will update estimates as needed for second estimate review meeting TBD. FA to forward estimate meeting notes to consultants. 5/27 - Estimate finalization meeting scheduled for the beginning of next week's O/A/U/C meeting. 6/01 - Cost finalization held prior to today's meeting. Discussion resulted in +/- 2.5% delta and estimates are 	DOC / FCS / TEAM
24.12	considered reconciled and on budget.	
24.12	Early Bid Packages	
33.00	<u>11/4 – Meeting 33 Items</u>	
33.01	 11/18 – To hook up the trailers with water and sewer, the Boston Water and Sewer Commission (BWSC) requires the submission of a PE stamped Site Plan that shows the proposed tie-in locations and cut and cap plan after the trailers are demobilized. DOC submitted draft site plan and DCAMM provided initial markups to be reviewed at 11/25 project meeting. 30 Days for BWSC to review and approve or provide comments. 12/5 – RJ reached out to Samiotes to provide DOC with a utility hookup plan for the trailers adjacent to the tennis courts. Water line tie-in needs to be brought into the site. DOC to provide costs for Samiotes design. Suggested as a change order to EBP#1. Water line is believed to be under Storrow Drive sidewalk. 	BWSC / SAMIOTES / DCAMM

	4/27 - DCAMM going with WSP for Cx Agent.	
	4/21 - DCAMM to review.	
	for comparison and inform DCAMM.	
	MEP. DOC and FA to review other CxAgents	
	(house doctor) is available for CxAgent for	
	onboard. 4/06 – DCAMM informed project team RDK	
	scope to DCAMM. DCAMM to get Cx agent	
	03/23 – FA provided required commissioning	
	soon as possible.	
	agent need to be brought on to the project as	
	points associated with commissioning, a Cx	
	02/20 – Ongoing. In order to get LEED	
	02/03 - Ongoing	
	01/27 – Ongoing, DCAMM to Confirm	
34.01	DCAMM to get commission agent/ envelope consultant on board	DCAMM
34.00		DCANN
24.00	6/01 – Ongoing. <u>11/18 – Meeting 34 Items</u>	
	with BWSC.	
	Samiotes is currently reviewing comments	
	5/27 – CW reach out was successful and	
	will discuss these with her contact at BWSC.	
	is waiting on BWSC for to Catherine and she	
	5/18 - FA forwarded outstanding items team	
	contact at BWSC.	
	and Catherine will discuss with her	
	list all outstanding questions to BWSC	
	 BWSC still not responding. Team decided FA to ask Samiotes / DOC to 	
	location on site will need to be provided.	
	be on site soon and without trailer, alternate	
	5/11 – DCAMM noted a resident will need to	
	and get a response.	
	but Samiotes leadership should jump in to try	
	from BWSC. DOC noted there is still time,	
	5/4 – Samiotes still has not gotten response	
	supply line plan to BWSC	
	4/27 – Samiotes submitted job trailer water	
	trailer power plan to DOC.	
	Samoites to pick up comments and resubmit	
	4/6 – DOC provided comments to Samiotes.	
	sent DOC first draft of trailer power plan. DOC to provide comments.	
	03/23 – DCAMM approved PCO. Samiotes	
	02/20 – Ongoing awaiting DCAMM approval.	
	approval.	
	02/10 – Ongoing, Waiting on DCAMM	
	02/03 – Ongoing	
	approve.	
	01/27 - Ongoing, DCAMM to review and	
	reviewed, in DCAMM court. JD to check on status and if it is included in Mini-GMP #1.	
	01/20 – PCO for this work was submitted and	

 5/4 – DCAMM still in process of signing up WSP for Cx Agent. 5/11 – DCAMM still in process. WSP has deadline of 5/18 to get proposal to DCAMM. FA noted the urgency for the LEED points 	
associated. 5/18 – DCAMM deadline for Cx Consultant proposal is today. DCAMM to advise team once Agent is contracted.	
 5/27 – Ongoing expected to have Cx Agent start this coming Friday. 6/01 – DCAMM sending Cx agent the current drawings. Meeting to be setup in the next week or so. 	

46.00	<u>04/21 – Meeting 46 Items</u>	
46.00 46.01	DCAMM asked why Civil/ Samiotes is running a new water line +/- 200' when there is an existing water line running along Storrow Drive sidewalk. FA to reach out to Samiotes. Samiotes's response: "The primary reason we located the new water line was because at the east end of that main in Storrow Drive it tapers down from a 12" line to a 6" line, and then eventually ends in a presumed dead end. Concerns were raised that there would not be enough available pressure at the eastern end of this service main, so we opted to tap into the 12" section of the main to avoid having water pressure issues." DCAMM and DOC to confirm this is acceptable.	MCPHAIL
	 4/27 – DCAMM would like to track this issue as well as the others listed below in the meeting notes. Soil testing Hydrant flow test and potential to tie in water line closer to barracks instead of traversing the site as currently shown. Video of sewer line, Samiotes to review and DOC to submit PCO for this work. 5/11 – Soil testing approval sent by DCAMM this morning. McPhail to schedule driller ASAP. 	

