June 13, 2017

RE: Your request for access to information under Part II of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (Our File: TW/067/2017)

On May 12, 2017, the Department of Transportation and Works received your request for access to the following records/information:

I would like to request any information on the water supply (wells) at Mobile Central High School as well as the plans to upgrade to accommodate the planned extension.

I am pleased to inform you that a decision has been made by the Deputy Minister of Transportation and Works to provide access to some of the requested information.

Access to the remaining record information contained within the records, has been refused in accordance with the following exceptions to disclosure, as specified in the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (the Act):

- 40. (1) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose personal information to an applicant where the disclosure would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy.

Please be advised that you may ask the Information and Privacy Commissioner to review the processing of your access request, as set out in section 42 of the Act. A request to the Commissioner must be made in writing within 15 business days of the date of this letter or within a longer period that may be allowed by the Commissioner.

The address and contact information of the Information and Privacy Commissioner is as follows:
Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner  
2 Canada Drive  
P. O. Box 13004, Stn. A  
St. John’s, NL A1B 3V8  
Telephone: (709) 729-6309  
Toll-Free: 1-877-729-6309  
Facsimile: (709) 729-6500

You may also appeal directly to the Supreme Court Trial Division within 15 business days after you receive the decision of the public body, pursuant to section 52 of the Act.

Please be advised that responsive records will be published following a 72 hour period after the response is sent electronically to you or five business days in the case where records are mailed to you. It is the goal to have the responsive records posted to the Completed Access to Information Requests website within one business day following the applicable period of time. Please note that requests for personal information will not be posted online.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me by telephone at 709-729-5351 or by e-mail at FrankWalsh@gov.nl.ca.

Sincerely,

Frank Walsh  
ATIPP Coordinator  
Department of Transportation and Works  
Enclosures
Disclosure harmful to personal privacy

40. (1) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose personal information to an applicant where the disclosure would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy.

(2) A disclosure of personal information is not an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy where

(a) the applicant is the individual to whom the information relates;

(b) the third party to whom the information relates has, in writing, consented to or requested the disclosure;

(c) there are compelling circumstances affecting a person's health or safety and notice of disclosure is given in the form appropriate in the circumstances to the third party to whom the information relates;

(d) an Act or regulation of the province or of Canada authorizes the disclosure;

(e) the disclosure is for a research or statistical purpose and is in accordance with section 70;

(f) the information is about a third party's position, functions or remuneration as an officer, employee or member of a public body or as a member of a minister's staff;

(g) the disclosure reveals financial and other details of a contract to supply goods or services to a public body;

(h) the disclosure reveals the opinions or views of a third party given in the course of performing services for a public body, except where they are given in respect of another individual;

(i) public access to the information is provided under the *Financial Administration Act*;

(j) the information is about expenses incurred by a third party while travelling at the expense of a public body;

(k) the disclosure reveals details of a licence, permit or a similar discretionary benefit granted to a third party by a public body, not including personal information supplied in support of the application for the benefit;

(l) the disclosure reveals details of a discretionary benefit of a financial nature granted to a third party by a public body, not including
(i) personal information that is supplied in support of the application for the benefit, or

(ii) personal information that relates to eligibility for income and employment support under the Income and Employment Support Act or to the determination of income or employment support levels; or

(m) the disclosure is not contrary to the public interest as described in subsection (3) and reveals only the following personal information about a third party:

(i) attendance at or participation in a public event or activity related to a public body, including a graduation ceremony, sporting event, cultural program or club, or field trip, or

(ii) receipt of an honour or award granted by or through a public body.

(3) The disclosure of personal information under paragraph (2)(m) is an unreasonable invasion of personal privacy where the third party whom the information is about has requested that the information not be disclosed.

(4) A disclosure of personal information is presumed to be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy where

(a) the personal information relates to a medical, psychiatric or psychological history, diagnosis, condition, treatment or evaluation;

(b) the personal information is an identifiable part of a law enforcement record, except to the extent that the disclosure is necessary to dispose of the law enforcement matter or to continue an investigation;

(c) the personal information relates to employment or educational history;

(d) the personal information was collected on a tax return or gathered for the purpose of collecting a tax;

(e) the personal information consists of an individual's bank account information or credit card information;

(f) the personal information consists of personal recommendations or evaluations, character references or personnel evaluations;

(g) the personal information consists of the third party's name where

(i) it appears with other personal information about the third party, or
(ii) the disclosure of the name itself would reveal personal information about the third party; or

(h) the personal information indicates the third party's racial or ethnic origin or religious or political beliefs or associations.

(5) In determining under subsections (1) and (4) whether a disclosure of personal information constitutes an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy, the head of a public body shall consider all the relevant circumstances, including whether

(a) the disclosure is desirable for the purpose of subjecting the activities of the province or a public body to public scrutiny;

(b) the disclosure is likely to promote public health and safety or the protection of the environment;

(c) the personal information is relevant to a fair determination of the applicant's rights;

(d) the disclosure will assist in researching or validating the claims, disputes or grievances of aboriginal people;

(e) the third party will be exposed unfairly to financial or other harm;

(f) the personal information has been supplied in confidence;

(g) the personal information is likely to be inaccurate or unreliable;

(h) the disclosure may unfairly damage the reputation of a person referred to in the record requested by the applicant;

(i) the personal information was originally provided to the applicant; and

(j) the information is about a deceased person and, if so, whether the length of time the person has been deceased indicates the disclosure is not an unreasonable invasion of the deceased person's personal privacy.
Access or correction complaint

42. (1) A person who makes a request under this Act for access to a record or for correction of personal information may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting a decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request.

(2) A complaint under subsection (1) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days

(a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16(2).

(3) A third party informed under section 19 of a decision of the head of a public body to grant access to a record or part of a record in response to a request may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting that decision.

(4) A complaint under subsection (3) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days after the third party is informed of the decision of the head of the public body.

(5) The commissioner may allow a longer time period for the filing of a complaint under this section.

(6) A person or third party who has appealed directly to the Trial Division under subsection 52(1) or 53(1) shall not file a complaint with the commissioner.

(7) The commissioner shall refuse to investigate a complaint where an appeal has been commenced in the Trial Division.

(8) A complaint shall not be filed under this section with respect to

(a) a request that is disregarded under section 21;

(b) a decision respecting an extension of time under section 23;

(c) a variation of a procedure under section 24; or

(d) an estimate of costs or a decision not to waive a cost under section 26.

(9) The commissioner shall provide a copy of the complaint to the head of the public body concerned.
Direct appeal to Trial Division by an applicant

52. (1) Where an applicant has made a request to a public body for access to a record or correction of personal information and has not filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42, the applicant may appeal the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request directly to the Trial Division.

(2) An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (1) not later than 15 business days

(a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16(2).

(3) Where an applicant has filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42 and the commissioner has refused to investigate the complaint, the applicant may commence an appeal in the Trial Division of the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request for access to a record or for correction of personal information.

(4) An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (3) not later than 15 business days after the applicant is notified of the commissioner’s refusal under subsection 45(2).
Matthews, Robert M. C.

From: Pat Royle <PatRoyle@esdnl.ca>
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2009 2:34 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Cc: Foley, Claude J.; Sexton, Ed R.; Clarke, Ingrid E.; JimSinnott@esdnl.ca; Huxter, Frank; LarrySmallwood@esdnl.ca
Subject: Re: FW: 722074 - Well Chamber Flooding

Got it.

Patrick Royle P.Eng.
Director of Facilities and Maintenance
Eastern School District

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

"Matthews, Robert M. C." <robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca> writes:
> I just sent via separate emails the design, work description and
> estimate.
>
> Rob
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Pat Royle [mailto:PatRoyle@esdnl.ca]
> Sent: November 19, 2009 12:39 PM
> To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
> Cc: Foley, Claude J.; Sexton, Ed R.; Clarke, Ingrid E.;
> JimSinnott@esdnl.ca; Huxter, Frank; LarrySmallwood@esdnl.ca
> Subject: Re: FW: 722074 - Well Chamber Flooding
>
> Please forward the document provided to Chards for quote - thanks.
>
> Patrick Royle P.Eng.
> Director of Facilities and Maintenance
> Eastern School District
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Pat Royle [mailto:PatRoyle@esdnl.ca]
> Sent: November 19, 2009 12:39 PM
> To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
> Cc: Foley, Claude J.; Sexton, Ed R.; Clarke, Ingrid E.;
> JimSinnott@esdnl.ca; Huxter, Frank; LarrySmallwood@esdnl.ca
> Subject: Re: FW: 722074 - Well Chamber Flooding
>
I have yet to receive a quotation from Chard's, despite numerous requests. I suggest that this work be done as an invited tender outside of their contract.

Rob

Original Message-----
From: Pat Royle [mailto:PatRoyle@esdl.nl.ca]  
Sent: November 17, 2009 11:07 AM  
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
Cc: Foley, Claude J.; Sexton, Ed R.; Clarke, Ingrid E.; JimSinnott@esdl.nl.ca; Huxter, Frank; Larry Smallwood  
Subject: Re: FW: 722074 - Well Chamber Flooding  

Rob, has Chard's been issued a change order to correct the deficiency as per BAE Newplan detail?

Patrick Royle P.Eng.  
Director of Facilities and Maintenance Eastern School District  

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

"Matthews, Robert M. C." <robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca> writes:

FYI
To:

Cc:

Subject: 722074 - Well Chamber Flooding

The well cap is not designed to hold back pressure.

Wouldn't the leaking well cap be a contractor deficiency?

Rob

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: November 11, 2009 12:19 PM

To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: 722074 - Well Chamber Flooding

Wouldn't the leaking well cap be a contractor deficiency?
Robert,

I received a telephone call from a plumber working for Chards on Monday of this week. The plumber was pricing up the recent contemplated change to put a floor and a sump pump into the well chamber. When the plumber was on site he noted that the temporary pump installed in the wellhead was not working and that the well chamber was partially flooded. He also noted that water was coming out of the well cap on the top of the casing. If this is the case then putting a floor into the well chamber will not by itself stop the chamber from flooding.

We recommend that you carry on with your intention of putting a floor into the bottom of the well chamber complete with a sump pump assembly. You may however want to look at possibly altering the control strategy for the pump such that the submersible pumps cut in to pump down the casing.
when the detected casing water level rises above a pre-determined high level set point. All of the infrastructure is in place to make this happen. All that is required is for a new control sequence to be programmed to deal with this matter. You could ask Heating Products Ltd. to deal with this matter for you directly. The submersible pump would then pump up to the underground domestic water and fire water reservoirs whenever a high casing water level was detected. This would not be a normal event and might only occur several times a year. The water being pumped out of the well and into the underground reservoirs would have to be chlorinated which would result in an increased chlorine consumption but since this control sequence would not be occurring all of the time and only during high water events then this would probably be an acceptable trade off. The reservoirs would continue to fill until they overflowed into the overflow pipe and out into the building weeping tile.

The combination of the solid bottom and sump pump in the well chamber coupled with the revised control strategy to control the high water level within the well casing should keep the well chamber from flooding in the future.

Please call if you have any questions regarding the content of this e-mail.
This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.
email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender."

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”
From: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
Sent: November 11, 2009 12:19 PM  
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
Cc: patroyle@esdnl.ca  
Subject: RE: 722074 - Well Chamber Flooding

Wouldn't the leaking well cap be a Contractor deficiency?

Rob

From: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
Sent: October 28, 2009 1:20 PM  
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
Cc: patroyle@esdnl.ca  
Subject: 722074 - Well Chamber Flooding

Robert,

I received a telephone call from a plumber working for Chards on Monday of this week. The plumber was pricing up the recent contemplated change to put a floor and a sump pump into the well chamber. When the plumber was on site he noted that the temporary pump installed in the wellhead was not working and that the well chamber was partially flooded. He also noted that water was coming out of the well cap on the top of the casing. If this is the case then putting a floor into the well chamber will not by itself stop the chamber from flooding.

