

CWC LAND COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 3, 2015
MINUTES

Present: Martin Donnelly, Berndt Leifeld, Alan Rosa, Jeff Graf (NYCDEP), Michael Triolo, Martin Donnelly, Inness Kasanof

Excused: Mark McCarthy Tom Snow (NYSDEC)

Others Present: Tim Cox (CWC)

- I. Call to Order at 10:30 am
- II September, 2015 Minutes unanimously approved
- III. TLAP – NYCDEP Consultant for Shandaken Collection Lines

Tim Cox notified the committee that NYCDEP had selected Douglas Clark of Ryan, Biggs, Clark & Davis Engineers to be their consultant. Tim stated that neither he nor John Nye had any reservations about Mr. Clark. Committee agreed

- IV. Other

Tim briefly reviewed the status of other matters. He stated that Roxbury was in settlement discussions with the City and had requested information on the sewer collection line template. Tim also stated that CWC consultant was continuing work on review of Marbletown report and CWC hoped to have something by end of the year.

- V. Next meeting to be scheduled as needed
- VI. Adjourned at 10:41 am

Hi John

For further explanation as to my concerns and request for a contract addition, please let me describe several examples, keeping in mind that I am not suggesting that the template be changed in any way, only that I think costs and items may be missing:

Using the east dike as an example, (the analysis provided by the city is not paginated) the first five pages are calculations of quantities. While we have and will continue to spot check the calculations, the larger issue is that it appears that a number of construction items and thus costs are missing. Such items as mobilization, environmental controls, site remediation and landscaping, construction of laydown areas and remediation at job end, soil base preparation, keyway preparation, installation of gates, pizometers, toe drains, fabrics, construction site fencing, etc., are not apparent in the inventory or costing. Our recommendation is to inventory but not cost, what we believe is missing.

Second, for those items that are inventoried on the work sheets of the city, we believe that the costs used to calculate the reproduction costs, shown on pages 5 to 10, of the east dike, appear to be understated, either in task or in aggregate. Our goal is to spot check and prepare detailed sample items to ascertain, with the RS Means costs, which items are likely understated.

In both cases, it appears to us that items are either missing or under costed, or both. We propose to prepare samples of each of these concerns so the Watershed Corp. can go back to the city for a revision.

Hope this meets your needs, but please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions

Thanks,
Skip