

From: [Shelly Lizotte](#)
To: [Penny Thompson](#)
Cc: [Ellen Angel](#)
Subject: RE: Tuesday Questions
Date: Tuesday, January 21, 2025 6:28:22 PM

Penny,

Ellen and I went through the last year of our efforts to generate a timeline outlined below. We are working diligently to meet the deadline that you have requested as was indicated in our contract amendment (March 15th).

Keeping that in mind, I've added a couple of comments myself from review of our obligations in our contract.

Regarding the comment about Council Review and approval (item 4 from your email) It does not state in our Contract that the City Council needs to review or approve, it specifically refers to "Architect" submitting to the "Owner" and requesting approval by the "Owner".

In Section 1 of the contract, it identifies both the Chief (formerly Michael Gahagan) and You, Penny as representatives of the Owner. We have been submitting "progress" plans and information to you as the Owners representative throughout the entire project to meet those requirements under sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the contract. I'm not sure how the new chief fits into this as he is not listed in the contract, but perhaps it is implied.

Ellen said that she needs to discuss with Rob and our MEP consultants about the February 3rd date and the meeting on the 10th. There is nothing magical about the end of the DD phase, as the description below attempts to explain the reiterative nature of the process. It's meant to be a check-in with the Owner when there isn't constant involvement with a building committee. I will let Ellen respond to that question when she can.

My feeling is that the Schedule at this point is so very tight that any "pause" to gather, package, and present a progress submittal could push the March date out further.

Shelly

From: Ellen Angel <eangel@artifexae.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2025 4:17 PM
To: Shelly Lizotte <rlizotte@artifexae.com>
Subject: RE: Tuesday Questions

Hi Penny,

I will attempt to answer these important questions; I feel we have answered them, but since they are not simple "here you go" answers, they have not registered. Also, I feel it is important to remind everyone that apart from you and 3 members of the current committee (also on the City Council) and Councilman Bagley, the players on the City side of the table have changed since we started this

project: the Chief, the Committee, the Council. This discontinuity has not assisted our progress, although it has, in my opinion, made the current smaller project better. The other comment I would like to make is that design is not a linear process, it is reiterative, even in the most perfect of situations. What I mean is that we make progress, we see elements that no longer work as originally conceived, we go back and change those elements and then go forward.

The Completed Schematic Package was submitted to the City Council and approved in February of 2024. The condition was that it met the City's budget which at that time was understood to be \$12.5 million. We did not have the cost estimate at that meeting. When we received it, realized that it exceeded the budget and in March informed the Committee that we could not meet the budget with a building over a full basement. We discussed options with the committee at their March meeting.

Then in April, when we were reconfiguring the plan, we were also tasked with looking at another site, which we declined after a discussion. At the end of April, we had this conversation (copied from April 30th email) "Our 2021 design versus our 2024 design incorporated a basement and other functional spaces that both the Chief and the City Manager believed were extremely important, based on their attendance at a conference and also based on other departments they had visited and Chiefs they had spoken with. We think they were correct in their conclusions. Our 2023 design was representative of these inclusions. And based on our meetings with the Chief and Penny, we had understood that the budget was the approved \$10 million by the City, plus the \$2.5 million from Susan Collins grant which we were able to accommodate. Given the site slopes and the opportunity to create a two-story building with potential full basement for future growth/expansion, we completed the schematic design with that design concept and shared the renderings with the City. It was that design the cost estimators used. We had not done any cost estimates for a two-story building at this site so it was more time consuming for the estimators to complete.

After making our plan revisions, the Cost Estimator went on a two week vacation. When she got back, I went on a two week vacation, returning just when the final Geotech report was available (end of April). So we basically lost a month. We subsequently brought the number down to what we, Artifex, believed was the budget per the Council meeting, but recently Penny informed us that we could not include the Susan Collins funds of \$2.5 million in our budget, bringing the budget down to \$10 million total-total.

So although on April 17 we submitted updated plans and budget, at the end of April, we had to cut another \$2,000,000 out of our budget.

Following this, we reconfigured the floor plan but not the building appearance/aesthetic. After the consideration with all of us, of those factors, we moved the building up the hill, towards Birds Eye Avenue as a one-story iteration of the approved design. Based on comments at the June 24 Council meeting, we again started by cutting elements that Councilors had recommended as either "unnecessary or too large" in order to decrease the square footage of the building. The Committee was also disbanded at this meeting, leaving us with no one to discuss decisions or to seek comments. There was also no Police Chief at this time .

On July 8, we sent updated Schematic Design Package – floor plans, site plan and renderings.

On August 26, we met with the City Council and presented updated drawings – representing Design Development progress. At the August meeting, we were introduced to the new Chief and listened to his comments and concerns.

On September 9 we sent an updated budget based on our conversations with PCM and square footage cost reductions.

In October you sent a cut-up plan, prepared by the Chief and newly formed Committee which re-located the Cells. We stated that along with the cell relocation, other changes would be required in order for the building to fully function under the best practices. We made some of those changes and presented in November 2024 and received consensus on this plan on January 3 at the Committee meeting with everyone agreeing that this plan met all the functional/operational requirements of the City Police department.

After the July floor plan updates, in order to come close to building this in 2025, we had to keep moving, engaging our structural engineer and MEP engineers as well. That's why we are billing into DD's as we are more complete in some aspects of the project and still refining others.

All of the changes (made for a variety of reasons influenced by several individuals) have hampered any efforts we have made to make and keep a schedule. This is why I am loathe to confirm a mid-point completion date. I am sticking to the March date.

Picking an HVAC system was a solid decision that allows us to make significant progress. If all decisions were to continue to be made at a Committee meeting in a timely manner without needing further approval, we would be able to make steady progress.

From: Penny Thompson <pthompson@cariboumaine.org>

Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2025 12:11 PM

To: Ellen Angel <eangel@artifexae.com>; Shelly Lizotte <rlizotte@artifexae.com>

Subject: Tuesday Questions

Good morning Ellen and Shelly –

I hope you both had a nice weekend.

Here are some questions/comments I received today. Would you be able to provide some answers so that I can respond to the City Council?

1. *What is the status of the missing Schematic Design documents?*

2. *I noticed that the architect has been charging against the Design Development task since August 2024. How can this be, considering that we didn't approve the Schematic Design until 16 December 2024?*
3. *I'm ok with the slight delay in moving the required delivery of the Design Development package from 27 Jan to 3 February, but I want to make sure that when we do get the package for review and approval, that the delivered package is complete. I hope and expect that everything will be in hand to enable us to approve their design during our meeting on the 10th, and it's critical that the architect be present for the meeting to address any questions we might have. Please make the necessary arrangements to have the architect's representative attend the meeting in person on the 10th.*
 - a. *Will you be able to come on February 10? Is this included in the budget? Could I get the materials ahead of time so that I can put it on the screen?*
4. *Council review and approval of the Design Development package and Construction Documents package are critical reviews and key decision points, required by contract and fundamental to a disciplined design process. They cannot be allowed to proceed into the Construction Documents phase until their Design Development package is approved by Council.*
 - a. *Will you need approval on February 10 to make the March 15 deadline?*
5. *Finally, where is the architect's project schedule?*

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to these important questions and comments.

Penny Thompson

City Manager

City of Caribou Maine

(207) 493 - 5961 (direct line)

pthompson@cariboumaine.org

[This email comes from outside of your organization. Please be cautious opening or clicking on any attachments or links.]