We recommend that you carry on with your intention of putting a floor into the bottom of the well chamber complete with a sump pump assembly. You may however want to look at possibly altering the control strategy for the pump such that the submersible pumps cuts in to pump down the casing when the detected casing water level rises above a pre-determined high level set point. All of the infrastructure is in place to make this happen. All that is required is for a new control sequence to be programmed to deal with this matter. You could ask Heating Products Ltd. to deal with this matter for you directly. The submersible pump would then pump up to the underground domestic water and fire water reservoirs whenever a high casing water level was detected. This would not be a normal event and might only occur several times a year. The water being pumped out of the well and into the underground reservoirs would have to be chlorinated which would result in an increased chlorine consumption but since this control sequence would not be occurring all of the time and only during high water events then this would probably be an acceptable trade off. The reservoirs would continue to fill until they over flowed into the overflow pipe and out into the building weeping tile.

The combination of the solid bottom and sump pump in the well chamber coupled with the revised control strategy to control the high water level within the well casing should keep the well chamber from flooding in the future.
Please call if you have any questions regarding the contents of this e-mail.

s. 40(1)

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”
Proceed with CO to fix.

Edward R. Sexton P. Eng.
Manager of School Construction and Facilities Design and Construction Division Department of Education P.O. Box 8700
St. John's NL
A1B4J6
Ph 709-729-4988
E- Mail esexton@gov.nl.ca

Sent Via BlackBerry

----- Original Message -------
From: Pat Royle <PatRoyle@esdnl.ca>
To: @snclavalin.com>
Cc: Sexton, Ed R.; Matthews, Robert M. C.; Huxter, Frank; Larry Smallwood <LarrySmallwood@esdnl.ca>
Sent: Fri Oct 23 09:25:07 2009
Subject: Re: FW: 722074 (.1) - Mobile Central High

we are monitoring the artesian well chamber & have had to pump it out on a few occasions - we are anxious to have this situation corrected.
We pumped out the septic tank once last winter due to a blockage in the line - no problem since that I am aware of.

Patrick Royle P.Eng.
Director of Facilities and Maintenance
Eastern School District

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

@snclavalin.com> writes:
> Pat
> I have contacted Robert Matthews to confirm whether DTW intends to have the CCN issued to have this work carried out. I will await his response. If they don't have money in the budget I will let you know, and we can get a quote for you. We proposed putting a base in the chamber and sump pump.
We visited the site last Friday the chamber was full of water. You need to have it pumped out, and monitored until the work is done.

Also, we understand that the septic tank has been pumped out several times. This should not be required; can you let me know the status.

There is an issue with the artesian well chamber filling with ground water - water is running through the electrical conduit to the electrical room - could you please provide me with an upset lump sum amount to investigate & scope corrective solution. Water is overflowing into the chamber from the wellhead - we've had to pump out the chamber.

Please advise - thanks.

Patrick Royle P.Eng.
Director of Facilities and Maintenance
Eastern School District

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank you.
From: @chardsconstruction.com>  
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
Subject: Well

Rob  
I spoke to [REDACTED] yesterday & he is going to get me a price on the elect for the well chamber & the plumber is also going to get his for me i will have a price for you by Monday.

Thanks

----- Original Message -----  
From: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc:  
Sent: Thursday, October 22, 2009 10:29 PM  
Subject: FW: 722074.1 & .5, 722812.1, Mobile School CP3 Final Inspection

Robert,

We did a final inspection at Mobile for CP3 on Friday, October 16, 2009. A copy of the [REDACTED] deficiency list is attached.

We note that the fence around the ballfield has been completed. However, on inspection of the wellhead, we note that the concrete base and sump pump have not been installed. At the time of inspection, the chamber was full of water, with all electrical and mechanical equipment submerged. What is the status of the CCN?

We understand that the fence was not part of the CP3 contract. Is there any intention to have the wellhead chamber done under CP3?

We (REDACTED) received an e-mail from Pat Royle yesterday (copy attached for your information). Should we now deal directly with ESD, Pat Royle, on the corrective action required at the wellhead? If not further work can be done under CP3 will DTW or ESD be responsible for getting this work done?

Based on the deficiency list attached, it appears that another site visit will be required. Will DTW be doing the final inspection?

Due to the size and number of photos, we will be sending a hard copy of the photos via courier.

Also, we inspected the chamber in the Science Lab and the Contractor (CP2) has completed the work. The chamber was dry at the time of inspection.

Regards,
"This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender."
Robert M. C.

From: [snclavalin.com]\nSent: Friday, August 21, 2009 9:01 AM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Subject: RE: Mobile School - Well Head Chamber
Attachments: Well Head Estimate.pdf

Robert,

Copy of estimate for Proposed Change Order attached.

Also, regarding CP4 - Fencing, please provide scope of work to that we can finalize the tender.

Thanks

---

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: August 20, 2009 8:30 AM
To: [snclavalin.com]
Subject: RE: Mobile School - Well Head Chamber

What is the estimated value for this work?

Rob

---

From: [snclavalin.com]
Sent: August 20, 2009 8:30 AM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Subject: RE: Mobile School - Well Head Chamber

Robert,

PCO write-up for CP3 - Chard's Construction for Well Head Chamber.

---

"This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Install base in existing manhole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>reinforcing</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>PVC watersstop</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>10 mil poly</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Excavate material and other labour</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Exterior piping to existing swale</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor's Overhead @ 10%</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor's Profit @ 15%</td>
<td>1,485.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,385.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Matthews, Robert M. C.

From: Huxter, Frank
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2009 5:24 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Subject: RE: Mobile School - Issues

noted

-----Original Message-----
From: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Sent: June 23, 2009 5:17 PM
To: Pat Royle
Cc: Foley, Melissa S.; Huxter, Frank; Sexton, Ed R.; Foley, Claude J.; Keith Brinston
Subject: RE: Mobile School - Issues

Pat,

I would assume that the request is made under a new contract between ESDNL and Heating Products and not through the existing Contract with Olympic Construction.

Rob

-----Original Message-----
From: Pat Royle [mailto:PatRoyle@esdnl.ca]
Sent: June 23, 2009 5:16 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Cc: Foley, Melissa S.; Huxter, Frank; Sexton, Ed R.; Foley, Claude J.; Keith Brinston
Subject: Re: Mobile School - Issues

Rob, Heating Products have been requested to reinstate the controls remote access; Keith will be back to you on warranty items.

Patrick Royle P.Eng.
Director of Facilities and Maintenance
Eastern School District

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

"Matthews, Robert M. C." <robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca> writes:
>Pat,
>
>I visited the Mobile Site to meet with Chard’s Construction while they
>are re-mobilizing to site. While there I met with the Principal and
>Consultant on the many issues we have been having. The following were
>discussed;
>
>Water fill-up of well - The well housing was designed as it is typically.
>That is, concrete walls and a gravel floor. As the well has been
>filling with water, it would appear that either the well head is
>overflowing, or the water table is rising above the gravel floor. I
>have discussed with the Consultant and Bae Newplan are going to
>investigate the following two solutions;
>
>a) Pour a concrete floor in the bottom of the well
>complete with water stops and the installation of a "dry" sump. The
>sump would take water out of the well housing and into a swale.
>b) Install a drainage line from the well to the swale
>surrounding the sports field. This would involve tearing up of
>pavement, sodding, etc.
>
>Sewer back-up – The Consultant was not able to determine the cause of
>this at our meeting this morning, but he will be following up with
>causes and proposed solutions.
>
>Dilution pit water infiltration – I reviewed this while on-site and it
>appears that the ground water is seeping into the tank at the bottom
>intersect between the walls and slab. This is a warranty item, it
>appears that the water seal is missing or failed. I have contacted the
>Contractor to correct.

>Humidifier Maintenance – identified a humidifier that his cleaner
>had to turn off because it was flashing a warning. The warning
>indicated "large maintenance required". ESDNL should look at this
>right away before it becomes an issue. Currently the humidifier is turned off.
>
>Heating Relays – Olympic Construction have confirmed that all work is
>complete including the high temperature shut off. I have since asked
>if this was tied into the controls yet.
>
>Controls Internet Connection – The connection for Controls is still not
>completed. ESDNL should look after having this completed to allow for
>remote access to the controls.
>
>Sports Field Fence – The Consultant is reviewing the cost of a 4ft and
>6ft wire fence option around the field. If it can be done for under
>$20,000 DOE and ESDNL may want to consider doing an invited tender for
>this after Chard's has left. There isn't a lot of monies remaining in
>the PTA, thus an invited tender may be best.
>
>CP3 Contract – Chard's Construction began to remobilize to site this
I plan to meet with them as soon as they arrive. The following pieces of work are remaining:

- Installation of 3 remaining sewer distribution lines
- Installation of site signage on posts previously installed
- Relocation of service to new pole installed last December
- Second layer of paving
- Grading of sports field
- Sodding of sports field and surround
- Correction of poor swale grading
- Clean-up and removal of debris and other USM form site

CP2 Warranty – Please forward any and all issues/warranty items that are known for the school. The warranty period on the new school ends on July 10, 2009. If there are any warranty issues that need resolution, they need to be brought to the Contractor’s attention through me ASAP.

Regards,
Rob

________________________________________________________________________

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”
From: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
Sent: June 23, 2009 5:04 PM  
To: Pat Royle  
Cc: Foley, Melissa S.; Huxter, Frank; Sexton, Ed R.; Foley, Claude J.;  
Subject: Mobile School - Issues

Pat,

I visited the Mobile Site to meet with Chard's Construction while they are re-mobilizing to site. While there I met with the Principal and Consultant on the many issues we have been having. The following were discussed:

1. Water fill-up of well - The well housing was designed as it is typically. That is, concrete walls and a gravel floor. As the well has been filling with water, it would appear that either the well head is overflowing, or the water table is rising above the gravel floor. I have discussed with the Consultant and Bae Newplan are going to investigate the following two solutions:
   a) Pour a concrete floor in the bottom of the well complete with water stops and the installation of a "dry" sump. The sump would take water out of the well housing and into a swale.
   b) Install a drainage line from the well to the swale surrounding the sports field. This would involve tearing up of pavement, sodding, etc.

2. Sewer back-up - The Consultant was not able to determine the cause of this at our meeting this morning, but he will be following up with causes and proposed solutions.

3. Dilution pit water infiltration - I reviewed this while on-site and it appears that the ground water is seeping into the tank at the bottom intersect between the walls and slab. This is a warranty item, it appears that the water seal is missing or failed. I have contacted the Contractor to correct.

4. Humidifier Maintenance - Jim identified a humidifier that his cleaner had to turn off because it was flashing a warning. The warning indicated "large maintenance required". ESDNL should look at this right away before it becomes an issue. Currently the humidifier is turned off.

5. Heating Relays - Olympic Construction have confirmed that all work is complete including the high temperature shut off. I have since asked if this was tied into the controls yet.

6. Controls Internet Connection - The connection for Controls is still not completed. ESDNL should look after having this completed to allow for remote access to the controls.

7. Sports Field Fence - The Consultant is reviewing the cost of a 4ft and 6ft wire fence option around the field. If it can be done for under $20,000 DOE and ESDNL may want to consider doing an invited tender for this after Chard's has left. There isn't a lot of monies remaining in the PTA, thus an invited tender may be best.

8. CP3 Contract - Chard's Construction began to remobilize to site this morning. I plan to meet with them as soon as they arrive. The following pieces of work are remaining:
   a) Installation of 3 remaining sewage distribution lines
   b) Installation of site signage on posts previously installed
   c) Relocation of service to new pole installed last December
   d) Second layer of paving
9. CP2 Warranty – Please forward any and all issues/warranty items that are known for the school. The warranty period on the new school ends on July 10, 2009. If there are any warranty issues that need resolution, they need to be brought to the Contractor's attention through me ASAP.

Regards,
Rob
From: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2009 5:47 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; Clarke, Clyde J.
Cc: Huxter, Frank
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

NOTED

From: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Sent: June 9, 2009 12:01 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; [redacted]
Cc: Clarke, Clyde J.; Huxter, Frank
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

As the designer for CP3, it is important that you respond to the comments of [redacted] with respect to the grading issue. Was this actually a design error in the CP3 package and what can be done to correct this issue?

Regards,
Rob

From: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Sent: May 27, 2009 3:21 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Well - Mobile Central High School

Still no response from Bae Newplan on this.

Rob

From: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Sent: May 25, 2009 5:02 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

I understand that site work and selection of final grades was not part of the CP2 scope of work. However, we need to determine the cause of the problem. It may or may not be related to the site work. I would like the opinion of your Consultant on this.

