

Architectural Consulting Group, LLC

1025 Pequot Street, New Bedford, MA. 02745
508-965-3693

Progress Report

May 11, 2011

5/12/11
cc: Francis
Winn
Jovan
Tim
Middle
P.O.
Rental

Through end of this reporting period, progress at the three sites continued at a slow pace. The Contractor completed a majority of corrective items, and site inspections were conducted by the Town and Architect team. Site "as-built" drawings were delivered and reviewed, and some issues were discovered needing correction on the part of the Town as well as the contractor. Engineer to weigh in with the landscape architect for solutions.

The unacceptable workmanship issues needing corrections continued to dominate the discussions throughout the month, with ACG on several occasions at meetings and via emails, calling for larger, more qualified carpentry crews.

The average daily manpower on site with sub contractors was increased to about 12 men. The requested recovery schedule was not received. The two week look ahead schedules were not a good indicator and mostly milestones were not met. Work completed at the end of this period:

Windows 100% all sites no doors
Siding Site 2 90% Site 5 0% Site 8 10%
Windows Site 2,5,8 100%
Trim Site 2 90% Site 5 0% Site 8 90%
Concrete basement slabs 100% all sites
Electrical Rough Site 2 100%, Site 5 10%, Site 8 100%
Plumbing Rough Site 2 100%, Site 5 30%, Site 8 100%
Spray insulation Site 2 100%, Site 5 0%, Site 8 100%
Drywall Site 2 90%, Site 5 0%, Site 8 0%

The contractor acting against recommendations and discussions, proceeded to insulate the buildings. To add more potential for problems, they started sheetrocking as well at Site 2. ACG pointed out the need per the specs for an assistant super, and since this position was never filled, ACG recommended to the Town that a credit be sought for all the contract time where an assistant would have been working. Seaver objected, but ACG points out, it is a contract requirement, not a debatable issue. This again could have alleviated much of the quality control issue as to lack of supervision has created.

This lack of effort by Seaver has caused the Architect and the Town as well as ACG extra effort, lost time, and extra services expenditures soon to come.

Once again, there were several architect interpretations required, and ACG pointed out several times that the contractor needs to use the RFI process to

(over)

discover answers and solutions to questions or design issues. Going to the Owner is not correct procedure.

Many e-mail memos were passed between many parties, and the OPM set a new chain to be followed, that being the Architect, Contractor, and OPM. All other activity would be between these three and their own teams.

The owner made several inspections for quality control and discovered many problems with the siding, venting, and window installations. Ultimately, the contractor corrected most to the satisfaction of the Owner, but still the issue over sequencing is not yet resolved.

The OPM contacted Scott Seaver on several occasions to discuss these areas of concern. The OPM recommended that the bonding company be notified and their attendance at the upcoming May 18 meeting be required.

The OPM, after discussion with the Architect and Town, offered a one month extension to the schedule if the contractor would take the time and not perform work out of sequence. The opportunity to collect all missing documents was also afforded the contractor and architects office staff with the expressed goal of having all missing information in hand by May 13.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Josefek, OPM