		[]
	5/18 – Driller scheduled for 5/28. McPhail to	
	email the team a marked-up site plan	
	showing locations for sampling.	
	- FA to ask McPhail for timeline on	
	receiving lab results and final report.	
	5/27 – Driller still on for tomorrow 5/28.	
	McPhail informed the team that test results	
	have a 5-day turnaround and then McPhail	
	would need 2 weeks to complete report.	
	6/01 – ongoing, no change to schedule.	
49.02	5/11 – Video of sewer line costs being put	DCAMM
	together by DOC. In order to clean/video	
	30x36 sewer line requested, it will require a	
	hydrant hookup. BWSC is currently not	
	allowing this due to COVID-19. DOC getting	
	pricing and would be able to do this cleaning	
	and video once allowed.	
	5/18 – DOC provided PCO this morning for	
	cleaning and video of sewer lines. DOC	
	-	
	priced the change on T&M not to exceed	
	basis. Expected to take two days to perform	
	work. RJ thinks that the hydrant meter will	
	likely be available from BWSC soon pending	
	Governor Baker's announcement on COVID-	
	19 restrictions today.	
	- FA to review PCO and provide letter to	
	DCAMM.	
	5/27 – FA's PCO review letter was submitted	
	to DCAMM and JD noted the PCO is in	
	process and will likely be executed this week.	
	6/01 – JD to check on status of PCO	
46.00	approval.	DCAMM
46.03	DCAMM to issue RFQ and schedule RFQ	DCAMM
	meeting for full building scope.	
	4/27 – DCAMM will issue RFQs beginning of	
	May.	
	5/4 – No change	
	5/11 – DCAMM intends to split RFQ's into	
	two groups, main trades and smaller trades.	
	5/18 - RFQ's for first round going out at the	
	end of this week per DCAMM.	
	- First round expected to be received	
	back 1 st week of June.	
	 Second round expected to be 	
	received back 3 rd week of June.	
	 RFB's to go out in July. 	

5/27 - RFQ's for primary trade contractors sent out today. Second round will be June 17th. 6/01 - No Change to RFQ schedule. 1770 94/27 - Meeting 47 Items 17.00 4/27 - DOC to do cost analysis of reusing existing slab in new fitness area vs. new slab on grade. 5/4 - Will be included in 60% cost estimate as alternate. 5/11 - Due to ongoing discussion of removing existing slab, DOC did 60% estimate on current drawings showing to keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
17 th . 6/01 – No Change to RFQ schedule. 17.00 04/27 – Meeting 47 Items 17.01 4/27 – DOC to do cost analysis of reusing existing slab in new fitness area vs. new slab on grade. S/4 – Will be included in 60% cost estimate as alternate. 5/1 – Due to ongoing discussion of removing existing slab, DOC did 60% estimate on current drawings showing to keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
6/01 - No Change to RFQ schedule.17.0004/27 - Meeting 47 Items17.014/27 - DOC to do cost analysis of reusing existing slab in new fitness area vs. new slab on grade. 5/4 - Will be included in 60% cost estimate as alternate. 5/11 - Due to ongoing discussion of removing existing slab, DOC did 60% estimate on current drawings showing to keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
17.00 04/27 - Meeting 47 Items 17.01 4/27 - DOC to do cost analysis of reusing existing slab in new fitness area vs. new slab on grade. RSE/FA 5/4 - Will be included in 60% cost estimate as alternate. 5/11 - Due to ongoing discussion of removing existing slab, DOC did 60% estimate on current drawings showing to keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
17.01 4/27 – DOC to do cost analysis of reusing existing slab in new fitness area vs. new slab on grade. S/4 – Will be included in 60% cost estimate as alternate. 5/11 – Due to ongoing discussion of removing existing slab, DOC did 60% estimate on current drawings showing to keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
existing slab in new fitness area vs. new slab on grade. 5/4 – Will be included in 60% cost estimate as alternate. 5/11 – Due to ongoing discussion of removing existing slab, DOC did 60% estimate on current drawings showing to keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
on grade. 5/4 – Will be included in 60% cost estimate as alternate. 5/11 – Due to ongoing discussion of removing existing slab, DOC did 60% estimate on current drawings showing to keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
5/4 – Will be included in 60% cost estimate as alternate. 5/11 – Due to ongoing discussion of removing existing slab, DOC did 60% estimate on current drawings showing to keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
as alternate. 5/11 – Due to ongoing discussion of removing existing slab, DOC did 60% estimate on current drawings showing to keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
5/11 – Due to ongoing discussion of removing existing slab, DOC did 60% estimate on current drawings showing to keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
removing existing slab, DOC did 60% estimate on current drawings showing to keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
estimate on current drawings showing to keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
keep slab in place. Team discussed that pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
pricing would likely be less once preferred alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
alternate to replace is decided. FA submitted proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
proposal from RSE to conduct mini-study for slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
slab replacement. FA noted that this option was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
was not studied in initial study because removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
removing the slab was not considered as RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
RSE's position was that it could be repaired. DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
DOC has informed the team that keeping the existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
existing slab would result in constructability and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
and schedule issues and not be cost or schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
schedule effective. DCAMM requested to	
·	
approve RSE proposal as soon as possible.	
5/18 – FA noted that RSE is awaiting	
authorization of additional service from	
DCAMM to proceed with analysis study. JD	
to check email records if this has been	
provided.	
- Analysis will be SD level narrative	
without drawings. DOC requested	
simple section details of each ption	
to assist with pricing.	
5/27 – FA to ask RSE to expedite their	
analysis if possible.	
6/01 – RSE working as quickly as	
possible on study.	
IT.034/27 – DOC to submit PCO to performDCAMM/ DOC	
investigation work per the marked up plan	
circulated to the team. The areas of	
investigation are as follows.	
- Remove section of ceiling at each	
tower bay to expose roof framing.	