Rob

From: [redacted]@olympic-construction.nf.ca
Sent: May 25, 2009 4:56 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School
Robert,
There must be a problem with the groundwater elevation of the site. We did not do the sitework, or have no knowledge of what was done or any final grades. This is a sitework issue. The groundwater elevations and grading should have taken the bottom elevation of the chamber into account.

-----Original Message-----
From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: May 25, 2009 4:48 PM
To: @olympic-construction.nf.ca
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

This issue is ongoing, there is currently 4-5 feet of water in the chamber, and the level often rises above the panels mounted on the wall. This needs to be reviewed ASAP to find both a cause and solution.

Thanks
Rob

From: @snclavalin.com]
Sent: March 11, 2009 1:33 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; @olympic-construction.nf.ca
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

Robert,
If it is the concrete chamber for the well then I assume the statement that it is full of water is an exaggeration since the chamber is probably 7 to 8 feet in height. I know we had standing water in the chamber before the site modifications were done but I thought the latest site work had alleviated this problem.

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: March 11, 2009 1:10 PM
To: @olympic-construction.nf.ca
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

Keith is referring the the housing for the well.

Rob

From: @snclavalin.com]
Sent: Wed 3/11/2009 1:05 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; @olympic-construction.nf.ca
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

Robert,
What tank are you referring to?
From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]  
Sent: March 11, 2009 12:59 PM  
To: [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]  
Subject: FW: Well - Mobile Central High School

Please review and advise to the cause. In either even, this should not be happening.

Rob

From: Keith Brinston [mailto:keithbrinston@esdnl.ca]  
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
Subject: Well - Mobile Central High School

Good day Rob,

Received a call from the school on Monday with regards to the well. The tank located near the soccer pitch, upon opening was full of water, possibly infiltrating through the tank itself. Our plumber was up there on Monday to pump it out. I would assume that this would be a warranty item for the contractor. Please advise.

Keith Brinston, P.Eng  
Manager of Operations  
Eastern School District  
Tel #: 757-4650  
Cell #: 693-7817  
email: keithbrinston@esdnl.ca

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”
Matthews, Robert M. C.

From: Clarke, Clyde J.
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2009 4:26 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; Leja, Gunar
Subject: RE: Mobile School - CP 3 Request for Additional Fees
Attachments: 09-06-09 Clarke.pdf

You were copied on it from [redacted]. I have re-attached the e-mail he sent to me.

Clyde J Clarke, P.Eng.
Electrical Engineer/Project Design Manager
Department of Transportation & Works
Design & Construction Division (Works)
Building Design Services
5th Floor, Confederation Bldg, West Block
Box 8700, St. John's, NL, A1C 4J6
Tel: (709) 729-4150 Fax: (709) 729-0646
clarkec@gov.nl.ca

From: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2009 3:58 PM
To: Clarke, Clyde J.; Leja, Gunar
Subject: RE: Mobile School - CP 3 Request for Additional Fees

Clyde,

What is the size of CO that Bae-Newplan is requesting? I will review from the cashflow received from [redacted] for availability of funds.

My understanding of this requested CO is as follows;

1. Bae Newplan wants to be paid for the effort and design related expenses required to redesign the sewer system tank and to prove to GS that a reduction in size was adequate.
2. To redesign the sports field and adjacent roadway, retaining wall, etc.

I am unable to comment on the validity of these claims as these decisions and designs were completed before I was fully involved in the project.

Rob

From: Clarke, Clyde J.
Sent: June 9, 2009 3:36 PM
To: Leja, Gunar
Cc: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Subject: RE: Mobile School - CP 3 Request for Additional Fees

My previous position was that I was not going to approve any additional fee as it was already included with the negotiated fee for the whole project. The requested changes seem to indicate we need to address this as an additional item. Don't know where the money is coming from, Robert can comment on available funding remaining. When do you want to meet and where.
From: Leja, Gunar
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2009 9:59 AM
To: Clarke, Clyde J.
Subject: RE: Mobile School - CP 3 Request for Additional Fees

We also need your previous positions and those of Rob Matthews before we can meet with BaeNewplan Group on this subject.

Gunar

From: Clarke, Clyde J.
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2009 9:48 AM
To: Leja, Gunar
Subject: FW: Mobile School - CP 3 Request for Additional Fees

fyi

Clyde J Clarke, P.Eng.
Electrical Engineer/Project Design Manager
Department of Transportation & Works
Design & Construction Division ( Works )
Building Design Services
5th Floor, Confederation Bldg, West Block
Box 8700, St. John's, NL, A1C 4J6
Tel:(709) 729-4150 Fax:(709) 729-0646
clarkec@gov.nl.ca

From: [Redacted]@snclavalin.com
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2009 9:33 AM
To: Clarke, Clyde J.
Cc: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Subject: RE: Mobile School - CP 3 Request for Additional Fees

Clyde,

Please see attached.

s. 40(1)
- please advise status of the above. As discussed via phone a number of weeks ago, you were to submit supporting back-up regarding your request for additional fees on CP 3.

Clyde J Clarke, P.Eng.
Electrical Engineer/Project Design Manager
Department of Transportation & Works
Design & Construction Division (Works)
Building Design Services
5th Floor, Confederation Bldg, West Block
Box 8700, St. John's, NL, A1C 4J6
Tel: (709) 729-4150 Fax: (709) 729-0646

clarkec@gov.nl.ca
NOTED

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. 
Sent: June 9, 2009 12:01 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; 
Cc: Clarke, Clyde J.; Huxter, Frank
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

As the designer for CP3, it is important that you respond to the comments with respect to the grading issue. Was this actually a design error in the CP3 package and what can be done to correct this issue?

Regards,
Rob

Still no response from Bae Newplan on this.

Rob

I understand that site work and selection of final grades was not part of the CP2 scope of work. However, we need to determine the cause of the problem. It may or may not be related to the site work. I would like the opinion of your Consultant on this.

Rob
Robert,

There must be a problem with the groundwater elevation of the site. We did not do the sitework, or have no knowledge of what was done or any final grades. This is a sitework issue. The groundwater elevations and grading should have taken the bottom elevation of the chamber into account.

--- Original Message ---

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: May 25, 2009 4:48 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

This issue is ongoing, there is currently 4-5 feet of water in the chamber, and the level often rises above the panels mounted on the wall. This needs to be reviewed ASAP to find both a cause and solution.

Thanks
Rob

From: [Redacted] [mailto:sncsavalin.com]
Sent: March 11, 2009 1:33 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

Robert,

If it is the concrete chamber for the well then I assume the statement that it is full of water is an exaggeration since the chamber is probably 7 to 8 feet in height. I know we had standing water in the chamber before the site modifications were done but I thought the latest site work had alleviated this problem.

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: March 11, 2009 1:10 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

Keith is referring to the housing for the well.

Rob

From: [Redacted] [mailto:sncsavalin.com]
Sent: Wed 3/11/2009 1:05 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

Robert,

What tank are you referring to?
From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]

Sent: March 11, 2009 12:59 PM

To: pic-construction.nf.ca

Subject: FW: Well - Mobile Central High School

Please review and advise to the cause. In either even, this should not be happening.

Rob

From: Keith Brinston [mailto:keithbrinston@esdnl.ca]


To: Matthews, Robert M. C.

Subject: Well - Mobile Central High School

Good day Rob,

Received a call from the school on Monday with regards to the well. The tank located near the soccer pitch, upon opening was full of water, possibly infiltrating through the tank itself. Our plumber was up there on Monday to pump it out. I would assume that this would be a warranty item for the contractor. Please advise.

Keith Brinston, P.Eng
Manager of Operations
Eastern School District

Tel #: 757-4650
Cell #: 693-7817
e-mail: keithbrinston@esdnl.ca

"This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender."
Robert,  

There must be a problem with the groundwater elevation of the site. We did not do the sitework, or have no knowledge of what was done or any final grades. This is a sitework issue. The groundwater elevations and grading should have taken the bottom elevation of the chamber into account.

-----Original Message-----
From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: May 25, 2009 4:48 PM
To: [email protected]
Cc: Matthews, Robert M. C.; [email protected]@olympic-construction.nf.ca
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

This issue is ongoing, there is currently 4-5 feet of water in the chamber, and the level often rises above the panels mounted on the wall. This needs to be reviewed ASAP to find both a cause and solution.

Thanks
Rob

From: [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: March 11, 2009 1:33 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; [email protected]@olympic-construction.nf.ca
Cc: [email protected]
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

Robert,

If it is the concrete chamber for the well then I assume the statement that it is full of water is an exaggeration since the chamber is probably 7 to 8 feet in height. I know we had standing water in the chamber before the site modifications were done but I thought the latest site work had alleviated this problem.

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: March 11, 2009 1:10 PM
To: [email protected]@olympic-construction.nf.ca
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

Keith is referring the the housing for the well.

Rob
From: Matthews, Robert M. C.; [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: Wed 3/11/2009 1:05 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Subject: RE: Well - Mobile Central High School

Robert,

What tank are you referring to?

Rob

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: March 11, 2009 12:59 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Subject: FW: Well - Mobile Central High School

Please review and advise to the cause. In either even, this should not be happening.

Rob

From: Keith Brinston [mailto:keithbrinston@esdnl.ca]
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Subject: Well - Mobile Central High School

Good day Rob,

Received a call from the school on Monday with regards to the well. The tank located near the soccer pitch, upon opening was full of water, possibly infiltrating through the tank itself. Our plumber was up there on Monday to pump it out. I would assume that this would be a warranty item for the contractor. Please advise.

Keith Brinston, P.Eng
Manager of Operations
Eastern School District
Tel #: 757-4650
Cell #: 693-7817
email: keithbrinston@esdnl.ca

"This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender."

"This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any
means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”
Matthews, Robert M. C.

From: Pat Royle <PatRoyle@esdnl.ca>
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2009 1:31 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Cc: Foley, Claude J.; keithbrinston@esdnl.ca
Subject: Re: Mobile School CP2 - Water Supply

OK - thanks.

Patrick Royle P.Eng.
Director of Facilities and Maintenance
Eastern School District

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

"Matthews, Robert M. C." <robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca> writes:
The training was completed on the first commissioning date, the second commissioning date was for verification of deficiencies.

>Rob

>-----Original Message-----
>From: Pat Royle [mailto:PatRoyle@esdnl.ca]
>Sent: December 31, 2008 9:23 AM
>To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
>Cc: Foley, Claude J.; Keith Brinston
>Subject: Re: FW: Mobile School CP2 - Water Supply
>
>Rob, the scheduling of the last part of the commissioning process was changed - please advise of status.
>
>Patrick Royle P.Eng.
>Director of Facilities and Maintenance
>Eastern School District
>
>Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank you.
"Matthews, Robert M. C." <robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca> writes:

>>Please see response below.

>>

>>Rob

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>=

>>=

>>=

>>

>>From: [redacted]@olympic-construction.nl.ca

>>Sent: December 23, 2008 11:11 AM

>>To: Matthews, Robert M. C.

>>Cc: [redacted]@olympic-construction.nl.ca

>>Subject: RE: MobileSchool CP2 - Water Supply

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>Robert,

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>The booster pump package for the domestic water was "scheduled-off" for the holidays as per the program, just as the building heat is on set-back. The main tanks are full for firefighting. I asked the plumber to remove that item so the booster pumps are on full time, but this just shows that someone from the Operator's side has to become more familiar with all these systems. Anyway, everything is OK.
I just received a call stating that they have no water in Mobile. It would appear that there is a problem with the well system, or maybe even inside the building. Can you have the appropriate sub-contractor visit the school to correct.

Thanks

Rob
"This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender."
Robert,

For the record, [redacted] This is the reason you have not had a response from him concerning your direction on the well head.

[redacted] I spoke with [redacted] and she does not have the well test report. I am not looking for just the results of the well draw down test but the full report including all of the items I mentioned in my earlier e-mail. The testing was done by Olympic under the CP-2 contract. We have requested this report from them but to date it has not been forthcoming. Without it I cannot complete my work for the CP-3 package.

I did not propose the meeting with Olympic. You indicated in several correspondence to me last week that you were trying to set this up. We advised that we were ready to attend when you had the meeting arranged. Our position hasn’t changed in this regard.

Your opinion regarding the work involved for the CP-2 contractor is well taken. As I stated in an earlier e-mail we will be opening up the CP-2 contract to a potential change order. I still stand by my position. Time will tell what the dollar ramifications of your decision to proceed with the new well head are, if any.

As I understand it the site still belongs to Olympic. You can correct me if my understanding of this matter is wrong. Should we not request permission from Olympic to visit the site? Who do we see on site to gain access to the areas which we may need to get access to? Do you have a contact name and telephone number?

My previous e-mail regarding the anticipated completion date for the CP-3 tender package still stands. Pending your approval we will start right away to redesign the CP-2 package and design the new CP-3 package as follows:

- We will run the new PE pipe to the new drilled well location under the CP-3 package.
- We will run the new power and control wiring to the new drilled well location from the new school pump room under the CP-3 package. Olympic has already ran both power and control wiring to the existing well location under the CP-2 contract. If this is not a correct statement please advise accordingly.
- We will provide a new submersible pump for the existing well under the CP-3 contract.
- We will provide a new disconnect switch for the new submersible pump in the new well head on top of the existing well under the CP-3 package.
- We will wait to get the well test report from Olympic pertaining to the new drilled well before we select a new submersible pump for them to install within this well under the present CP-2 contract.
- We will provide a new pre-cast concrete wellhead on top of the existing well under the CP-3
• Without any information regarding the existing well we will proceed and install the submersible pump which was allowed for in the CP-2 tender specification in this existing well under the CP-3 package.

• We will design the CP-3 package such that the one pump control valve, basket strainer and magnetic flow meter inside the new school can service both submersible pumps. This will require some modifications to the building controls. This work will be made part of the CP-3 package.

• Olympic will be responsible to supply and install a new magnetic motor starter for the new submersible pump in the new drilled well within the new school under the CP-2 contract. We will provide a new magnetic motor starter within the school pump room to service the new submersible pump to be installed in the existing well under the CP-3 package.

• We will have to prepare a new sketch for the new wellhead going on top of the new drilled well to Olympic since the flows from this well are substantially different from those anticipated to come from the existing well. Hence the design of the riser pipe within the well as well as the piping at the surface within the well head and related components will be different. This will have to be sent to Olympic as a contemplated change notice along with the other changes outlined above.

• At the completion of the CP-2 work we will have a new pre-cast concrete manhole sitting on top of the new drilled well. This well head will be completely outfitted with all of the components currently shown on the CP-2 drawings except that all of these components will be resized for the lesser flow. This well will also be outfitted with a new submersible pump as well as a new disconnect to service this pump. Inside the school pump room shall be a new wall mounted magnetic starter to service this new pump. However this shall not be a functional well head as the underground water pipe to the well head will not be installed nor will the control or power wiring to service the new well head.

• The well head supplied and installed on the new drilled well under the CP-2 contract shall not be made operational until the CP-3 package has been completed. The well head supplied and installed on the existing well will not be made operational until the CP-3 package has been completed.

• We will change out the impellers within the sewage lift station pumps to service the revised discharge head requirements when we switch to the new disposal field from the present sewage treatment plant.

Please respond to this office if you are in agreement with this work scope for the CP-2 and CP-3 construction packages. When we have received your agreement we will commence designing immediately.

We await your response.
From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]  
Sent: February 19, 2008 1:35 PM  
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP-3 722074

Please advise if I have missed any of the points in your email below, here is my responses;

The option that I was discussing with you last week was not a new one. It was the only option that I had discussions with on back in December, and until late last week, the option I believed we were going with. Please consult with on this, as there may of been some misunderstanding.

I responded directly to in regards to our position on the Well head, my apologies for not copying you on it. In this email, I advised that unless there is an expected major problem with the route that I had requested, then this was the route we would take. I have yet to receive a response, thus it is my understanding that no such condition exists.

It was my understanding from that from your office has the draw down test results. Should I be incorrect on this, the contractor should have these test results readily available.

As for the meeting with Olympic. A meeting may/or may not be required for this. I have been trying to contact via his email and cell, I want to discuss this more with him. As far as T&W is concerned, asking for the new well head to be installed on the new well is not a change in the design scope, and as such may not require a meeting at all. In the mean time, Olympic has been instructed to install the new well head, pump and housing on the new well. I have yet to receive a response on this from them.

It is my opinion that there is actually less work required to install the new equipment on the new well as nothing will need to be dismantled (the old set-up) and no physical connection will be completed to the pipe or conduit. All of which should be included in CP3.

Any site visit(s) required by your sub-consultants to complete the CP3 design package should be arranged by Bae Newplan.

In Conclusion, it is the position of T&W that the new well head, pump and housing included in CP2 be installed on the new well head, and any impacts of this should be considered in the CP3 Design Package. Please note

Rob
Robert,

We made a commitment to you last week that we would have the CP-3 package out to tender by the end of this month. That commitment was made at that time given an assumption as to how we would proceed with the scope of work for the project, namely the well head design. You brought forward an alternate proposal last week which Cory Grandy of DOE appeared to agree with according with the e-mail which you sent me. We responded to your proposal as per your request but to date we have not had any response to our position from your office. In addition we have not heard anything from your office as far as a date being set for a meeting with the CP-2 contractor to discuss the CP-2 / CP-3 work scope as you alluded to last week. Finally, we have requested but have not received to date the test report from the CP-2 contractor pertaining to the new drilled well. This test report would contain the safe pumping yield, the safe drawdown level, the normal static water elevation as well as the desired location within the well column to mount the submersible pump. The mechanical, electrical and civil designers for this particular package have never been to this particular job site and hence it is our intention at the moment to proceed with the development of the CP-3 tender package based upon our existing CP-2 "issued for Construction" drawings, directions from your office as well as discussion items which would arise from our meeting with the CP-2 contractor as alluded to above. It may be desirable to have the CP-3 design team visit the site to determine the actual state of the existing systems as opposed to relying on "issued for Construction" drawings and verbal direction from the CP-2 contractor. I will leave this decision to you to make. If you do elect to schedule a site visit please give advance warning to this office so that we can schedule this visit with our other activities.

Without the information outlined above we are unable to complete the design of the CP-3 tender package. As it stands at the moment we are approximately five (5) calendar days behind in our completion schedule because of lack of receipt of the desired information. Therefore the new anticipated completion date for the CP-3 tender package is March 5th. Unfortunately our scheduled completion date will continue to move forward until we receive all the information we have requested.

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”
I discussed this with Rob earlier, the new well if setup to pump properly cannot provide for the school. In the long term it would only serve as a matter of backup to the current well (which needs to be kept in operation). Typically if at all, schools do not have a back up water system, correct? That would mean two sets of pumps etc etc to maintain. I suggested to Rob that due to the time of the year, the pumps and other equipment can be turned over now, leaving only the installation for the new year which lessens the burden. Another option would be to back the installation out of Olympic's contractor and have the follow up contract install the "owner supplied equipment". From experience you will be lucky to get 25% of value of any credit from Olympic, so better to take the pumps and run.

First issue, based on the well production information decide as to whether you want one or two wells, it is an operating choice. Either way the pumps and ancillary equipment can be paid for this year under current contract.
Subject: FW: Mobile School CP2

Cory,

Please review and comment. I just finished speaking to [redacted], he is advising me that this may not be an issue. My recommendation was based on a flow of 6 GPM as was communicated to me from the Contractor shortly after the well was drilled. The 72 hours draw down test, in which we only received results on this past Friday, and the Consultant received results on yesterday, shows a sustainable yield of only 2 GPM, with 16 hours recovery period, or 4 GPM with 8 hour recovery period.

In discussing this with [redacted], this may not be an issue, because we will only be operating like this for 1 to 2 months before the other well is put into operation, and or we can leave the existing well connected to the new school. The only problem that I can see with this is, we will not gain as much time as I was anticipating, as we will need to leave the existing well in operation longer than expected.

As a result of the lower flow, the well head will be redesigned for the new well, and I will be seeking a credit from Olympic for the new well head. The new well head equipment shown in CP2 will have to be reduced due to the lower flow and should be much cheaper. Essentially, what may happen is, the cost of CP3 will go up by about the same amount that CP2 will decrease. Thus, we may need to transfer money out of the CP2 budget, to the CP3 budget. I will review the budget more closely in the next few days, as I believe there may be an additional $30,000-$40,000 in CP2 that we could transfer as well.

Also, it should be noted that there will be approximately a carry over of $40,000 required for the CP2 Contract for fiscal year 08/09.

Regards,
Rob

From: [redacted]@snclavalin.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2008 12:46 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

Robert,

The original yield estimate from the well drillers report was 6 US GPM. This is not the "safe pumping yield" as established by the Hydro geologist. The new well should safely be able to produce 4 Imperial GPM (4.8 US GPM) if the well is only operated 8 hours out of each 24 hour period. This is sort of how we intended to operate the pump as the underground reservoir would look after the peak school day demand and the pump would work during the unoccupied school period to refill the reservoir. Our concept had a 16 hour pump operating period as opposed to a 8 hour operating period. Now you can see why I was asking for this report from the Hydro geologist in order to properly size the submersible well pump.

You will have to talk to [redacted] about the wells. I have never been to site and I don't know one well from the other. [redacted] is much more familiar with these wells and should be able to answer your question.

Just to let you know we have proceeded to develop the CP-3 construction package drawings as per your instruction last week. We are well under way and in fact are nearing completion. There is a drawing set currently on my desk for review. I still have some calculations to carry out, equipment to select and a specification to write. We are waiting for some survey information from site pertaining to the existing well head. We hope to have this information early next week at the latest.
In my earlier e-mail I advised that we were going to build a new wooden house on top of the existing well head. We have had a closer look at this with our civil department and we are now going back to the concrete manhole in the ground.

The design flow rate for the septic system as established by the Government Services Center in conjunction with Mr. Gunar Leja of DTW is 16,000 litres per day. This was a substantially reduced flow rate from the original design flow rate and was determined based upon actual flow data at the original school. Special permission had to be obtained from the Government Services Center in order to allow us to design to this lower flow rate. There isn't any process water to speak of and the water for sanitary purposes is potable, hence the potable water flow can be assumed to equal the design septic tank flow. Therefore the design potable water flow rate is 16,000 litres to be made up during the 16 hour unoccupied school period. This result in a continuous flow rate of 4.39 US GPM. Since our well can only safely pump for 8 hours and then at a flow rate of only 4.76 US GPM (i.e. 4 Imperial GPM) then our new well isn't sufficient to maintain the level within the underground reservoir on a daily basis.

I trust this answers your question.

---

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: February 27, 2008 11:43 AM
To: [name]
Cc: [name]
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

That low of a yield is much lower than expected. Originally, it was thought that the yield was 6.0 GPM. This was on the well closest to the ocean. Can you confirm which well this flow was measured from?

We may have to rethink this completely. My recommendations to DOE was based on the flow of 6 GPM, with a design required flow of 4.5 GPM. Can you confirm the requirements of the school used for design?

Rob

---

From: [name]@snclavalin.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2008 10:00 AM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Cc: [name]
Subject: FW: Mobile School CP2

Robert,

We were on site on Friday and can confirm the following:

1. The power wiring is not pulled to the existing well. The conduit is installed.
2. The control wiring is not pulled to the existing well. The conduit is installed.
3. None of the internal components associated with the well head are installed as per detail 3/M13 on
the CP-2 "Issued for Construction" drawings.
4. The hydrostatic level sensor is not installed in the existing well.
5. The water service entrance in Mechanical Room 161 is not installed as per the drawings. The following components have not been installed:

- Pressure air release valve.
- Basket strainer and associated differential pressure transmitter.
- Pressure gauges.
- Pressure transducer.
- Pump control valve.
- Magnetic flow meter.

6. The magnetic motor starter for the submersible pump that was supposed to be installed in the existing well is not installed.
7. The control inputs and outputs to the existing well pump magnetic motor starter are not completed since the starter is not installed.

Please note that it is not as simple as saying that the well equipment has been moved from the existing well to the new well. The existing well had a supposed safe yield in excess of 30 GPM. The new drilled well has a safe pumping yield of between 2 and 4 GPM as established by ADI in their well test report which I received this Monday past. Therefore the design of the internal components of the well head which will sit on top of the new drilled well will not be the same as that which was designed for the existing well. This will have to be addressed in a contemplated change notice from our office through DTW and finally to the CP-2 contractor.