	- Remove plaster and lath covering	
	original Mass DOT entry stair from	
	gate room side to determine	
	condition of existing structure.	
	 Core holes through red brick at 	
	mortuary and gym building to	
	determine if blond brick exists and	
	the condition it is in.	
	- FA to review 3D scan to determine if	
	existing original 1908 stairs above	
	boiler room need to be removed for	
	head clearance.	
	 Items 5,6,7 on hold pending final decision on 1913 slab in new fitness 	
	area. DOC to submit PCO for	
	additional under slab photo	
	investigation, coring and selective	
	Demo.	
	5/4 – RL to respond to Ryan's Email to	
	confirm scope.	
	5/11 – FA responded to scope and PCO was	
	issued. DCAMM/FA to review.	
	5/18 – DCAMM noted they had not received	
	FA's PCO review letter. FA to respond to	
	PCO today.	
	5/27 – PCO review letter was submitted to	
	DCAMM last week. DOC to begin	
	investigation work as soon as PCO formally	
	approved by DCAMM.	
	6/01 – PCO not yet approved by	
	DCAMM. As of today, tower is now	
	_	
	occupied 24/7. Paul Hession to help	
	reach out to MassDOT to ask them for	
	flexibility to allow night work to	
40.04	happen while tower is in operation.	
48.01	5/4 – JD asked about virtual meetings with	STV
	inspectors. None scheduled, team to explore	
	what inspectors are doing.	
	5/11 – FA will reach out to STV to confirm	
	contact with AHJ's.	
	5/18 – STV has been communicating with	
	AHJ's via email. Per CW all consultant	
	communication with AHJ's must copy	
	DCAMM.	
	5/27 – FA to ask STV to forward all previous	
	communication with plumbing inspector to	
	DCAMM.	
	1 =	

	6/01 – DCAMM would like meeting with	
	new plumbing inspector. STV to setup	
	for this week.	
49.03	5/11 – Second accessibility review will be needed per DCAMM. Floor plans only to be reviewed once 100% CD set is complete. FA to forward to DCAMM at that time. 5/18 – JD agreed to sending DCAMM accessibility consultant the 100% documents for comment. Requested this item be left on the notes as a reminder.	DCAMM
50.02	 5/18 – AM asked on current status with Boston Landmarks and MHC. JA noted that meeting with landmarks was successful and all façade material are approved. Staff reviews will be required during CA. All photo documentation for MHS is complete except for the Fens Gatehouse. Once that is complete, the MOA to MHS will be responded to. 5/27 – RL to check with JA on when photos of Fens Gatehouse will happen. FA to forward photos of Stop Plank Garage to DCAMM. 6/01 – FA to coordinate SPG interior and Fens gatehouse photos. 	FA
50.03	 5/18 – DOC noted that they continue to add review comments to the google spreadsheet for the 60% set and they will re-issue drawing comment matrix to team. 5/27 – more comments added by DOC, RJ noted that FA to utilize the online spreadsheet in lieu of formal PDF submission of comments. 6/01 – Team agreed that as of Friday of this week no more drawing and spec comments from DOC on the 60% set. 	DOC
50.04	 5/18 – DOC noted that the main water line was increased from 6" to 8" and asked for explanation from Samiotes on why. 5/27 – FA to confirm with Samiotes reason for upsizing the main water line. 6/01 – FA sent email noting wh the ize increase was needed. Item closed. 	RECORD

Finegold Alexander Architects

50.07	5/18 – noted that MassDOT has alerted him	FA
	to an ongoing problem with homeless people	
	sleeping in and urinating in the MassDOT	
	vestibule area. MassDOT has requested a	
	permanent gate to close the vestibule off.	
	The team discussed a temporary gate until	
	the MSP returns to the building. All agreed	
	this was an appropriate solution. FA to send	
	a sketch for temporary gate.	
	5/27 – Temporary gate can be plywood and	
	should not damage the existing stonework.	
	FA to discuss options with RJ. Gate to have	
	hasp and padlock and should swing out if	
	possible.	
	06/01 – Ongoing.	

If there are errors, discrepancies and/or omissions, please notify Finegold Alexander Architects within 24 hours of receipt of this report. After 24 hours, this report will be deemed correct in every aspect and accepted by all concerned.