What we intend to do as part of the CP-3 package is as follows:

**CP-3 Construction Package:**

1. Put a new wood house on top of the existing well head concrete foundation.
2. Complete the internals to the existing drilled well wellhead as per detail 3/M13 of the CP-2 construction package.
3. Supply and install the magnetic motor starter for the new submersible pump in the existing well.
4. Supply and install a new submersible pump for the existing well.
5. Connect the power feed already in the existing well head to the new pump.
6. Install a new disconnect in the new well head to service the new submersible pump.
7. Install a new hydrostatic level sensor in the existing well and connect to the control wiring already installed out to the existing well head.
8. Supply and install the inputs / outputs from the DDC system to the new submersible pump starter in Mechanical room 161.
9. Revise the control sequence associated with the potable water system so that both well pumps can work in parallel.
10. Commission the new submersible pump in the existing drilled well and all associated equipment including controls.
11. Change out the impellers in the sewage lift station pumps to meet the new design criteria now that the existing treatment plant is gone.
12. Supply and install a new 1-1/4 polyethylene pipe from the new drilled well to a connection point into the new NPS 4 cement lined ductile iron pipe serving the existing well head. A corporation stop will be installed at this connection point.
13. Connect the new 1-1/4 pipe to the existing pipe arrangement inside the well head on top of the new drilled well.
14. Supply and install both power and control wiring from the building to the existing well head on top of the new drilled well.
15. Connect the new power wiring to the new drilled well to the existing disconnect inside the well head serving the existing submersible pump.
16. Connect the new control wiring to the new drilled well to the existing junction box inside the well
head serving the existing submersible pump. This junction box serves the existing hydrostatic level sensor already installed in the new drilled well under the CP-2 construction package.

17. Supply and install a new DDC expansion board to the existing controller inside Mechanical room 161 to handle the extra control points associated with the new drilled well.

18. Connect the new power feed to the existing submersible pump in the new drilled well to the existing magnetic motor starter in Mechanical room 161. The magnetic motor starter will have been installed under the CP-2 construction package.

19. Commission the existing submersible pump in the new drilled well and all associated equipment including controls.

I may have left something out of the scope of work inadvertently but given how confusing this has become it would not surprising.

Please review and offer your comments. We await your reply.

---

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: February 26, 2008 8:55 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Mobile School CP2

FYI

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: February 26, 2008 12:50 PM
To: [redacted] (Olympic Construction Ltd)
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

You are partially correct, I am not asking for anything not already included in your contract. Please refer to drawing 3/M13 for the mechanical requirements, there may also be some electrical work required at the well head as well, but the physical M&E connection(Pipe and Conduit/wire from inside the school to well), will not be required, as this work has already been completed in relation to the old well. Please review drawings and supply and install as per the contract documents ASAP.

Please note, the well equipment has been relocated as a requirement for the old well to the new well in an effort to accommodate and address the concerns brought forward by Olympic Construction and the Mechanical sub-contractor in having to leave this work for the end of the school year.

Regards,
Rob

From: [redacted] @olympic-construction.nf.ca
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2008 12:03 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Subject: Re: Mobile School CP2

Robert

There is no confusion on our part in connection with the well assembly the only thing left to do is drop
the new pump into the well and install the manhole anything other would be extra work as far as tying it into one of the new wells including excavation and M&E

There appears to be some confusion as to the requirements of T&W for the Well assembly. I am writing this email in an attempt to clarify these previously communicated requirements and to ensure the timely completion of this work.

As such, please interpret this email as a Directive from T&W to install the new well head, pump and housing as per drawings 3/M13 on the Newly Drill Well with the greatest yield. I trust you will get this work done right away, with no future delays.

Regards,
Rob
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From: Lahey, Paul  
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
Subject: RE: Mobile CP2 Well Options  
Date: Friday, February 15, 2008 6:27:16 PM  

Rob  

Your going at it right, nothing to discuss. I might be wrong but is it actually cheaper via your direction?  

The installation should be the same, but do they have more prep work as per specifications? If for whatever reason it does come down to a meeting with them over these sorts of matters, let me know so that I can attend also. Sometimes its just good to full the table. Olympic will not come with just one individual and I will be pushing hard against whomever it is they send, I find it's typical of them at contract endngs.

---

From: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
Sent: Fri 15/02/2008 6:07 PM  
To: Lahey, Paul  
Subject: Mobile CP2 Well Options  

Got in to see Cory after you left today, he would also like to proceed in the fashion that I suggested. He also requested to come to the meeting with Olympic on this. I haven't decided that we will have a meeting on it for sure yet, there should be no explanation needed, other than to direct him to install the well head, pump and housing on the new well.  

Thus, unless is able to point out a major flaw in my ideology behind my suggestion, we will be going that route.

Rob
Robert,

I didn’t say it "would" cost more. I said in "my" opinion it would cost more. You are changing the scope of the CP-2 contract and opening yourself up to a possible change order. The cost will be what the cost will be.

As far as schedule is concerned, again in "my" opinion it will not be possible to get the wellhead constructed before the end of April at the earliest. I would expect it would take even longer then that. There are no materials ordered yet for this well head and the materials specified have long deliveries. I don’t have the well test report and without it I cannot select a pump. When the pump is selected there will be a significant time to get the shop drawings approved, pump ordered, delivered and installed. We still need to finish the design of the CP-3 package. This will not be complete until the end of the month. Then the CP-3 package has to be tendered and awarded which in all likelihood will take at minimum one month if all goes well. The shop drawings for materials will have to be submitted and reviewed which will likely take another month after tender award. This leaves us ordering material at the beginning of May. We will have a 6 to 8 week delivery schedule for material if all goes well which will place us into the middle of June when we get our material. The civil works can start before this and this is the large part of the job. Unfortunately the job cannot be finished without the remaining mechanical and electrical work as well.

Let me say again that this is [REDACTED] opinion and my opinion only. I am not speaking for anyone other then myself. You asked for my opinion as to whether or not your plan was plausible and I have offered my opinion accordingly. Take it for what it is.

When you have a time and a place established for the meeting with [REDACTED], please advise accordingly.

---

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: February 15, 2008 2:10 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Foley, Claude J.; Clarke, Clyde J.; Construction, School; 'Pat Royle'
Subject: FW: Mobile School CP2

As below, Cory would like clarification and/or explanations on this. Please advise.

Also, in speaking to [REDACTED] this morning, he has requested a meeting to discuss deficiencies, well head, etc. We need to be clear on the route we are going with before that meeting.

Rob
Rob,
Your approach seemed reasonable to me.

BAE doesn't give a definitive reason in their e-mails for:
1) Why it would cost more to install the well head on a different well.
2) Why they believe it would still be nearing the end of the school year before you will be ready to connect the new wellhead into the new school, as per your proposed route.

Can you discuss this further with them?

Cory

From: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2008 8:20 AM  
To: Grandy, Cory  
Cc: Foley, Claude J.; Clarke, Clyde J.  
Subject: FW: Mobile School CP2

FYI, this is the response to the email that I sent around.

Rob

From: [redacted]@snclavalin.com]  
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2008 6:37 PM  
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.  
Cc: [redacted]  
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

Robert,

I have taken a look at what you propose and I don't think your approach will buy you the kind of time that you are anticipating. I still believe it will be nearing the end of the school year before you will be ready to connect the new wellhead into the new school. If this is the case then it is not logical to proceed in this direction.

The other thing to consider is the potential added cost that may be entertained if we alter the CP-2 contract in any way. Moving the wellhead work to the new drilled well location will in my opinion open the door for Olympic to challenge you for extra costs under the CP-2 contract. I do not think this is a wise way in which to proceed. In my opinion it would be more beneficial to let Olympic carry out their scope of work as defined under the existing CP-2 contract and then place the work associated with the new wellhead into the CP-3 contract.

I understand the pressures that are being placed upon DTW to get the existing school torn down but in my opinion it just doesn't make sense to do so until the end of this coming school year.

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]  
Sent: February 14, 2008 1:51 PM
In a phone conversation with [person] this morning, I suggested we may be able to speed this process up by using another route.

That is, have the contractor install the new well head on the new well wish we had drill in November. While the original contract called for this to be done to the existing well, it should be a zero cost item to have it installed on the new well with the highest water yield. This work could be completed by Olympic as early as March in my opinion. Then in CP3, it would have to be specified that the conduit, wiring, piping, etc. required to connect the new well into the school be completed first, and probably done over a weekend, as at that point, the old well water supply to the building would be temporarily cut off and the school would be temporarily serviced by only the new well. Once the new school has its own water supply, that is independent of the old school (currently the pump providing water to the new school is physically located in the old school), the school could be demolished. Additionally, as part of CP3 the existing well would get a new well head and pump. I have sent a similar email to DOE, as they have expressed interest, along with the school board in having the school demolished ASAP. Please review and advise.

Rob

From: [redacted@sncavalin.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2008 11:33 AM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

Rob,

We did not have the water line or conduit installed to the new well. The price was an issue, and it was too late in the season to do the concrete foundations.

We recommend putting this work in CP#3 rather than a Change Order. The work for CP#2 at the existing well will have to be done after school is closed for the summer (June 2008); and, similarly, the light standards will have to be done when the CP#3 contractor has demolished the school and has site grading done. Thus, CP#2 will be around until July or August. If DOE want the school demolished earlier, we will have to make provisions to retain the existing water supply.

I will call to discuss.

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: February 14, 2008 10:22 AM
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

If we install new well head, submersible pump, etc on the existing well, won't that cut off/or change our ability to get water to the new school. It was my intention to have them install everything on the new
well as it was spec'ed for the existing. Give me a call to discuss.

Rob

From: snclavalin.com
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2008 9:57 AM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Cc: [RE: Mobile School CP2]

Robert, we would prefer to leave the CP2 work as per the contract so we don't get into pricing issues. Therefore, CP2 would install the wellhead on the existing well and we will deal with Olympic on the outstanding work. We will complete CP3 for tender by end of February. I will arrange a meeting to review prior to tender.

We are still waiting for the Report on the pump test, [RE: Mobile School CP2]

Please inform DOE and Clyde of the tender date.

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2008 11:57 AM
To: [RE: Mobile School CP2]
Cc: [Olympic Construction Ltd]
Subject: Mobile School CP2

What is the status on the work included in your contract for the well. As discussed in with you in December, we were not interested in taking a credit on this and it was discussed that the work previously included in your contract for the existing well would instead be installed for the new well yielding the highest flow. I also discussed this with [Olympic Construction Ltd] on site as well. Please advise as to when this work will be completed?

Rob
distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender."
Robert,

Robert is out of town, but he asked me to forward the attached CCN's from Olympic to your attention and ask that you issue a Change Order. I believe No. 11 is next; however, we do not have a copy of No. 10 in our files. Would you please forward a copy of both at your convenience.

These items are all under "Owner Request".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 17/08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Flagpole Base</td>
<td>$495.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 11/07</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Replace Red Stone</td>
<td>$2,090.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 30/07</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Frames &amp; Covers for Septic System</td>
<td>$8,267.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 18/07</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hook-Up Pump &amp; Well System</td>
<td>$8,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 17/08</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sidewalk Installation Additional Materials</td>
<td>$1,391.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $20,494.60

Thanks
The deep well pump, etc will not hold your SC, it is an issue pushed aside by TW, at least I believe to be the case. We cannot accept the price on the water hook-up and unfortunately will have to enforce other directives. As indicated 5500.00 is middle ground of the numbers forwarded to me and while I had previously indicated 5000 as a max it was based on a quick offer of a middle ground, that is to say if 5500.00 is offered we will accept, otherwise we will not pay more than our estimates for the work.

The other items hopefully can be updated to you shortly.

Thanks
Paul,

Please once again accept my assurance that ourselves and our subs are not trying to be difficult here, and are NOT trying to hold anyone up for ransom, as someone put it. I just sent you an e-mail on the hook-up of the water making a suggestion that, basically, you and our mechanical sub split the difference on the cost [(7700.00 - 5000.00) / 2 = approximately 1350.00 plus mark-up]. I have not spoken to him on this, but I think I can push this through. Let me know.

On the issue of occupancy, everything should be basically ready in all areas I am told by tomorrow, but there may be odd ends and ends to be done before January 8, 2008, which we will take care of. Most inspections are already done as are verifications and we will have the certificates over the next few days. For example, the stove in the kitchen supplied by the Owner was needed to finish the fire suppression system; but was not only on site yesterday; consequently, the fire suppression is being done today. With respect to the fire alarm system it has all been certified, but we cannot get the actual certificate until NL Power puts a separate meter in for the fire pump only, which they promise they are doing today. Handicap Accessibility is doing their final today. So everything is in hand. There are still issues we have with our insurer, etc., regarding occupancy prior to issuance of a certificate of substantial completion; however, can I propose that we have an agreement that we will not submit our application for substantial completion until December 31, 2007, but that you will accept it at that time. In the meantime I have been dealing with our insurer to try to find a way to make this work and here's what he suggests:

1. Olympic Construction needs to be named as an "additional insured" on the school's insurance policies and we need written acknowledgement sent to us.
2. The school board should give us a letter, stating that they have taken possession of all areas of the school except for the gym/music room area and that they are responsible for utilities, security, vandalism, glass breakage, cleaning, maintenance, safety, and other normal operating activities. This should be effective just prior to them starting to move anything in.
3. The school board should arrange to transfer utilities to their account just prior to move in.

I really do not want to get into any arguments with you guys or anyone on anything, especially on a job such as this which is basically finished, but we have certain exposure which we also have to be cognisant of and there are always two sides to every story. If the foregoing represents a fair and reasonable compromise, which I really believe it does, let's stop sending e-mails and just agree and get it done. None of us needs to spend the time we are on this, as you are all just as busy as we are. Let me know if the foregoing is OK, and I'll get everything moving in that direction.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lahey, Paul [mailto:laheyp@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 20, 2007 10:09 AM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C. 
Cc: Clarke, Clyde J.; Pat Royle; Grandy, Cory; @snclavalin.com
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

With respect to insurances the building is now added to governments all risk policy, you will be required to maintain liability insurance while completing any and all remaining work.

From discussions yesterday we had offered a solution to the water hook up problem however it appears we are placed in a position of being pressured to take prices due to a disadvantage and additionally the item appears to be used to force a SC.

SC is based on two basic criteria, one financial and one physical. It order to determine SC a review is requested once that state has already been achieved by the contractor and the general conditions dictate the steps to be taken from there. From what I gather no such request has ever been made and no inspections for that purpose have been conducted. Partial inspections (only in the class room wings) have taken place in order to allow
occupancy in those portions of the building and to distinguish any contractor deficiencies from potential owner damage. That was the scenario proposed by [redacted] and agreed to by others.

Again not been familiar with the site I note the follow with respect to SC. For it to be deemed so by us, physically all systems must be up and running, documented with appropriate certificates and regulatory approvals in place. To date we are not aware of any that are done, there was some conflicting information with respect to the fire alarm status. [redacted] informs Rob as late as this morning that you are hoping to have these approvals in place by tomorrow however added that no promises can be made. Can you confirm status of each system, certificate and/or approval?

On the financial side as of the last payment certificate there was approximately $350,000.00 of work remaining in order to achieve SC. If work has been progressing reasonably, it would seem that this is achievable. We have already noted that the last two items of change, water connection and gym floor will not be considered in the financial review for SC due to the lateness of addition.

It is again pointed out that, you are already considerably beyond your approved completion date, whereas an agreeable finish time line appears to be at hand. It gives the appearance however of taking advantage of the owner’s position at this time in order to force issuance of SC, hopefully this is not the case and work over the next couple of weeks by owner and contractor allows the school to open as expected.

Based on this information I see no reason why the School Board should not move in their furnishings as agreed. If for some reason this is not to occur, School Board needs to be advised today in order to make alternate plans.

Regards
we are only trying to accommodate and co-operate with everyone, but without SC, our hands are tied and I guess we will have to suffer the un-nice-ities.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lahey, Paul [mailto:laheyp@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 19, 2007 1:53 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Cc: Clarke, Clyde J.; Pat Royle; Grandy, Cory; @sncalvin.com
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

Again I cannot agree, no different than working on an alteration to a occupied building. We are trying to give you a way forward to completion option, we cannot let the owner be held for ransom, etc.

I urge you to rethink the logic and avoid the un-nice-ities.

Regards

Paul, 
Even when we turn over the school our Contractors' Liability policy remains in effect anywhere we are working, but as I said before we need to get SC to allow them to control, it is still a construction site.

-----Original Message-----
From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:laheyp@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 19, 2007 1:39 PM
To: Lahey, Paul; Matthews, Robert M. C.
Cc: Clarke, Clyde J.; Pat Royle; Grandy, Cory; @sncalvin.com
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

While SC would still not be warranted, I wouldn't expect you to operate the facility. School Board needs the building as soon as possible to allow them to setup. From that point their normal operations can take over even though you have work outstanding. I would expect you however to maintain some level of builders risk or other insurance that protects the building and contents while your work is ongoing. The school board would carry their own insurance for their purposes as normal. In the meantime if the School Board's own insurance covers the builders risk perhaps that will suffice.

Pat
Please advise?

With respect to gym, we will not hold SC due to the flooring.
Paul,

With all due respect, I have read your e-mail and that of Mr. Robert Matthews, and cannot concur. At the current time the areas the School Board want are ready, with the exception of a few minor items which will be done by Friday, which involves everything except the gym/music room area. The reason the gym area was not made ready is the fact that the flooring has been on HOLD since summer time and we were just given authorization to proceed two weeks ago. It is now December 19 and we still have no water source connected to the building, once again because we have no direction or authorization to proceed—what can we do? The plumbers are finishing up tomorrow and this issue has been ongoing since August. If someone gives us authorization to proceed we will do the best we can to hook things up.

On the insurance issue, our liability policy only covers construction sites and we cannot get one that allows us to be the custodian of a school for any price; should you wish to speak to our insurer, I will gladly give you his name and number and let him explain it to you himself.

I don't believe it fair and reasonable for you to think we should retain possession of the school, and allow it to be used for the purpose intended [except the area that was delayed through no doing of our own], and expect us to operate the facility, pay for utilities and maintenance, and worry about 300 students and teachers and such liabilities.

We do not wish to get into any arguments or confrontations, as we have done everything to give your client to facility on time, despite the fact it was awarded months after it was supposed to be.

-----Original Message-----

From: Lahey, Paul [mailto:laheyp@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 19, 2007 9:47 AM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; [email: olympic-construction.nf.ca]
Cc: Clarke, Clyde J.; Pat Royle; Grandy, Cory; [email: snclavalin.com]
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

Gents

Based on information forwarded to me, the School Board has indicated several times in writing and in conversations that they required the building for Jan 8 opening. At no time did anyone from the contractor object or raise concerns with that date. To open Jan 8, the School
Board would obligingly have to perform some prep work, move in furnishings, etc. In meetings with owner and other officials has reportedly indicated that materials could be moved starting on Mon, Dec 17/07. Approved contract Substantial Completion date is currently Nov 9/07, leaving Olympic both potentially liable for owner’s expenses and in breach of contract at this point. Issues of gym flooring and water supply are side issues from lateness and redundant in terms of Substantial Completion as there was/is in excess of $1.0 M from the point of approved contract completion date.

At this point having the owner move in furnishings and equipment would seem the logical best route for everyone involved in terms of achieving the shortest timelines. In terms of S.C and partially occupied, this will not be the first contract in which this has occurred. With respect to insurances etc, if this is not already covered under contractor’s insurance than I would suggest a revision to the policy and/or new policy be immediately enacted. To say that we cannot occupy and be insured does not make sense in terms of other projects that are undertaken, how would the insurance situation be any different if it were for an alteration of an occupied building. If there are additional costs for this insurance they are Olympic’s due to the lateness of completion.

Aside from denials of what dates were or were not indicated by Project Manager, Olympic also needs to clearly identify and submit for approval an anticipated date for Substantial Completion and all other work. Given the lateness and the Season, this is a critical submission requiring immediate action.

Contractor needs to take the bull by the horns and ensure completion as soon as possible, however in doing so must also cooperate to the fullest possible extend with the School Board so as to also ensure the school opens on the desired date. Missing that date will mean that it will be many months or the next school year before the School can operate as should be leaving the School Board with additional expenses, delaying removal of the old building, etc. It is imperative that Olympic does not place the Board in that position.

Regards
Robert,

There is obviously some big misunderstanding here and some legal issues relative to occupancy. The primary reason the gym/music room area can't be turned over is that you have only given us the authorization to proceed with the revised gym flooring during the past two weeks, and we still don't have final authorization to proceed with water connection as of yesterday afternoon. All the rest of the school can be occupied and in speaking to [redacted] he says he never agreed to turn over the school without substantial completion being granted. Without this our liability insurance policy is redundant, as we have no coverage for owner occupancy. We also never agreed to pay operating costs and do/pay for maintenance for any time when the school board is in occupancy as the facility is being used for the purpose intended—that is unheard of. The only way we can give the school board the school is if they take occupancy, grant substantial completion, and take over the security, utilities, and all responsibilities except for the gym/music room area. Otherwise it is a legal and insurance nightmare!

-----Original Message-----

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]

Sent: December 19, 2007 7:51 AM

To: @olympic-construction.nf.ca

Cc: @olympic-construction.nf.ca; Clarke, Clyde J.; Gollop, Cyril; Foley, Claude J.

Subject: Mobile School CP2

Since our conversation yesterday, I reviewed the tender documents, and as I stated then, waxing of the floors is indeed included in your contract. Please refer to spec. sections 09651 and 09652. As you are aware, this needs to be done today, if the school board is to get furniture brought into the building before the break.

Also, I need a letter from Olympic construction stating that Olympic Construction will allow the school to occupy the classroom and cafeteria spaces without substantial completion. It should also confirm that until substantial completion is awarded, Olympic construction will be responsible for all maintenance, electricity etc. for the spaces. As you know, this is what was agreed on between the Eastern School Board, DOE, T&W and Olympic Construction at our December 7th meeting at Mobile.

Regards,

Robert
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Paul,

As you know, our mechanical sub submitted a price of approximately 7700.00 to do the modifications to the existing well and wellhouse so the school could have water. He called me about 5:00PM yesterday and said WST would pay a maximum of 5000.00 period. I went back to the mechanical sub and he indicated he could not do this extra work at a loss—that is where it was left. I know he will not do it for that, but to get water on the school, I may be able to talk him down a bit if you could possibly meet him half-way. I only ask this in the interest of trying to get this building hooked up to a water source.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lahey, Paul [mailto:laheyp@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 19, 2007 1:53 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M.
Cc: Clarke, Clyde J.; Pat Royle; Grandy, Cory; @snclavalin.com
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

Again I cannot agree, no different than working on an alteration to a occupied building. We are trying to give you a way forward to completion option, we cannot let the owner be held for ransom, etc.

I urge you to rethink the logic and avoid the un-nice-ities.

Regards

-----Original Message-----
From: Lahey, Paul [mailto:laheyp@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 19, 2007 1:39 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M.
Cc: Clarke, Clyde J.; Pat Royle; Grandy, Cory; @snclavalin.com
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

Paul,

Even when we turn over the school our Contractors' Liability policy remains in effect anywhere we are working, but as I said, before we need to get SC to allow them to occupy, otherwise if we have control; it is still a construction site.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lahey, Paul [mailto:laheyp@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 19, 2007 1:39 PM
To: Matthews, Robert M.
Cc: Clarke, Clyde J.; Pat Royle; Grandy, Cory; @snclavalin.com
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

While SC would still not be warranted, I wouldn't expect you to operate the facility. School Board needs the building as soon as possible to allow them to setup. From that
point their normal operations can take over even though you have work outstanding. I would expect you however to maintain some level of builders risk or other insurance that protects the building and contents while your work is ongoing. The school board would carry their own insurance for their purposes as normal. In the meantime if the School Board's own insurance covers the builders risk perhaps that will suffice.

Pat
Please advise?

With respect to gym, we will not hold SC due to the flooring.

Regards

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, December 19, 2007 11:35 AM
To: Lahey, Paul; Matthews, Robert M. C.
Cc: Clarke, Clyde J.; Pat Royle; Grandy, Cory; [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

Paul,

With all due respect, I have read your e-mail and that of Mr. Robert Matthews, and cannot concur. At the current time the areas the School Board want are ready, with the exception of a few minor items which will be done by Friday, which involves everything except the gym/music room area. The reason the gym area was not made ready is the fact that the flooring has been on HOLD since summer time and we were just given authorization to proceed two weeks ago. It is now December 19 and we still have no water source connected to the building, once again because we have no direction or authorization to proceed. What can we do? The plumbers are finishing up tomorrow and this issue has been ongoing since August. If someone gives us authorization to proceed we will do the best we can to hook things up.

On the insurance issue, our liability policy only covers construction sites and we cannot get one that allows us to be the custodian of a school for any price. Should you wish to speak to our insurer, I will gladly give you his name and number and let him explain it to you yourself.

I don't believe it fair and reasonable for you to think we should retain possession of the school and allow it to be used for the purpose intended [except the area that was delayed through no doing of our own], and expect us to operate the facility, pay for utilities and maintenance, and worry about 300 students and teachers and such liabilities.

We do not wish to get into any arguments or confrontations, as we have done everything to give your client to facility on time, despite the fact it was awarded months after it was supposed to be.

And [Redacted] are still willing to co-operate in any way, but the fact remains that if the school board wants to operate out of the building, and as agreed in previous meetings there is no reason why they cannot, that they have to give us substantial completion, and take over the operating responsibilities such as security, maintenance, utilities, etc., as we will only be accessing the gym/music room area, which would have been done now if we had been given direction on the gym floor 2 months ago. There is no need to turn this into a confrontation now, but we just cannot accept responsibility to operate a school, when the delay was out of our control.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lahey, Paul [mailto:laheyp@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 19, 2007 9:47 AM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.; @olympic-construction.nf.ca
Cc: Clarke, Clyde J.; Pat Royle; Grandy, Cory; @srclavalin.com
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

Gents

Based on information forwarded to me, the School Board has indicated several times in writing and in conversations that they required the building for Jan 8 opening. At no time did anyone from the contractor object or raise concerns with that date. To open Jan 8, the School Board would obviously have to perform some prep work, move in furnishings, etc. In meetings with owner and other officials has reportedly indicated that materials could be moved starting on Mon, Dec 17/07. Approved contract Substantial Completion date is currently Nov 9/07, leaving Olympic both potentially liable for owner's expenses and in breach of contract at this point. Issues of gym flooring and water supply are side issues from lateness and redundant in terms of Substantial Completion as there was/is in excess of $1.0 M from the point of approved contract completion date.

At this point having the owner move in furnishings and equipment would seem the logical best route for everyone involved in terms of achieving the shortest timelines. In terms of S.C and partially occupied, this will not be the first contract in which this has occurred. With respect to insurances etc, if this is not already covered under under contractor's insurance than I would suggest a revision to the policy and/or new policy be immediately enacted. To say that we cannot occupy and be insured does not make sense in terms of other projects that are undertaken, how would the insurance situation be any different if it were for an alteration of an occupied building. If there are additional costs for this insurance they are Olympic's due to the lateness of completion.

Aside from denials of what dates were or were not indicated by Project Manager, Olympic also needs to clearly identify and submit for approval an anticipated date for Substantial Completion and all other work. Given the lateness and the Season, this is a critical submission requiring immediate action.

Contractor needs to take the bull by the horns and ensure completion as soon as possible, however in doing so must also cooperate to the fullest possible extend with the School Board so as to also ensure the school opens on the desired date. Missing that date will mean that it will be many months or the next school year before the School can operate as should be leaving the School Board with additional expenses, delaying removal of the old building, etc. It is imperative that Olympic does not place the Board in that position.

Regards

From: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Sent: Wednesday, December 19, 2007 8:30 AM
To: Lahey, Paul
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

Robert,

There is obviously some big misunderstanding here and some legal issues relative to occupancy. The primary reason the gym/music room area can't be turned over is that you have only given us the authorization to proceed with the revised gym flooring during the past two weeks, and we still don't have final authorization to proceed with water connection as of yesterday afternoon. All the rest of the school can be occupied and in speaking to he says he never agreed to turn over the school without substantial completion being granted. Without this our liability insurance policy is redundant, as we have no coverage for owner occupancy. We also never agreed to pay operating costs and do/pay for maintenance for any time when the school board is in occupancy as the facility is being used for the purpose intended—that is unheard of. The only way we can give the school board the school is if they take occupancy, grant substantial completion, and take over the security, utilities, and all responsibilities except for the gym/music room area. Otherwise it is a legal and insurance nightmare!

-----Original Message-----
From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 19, 2007 7:51 AM
To: @olympic-construction.nf.ca
Cc: @olympic-construction.nf.ca; Clarke, Clyde J.; Gollop, Cyril; Foley, Claude J.
Subject: Mobile School CP2

Since our conversation yesterday, I reviewed the tender documents, and as I stated then, waxing of the floors is indeed included in your contract. Please refer to spec. sections 09651 and 09652. As you are aware, this needs to be done today, if the school board is to get furniture brought into the building before the break.

Also, I need a letter from Olympic construction stating that Olympic Construction will allow the school to occupy the classroom and cafeteria spaces without substantial completion. It should also confirm that until substantial completion is awarded, Olympic construction will be responsible for all maintenance, electricity etc. for the spaces. As you know, this is what was agreed on between the Eastern School Board, DOE, T&W and Olympic Construction at our December 7th meeting at Mobile.

Regards,
Robert
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I met with [redacted] earlier this morning to discuss the scope of work with respect to the existing wellhead. Here is what was decided:

- The existing deep well pump is to be reused.
- The existing starter in the existing school is to be reused.
- The deep well pump will start and stop off of the pressure switch in the existing school as it is presently doing.
- Water will remain on in the existing school after the new school is in operation.
- The existing deep well pump will service both the new and existing schools simultaneously.
- The 1 inch discharge line from the existing well head will be cut into and a 1 inch tee will be installed. One side of the tee fitting will go to the existing school while the other will go to the new school. The line which feeds the new school will have a 1 inch globe valve installed to provide adequate back pressure to prevent the deep well pump from running out onto its curve. After the globe valve, a flange will be fitted into the 4 inch ductile iron piping presently terminated in the existing well head from the new school and the new 1 inch line will connect into this flange.
- The deep well pump will run off the pressure switch in the existing school. If the water demand in the existing school causes the pressure to drop then the deep well pump will start.
- A 1 inch solenoid will be connected into the new 2 inch water line presently terminated above the floor in Mechanical room 161. From the solenoid a 1 inch copper line will be extended over and down into the new potable water reservoir. The solenoid will be slow closing to avoid water hammer in the piping system back to the pump when the valve open and closes. The new solenoid will be controlled from the new building automation system. The level control in the new reservoir will open the solenoid when the water drops below the set point. The same will hold true for the fire water reservoir. If the solenoid is opened the pressure in the discharge pipe from the deep well pump will drop causing the pressure switch in the existing school to start the deep well pump. The only concern is if there is a check valve in the existing school. This will have to be determined in order to make this concept work. This will have to be determined in the field.
- No new power feed will have to be ran to the existing well head since the existing starter and feeder is to be reused.
- No new disconnect will have to be installed at the existing well head since the existing starter and feeder is to be reused.
- No new control wiring will have to be ran to the existing well head since the deep well pump will be controlled off of its existing pressure switch.

Mechano will give a price to carry out this new piping and control work. All of this work will be extra to the present contract. Mechano will seek a price from Heating products to carry out this control work. This price will include the new power supply for the solenoid valve. Heating products will still be responsible for all the software and control devices as per the original ‘Issued for Construction’ documents.

This will provide a temporary solution to the water supply for the new and existing school. The work at the existing well head and inside the building presently shown on the ‘Issued for Construction’ drawings and included in the ‘Issued for Construction’ specification shall remain as part of the contract. You will have to decide if this work will be done this summer under the existing contract or if the work involved is to be deleted from the present contract and put into the future CP#3 contract. Mechano did express concern with extending the present contract until this coming summer. They will have to carry additional costs for insurances, bonding, etc. which they will look to be reimbursed for if you elect to proceed in this fashion. I am just making you aware of this as it was brought to my attention by Mechano this morning.

I advised Mechano to ignore the drawings we issued last week pertaining to the additional work at the new 6 GPM well. This includes the new 1-1/4 PE underground line. They have pricing on this at the moment but in my opinion it is too confusing to include this work in the present contract at the moment. Let’s get the new school up and running and then we can talk about what we want to do, if anything, with the new 6 GPM well under the present contract. This work is probably more suited to be included in the future CP#3 contract.

You should approach Olympic for a quotation to carry out this work right away. You will need this quotation in place and agreed upon prior to the end of this week. The work will have to take place over the Christmas holidays. Mechano indicated that they shut down on December 21st and hence they will have to carry costs to reflect getting staff back to
complete this work over the holiday shut down period.

I trust this is acceptable to you.

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 14, 2007 5:14 PM
To: [removed]
Pty: Royle; Foley, Claude J.; [removed]; Gallop, Cyril
Subject: Mobile School CP2

I have scheduled a meeting with your sub-contractors regarding the artesian well for Monday morning at 9:00 am. I have been speaking with [removed] and Pat Royle and it has been decided that the old existing well will be used to supply water to the new building. The particulars will be discussed with your sub-contractors on Monday.

This should provide sufficient water for the operation of the new school. Everything needed to complete this work should already included in your contract. The new well house and pump arrangement can be determined at a later date and installed if required. The most important thing right now is to get water to the school. Without this, occupancy would not be possible for January. Please note, that water to the old school cannot be terminated until the end of the last school day for this year, December 20th or 21st, I will advise as to the actual date.

Robert
Robert,

I have faxed you everything except item #4 which will be certified by Thursday/Friday, item #5-Sprinkler guys are on the way to site and should be certified by the end of today; once they are done I can also get the official Fire Alarm Certificate, and item #6 the extra work to connect the water, which they tell me we will have today/tomorrow. Go ahead and move.

---Original Message---

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]  
To: Lahey, Paul  
Cc: @olympic-construction.nl.ca; Pat Royle; Foley, Claude J.; Grandy, Cory  
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2  
Date: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 8:21:47 AM  

Robert,

I have faxed you everything except item #4 which will be certified by Thursday/Friday, item #5-Sprinkler guys are on the way to site and should be certified by the end of today; once they are done I can also get the official Fire Alarm Certificate, and item #6 the extra work to connect the water, which they tell me we will have today/tomorrow. Go ahead and move.

---Original Message---

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]  
To: Lahey, Paul  
Cc: @olympic-construction.nl.ca; Pat Royle; Foley, Claude J.; Grandy, Cory  
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2  
Date: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 8:21:47 AM  

Canvas I get an update on the status of the various items noted in the attached email.

Regards,

Robert

---Original Message---

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]  
To: Lahey, Paul  
Cc: @olympic-construction.nl.ca; Pat Royle; Foley, Claude J.; Grandy, Cory  
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2  
Date: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 8:21:47 AM  

Paul,

Unfortunately, I cannot get anyone today, and most won't be back until January 2nd, but here is what I know.

---Original Message---

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]  
To: Lahey, Paul  
Cc: @olympic-construction.nl.ca; Pat Royle; Foley, Claude J.; Grandy, Cory  
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2  
Date: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 8:21:47 AM  

For clarity, please indicate either what is already certified in the field and with documentation and for those that are not which the dates on which they are expected to be finally blessed with documentation to owner.

1. Heating - Verified in field - He will issue certificate as soon as his assistant comes back.
2. Ventilation - Verified in field - He will send certificate this morning.

3. Plumbing - Verified in field - He will send certificate this morning.


5. Fire Alarms and Sprinkler System - Verified in field, but identified faulty switch in jockey pump controller. Viking has ordered it and it will arrive on Dec 28th and be replaced on that same day, they just test it and then we get both certificates, most likely on Jan 2 or 3.

6. Water - This is of course the extra to connect water to the building. They tell me it will be running on Jan 2nd, and they will then give us a certificate.

7. Accessibility - You have the certificate.

8. Data Systems - Bayview is chasing Aliant for certification. As far as he knows, they are complete and verified, but he has to verify with them and is unable to contact anyone.

9. Communication Systems - Intercom verified in field and certificate to be issued as soon as their office opens again.

From: [email] Sent: Monday, December 24, 2007 9:21 AM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Cc: [email]; [email]; Pat Royle; Lahey, Paul; Foley, Claude J.; Grandy, Cory
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

Robert,
The intercom system is complete, and Bayview tells me that Aliant did the data system for him, and that all that cable was pulled a week ago. He will double check with them if
he can get someone. The problem we have is, as I mentioned to you last week, the whole construction industry is shut down until January 2, 2008 and that it is difficult to get anyone to tell me everything is in hand and that the final odds and ends, will be compete, like the water, and some certificates, etc., between the 2nd and the 7th, ready for the students on the 8th. We are even hoping to see the gym floor a little earlier than promised, but cannot guarantee that.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 24, 2007 9:02 AM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Pat Royle; Lahey, Paul; Foley, Claude J.; Grandy, Cory
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

One item that I missed on that list was Data and Communications, please advise.

Robert

----- Original Message ----- 
From: [redacted]@olympic-construction.nf.ca]
Sent: Monday, December 24, 2007 8:52 AM
To: Matthews, Robert M. C.
Cc: Pat Royle; Lahey, Paul; Foley, Claude J.; Grandy, Cory
Subject: RE: Mobile School CP2

Robert,

We either have them all or are in the works. Plumbing and ventilation are coming from the mechanical contractor and he will issue these this morning. Sprinkler and fire alarm are done, but it will be a few days to get the actual certificate. Security is still in the works, but will be finished the next work day or two, and they are working on the extra well hook-up over the holidays and tell me it will be operational by the 2nd of January!

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 24, 2007 8:11 AM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Pat Royle; Lahey, Paul; Foley, Claude J.; Grandy, Cory
Subject: Mobile School CP2

On Friday, I received a fax copy of the Building Accessibility approval for Occupancy certificate. To date, this is the only certificate that I have received. Please advise as to the status of the other systems requiring certification prior to occupancy, Specifically;

1. Heating
2. Ventilation
3. Plumbing
4. Security
5. Fire Alarms and Sprinkler System
6. Water

Regards,

Robert Matthews

"This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender."
Robert,

The issue regarding the well head is complicated. You should discuss this with Olympic before reaching any conclusions. They may have a different opinion of events.

Robert

Thanks for the update. This option sounds good. I will discuss carrying over the well head work with the contractor. However, as you know, they were suppose to complete their work much earlier in the year, before it became a problem.

I was speaking to Cyril Gallop late Friday afternoon, from what he tells me, the school won't be ready to be opened in January, in which case, we will just give instructions to carry on with the work as per the original contract. I will advise.

Robert

I met with both earlier this morning to discuss the scope of work with respect to the existing wellhead. Here is what was decided:

- The existing deep well pump is to be reused.
- The existing starter in the existing school is to be reused.
- The deep well pump will start and stop off of the pressure switch in the existing school as it is presently doing.
- Water will remain on in the existing school after the new school is in operation.
- The existing deep well pump will service both the new and existing schools simultaneously.
- The 1 inch discharge line from the existing well head will be cut into and a 1 inch tee will be installed. One side of the tee fitting will go to the existing school while the other will go to the new school. The line which feeds the new school will have a 1 inch globe valve installed to provide adequate back pressure to prevent the deep well pump from running out of its curve. After the globe valve, a flange will be fitted into the 4 inch ductile iron piping presently terminated in the existing well head from the new school and the new 1 inch line will connect into this flange.
- The deep well pump will run off the pressure switch in the existing school. If the water demand in the existing school causes the pressure to drop then the deep well pump will start.
- A 1 inch solenoid will be connected into the new 2 inch water line presently terminated above the floor in Mechanical room 161. From the solenoid a 1 inch copper line will be extended over and down into the new potable water reservoir. The solenoid will be slow closing to avoid water hammer in the piping system back to the pump when the valve opens and closes. The new solenoid will be controlled from the new building automation system. The level control in the new reservoir will open the solenoid when the water drops below the set point. The same will hold true for the fire water reservoir. If the solenoid is opened the pressure in the discharge pipe from the deep well pump will drop causing the pressure switch in the existing school to start the deep well pump. The only concern is if there is a check valve in the existing school. This will have to be determined in the field. This will have to be determined in the field.
- No new power feed will have to be ran to the existing well head since the existing starter and feeder is to be
Mechano will give a price to carry out this new piping and control work. All of this work will be extra to the present contract. Mechano will seek a price from Heating products to carry out this control work. This price will include the new power supply for the solenoid valve. Heating products will still be responsible for all the software and control devices as per the original ‘Issued for Construction’ documents.

This will provide a temporary solution to the water supply for the new and existing school. The work at the existing well head and inside the building presently shown on the ‘Issued for Construction’ drawings and included in the ‘Issued for Construction’ specification shall remain as part of the contract. You will have to decide if this work will be done this summer under the existing contract or if the work involved is to be deleted from the present contract and put into the future CP#3 contract. Mechano did express concern with extending the present contract until this coming summer. They will have to carry additional costs for insurance, bonding, etc. which they will look to be reimbursed for if you elect to proceed in this fashion. I am just making you aware of this as it was brought to my attention by Mechano this morning.

I advised Mechano to ignore the drawings we issued last week pertaining to the additional work at the new 6 GPM well. This includes the new 1-1/4 PE underground line. They have pricing on this at the moment but in my opinion it is too confusing to include this work in the present contract at the moment. Let’s get the new school up and running and then we can talk about what we want to do, if anything, with the new 6 GPM well under the present contract. This work is probably more suited to be included in the future CP#3 contract.

You should approach Olympic for a quotation to carry out this work right away. You will need this quotation in place and agreed upon prior to the end of this week. The work will have to take place over the Christmas holidays. Mechano indicated that they shut down on December 21st and hence they will have to carry costs to reflect getting staff back to complete this work over the holiday shut down period.

I trust this is acceptable to you.

Robert

From: Matthews, Robert M. C. [mailto:robertmatthews@gov.nl.ca]
Sent: December 14, 2007 5:14 PM
To: [removed]
Cc: [removed]
Subject: Mobile School CP2

I have scheduled a meeting with your sub-contractors regarding the artesian well for Monday morning at 9:00 am. I have been speaking with [removed] and Pat Royle and it has been decided that the old existing well will be used to supply water to the new building. The particulars will be discussed with your sub-contractors on Monday.

This should provide sufficient water for the operation of the new school. Everything needed to complete this work should already included in your contract. The new well house and pump arrangement can be determined at a later date and installed if required. The most important thing right now is to get water to the school. Without this, occupancy would not be possible for January. Please note, that water to the old school cannot be terminated until the end of the last school day for this year, December 20th or 21st. I will advise as to the actual date.

Robert

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or
copying by any means of this information are strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender."
Further to our meeting on Thursday, April 11, 2006, we have commenced the preparation of Construction Package No. 1 based on the approvals of the concept site plan and floor plans.

The new school is very close to the existing school at the north end of the site and we recommend that the existing two (2) classroom extension be demolished to permit exiting from the existing school to be outside the construction site.

The construction scheduling for CP#1 is important to ensure that the contractor has completed all construction activities that require the manoeuvring of heavy equipment on the school site before school opens in September. The site will then be fenced such that the 'Construction Area' is secured from the students/staff areas. We will be providing the contractor with a plan showing the construction area with a separate access from the existing school area.

The scope of work for Construction Package No. 1 will include Site Preparation, Excavation and Backfilling, Foundations, Structural Steel, OWSJ and Metal Deck.

The existing well capacity is unknown. We have requested a quotation to have a yield test completed this week (Easter Break). This information is required to determine reliability and to confirm the size of the water storage tank. It appears that the tank will be approximately 40,000 litres for potable water and 90,000 litres for fire flows for the sprinkler system.

The sewer system will be based on a sewage treatment plant.

The only question requiring response to complete the CP#1 tender is the exterior wall/interior partition construction. Any other questions can be discussed in the meeting on Thursday.

If you have any questions, please give me a call.

---

From: 
To: 
Date: 4/18/2006 3:17:22 PM 
Subject: Mobile Central High School

Further to our meeting on Thursday, April 11, 2006, we have commenced the preparation of Construction Package No. 1 based on the approvals of the concept site plan and floor plans.

The new school is very close to the existing school at the north end of the site and we recommend that the existing two (2) classroom extension be demolished to permit exiting from the existing school to be outside the construction site.

The construction scheduling for CP#1 is important to ensure that the contractor has completed all construction activities that require the manoeuvring of heavy equipment on the school site before school opens in September. The site will then be fenced such that the 'Construction Area' is secured from the students/staff areas. We will be providing the contractor with a plan showing the construction area with a separate access from the existing school area.

The scope of work for Construction Package No. 1 will include Site Preparation, Excavation and Backfilling, Foundations, Structural Steel, OWSJ and Metal Deck.

The existing well capacity is unknown. We have requested a quotation to have a yield test completed this week (Easter Break). This information is required to determine reliability and to confirm the size of the water storage tank. It appears that the tank will be approximately 40,000 litres for potable water and 90,000 litres for fire flows for the sprinkler system.

The sewer system will be based on a sewage treatment plant.

The only question requiring response to complete the CP#1 tender is the exterior wall/interior partition construction. Any other questions can be discussed in the meeting on Thursday.

If you have any questions, please give me a call.

---

CC: "Clyde Clarke (E-mail)" <clarksc@mail.gov.nf.ca>
Gentlemen - next meeting scheduled for Aug 1/06 (Tues) at 9:00 AM in the smaller boardroom (adjacent to payroll) on the 5th floor of the West Block.

Some further points for discussion at our next meeting:

1. Consider carrying acash allowance for winterization costs. Has the advantage of backing out this cost if the schedule changes, etc.
2. Proceed with M&E design to be included in CP 2 package with consideration for design build for controls package.
3. Consider doing some water monitoring at the existing school with the use of an ultrasonic flow meter (available for rent/hire thru [REDACTED] of Kendall Engineering). (The size of the distribution field for the septic system could possibly be reduced with this information in hand.)
4. Carry the cost of the septic system in CP 2 contract so that all major item costs are known at tender close as opposed to waiting for a separate tender.

Regards,

Clyde

Clyde J. Clarke, P. Eng.
Electrical Engineer, Project Manager
Design and Construction Division
Department of Transportation & Works
St. John’s, NL
Ph # (709) 729-4150
Fax # (709) 729-0646
Email clarkec@gov.nl.ca
With respect to the existing sewage treatment plant and the request to extend this usage until June 2008, the minimum criteria are:

1. *existing sewage treatment system to be pumped and cleaned and subsequently reinspected; and*
2. *dye testing to be performed to determine the location of the effluent discharge at present. Both of the items must be undertaken and deemed acceptable by an official of the Government Service Centre prior to the beginning of the school year in 2007. Based on the flow data submitted on 12 July 2007, the minimum design criteria that can be accepted for the design of the new septic disposal system are:

   * daily flows of 16,000 L/day; and a *
   * minimum perc time of 10 mins. Additionally,
   * the existing sewage treatment plant is to be inspected every three months and pumped when necessary during the period September 2007 - June 2008;*
   * training must be provided for the maintenance staff as to safety requirements when in and around the sewage treatment plant; and*
   * flow meter data recorded and submitted as requested following operation of the new facility.

---Original Message---
From: [redacted]
Sent: July 17, 2007 14:16
To: [redacted]
CC: [redacted]

Subject: RE: Mobile enrolment projections - Dist 4 - SC

I have attached a sketch showing the old tile field and existing well. These were the sketches done for the three soccer field size options. This one shows the road around the reduced soccer field, I still don't know for sure which option they will choose. This shows the preliminary tile...
March 6, 2008

To: [Redacted]

Subject: CP#2 - Design-Build, Mobile Central High School

We’ve written you several e-mails over the past week or so in connection with the well situation at Mobile. However, to date we have not received a response and, as mentioned, Robert Matthews from the Department of Works, Services and Transportation, is quite anxious to have this work completed.

Please advise where we go from here.

Yours very truly,

[Redacted]

pc: Mr. Robert Matthews
Dept. Works, Services & Transportation (Fax: 729-0036)

BAE Newplan Group

RECEIVED
MAR. 6 2008
D. W. S. & T.
REGION

Building Newfoundland and Labrador for over 20 years.
Via Fax No. 729-0036/Mail
Dept. of Transportation & Works
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, NL A1B 4J7

Attention: Mr. Robert Matthews
Construction Manager

Re: CP#2 - Design-Build, Mobile Central High School
Mobile, Newfoundland

Dear Sir:

Further to your request, we enclose herewith information pertaining to the 72-Hour Draw-down test in connection with the well at the above-noted project.

Yours very truly,

Enclosure
Potential copyright material

If you wish to obtain a copy please contact the ATIPP Office at (709) 729-7072 or atippoffice@gov.nl.ca.