

# STATE PROPERTIES REVIEW BOARD

## Minutes of Meeting Held On March 3, 2022 – remotely via telephone conference –

Pursuant to Governor Lamont's Executive Order No. 7B regarding suspension of In-Person Open Meeting requirements, the State Properties Review Board conducted its Regular Meeting at 9:30AM on March 3, 2022 remotely via telephone conference at (866)-692-4541, passcode 85607781.

### **Members Present:**

Edwin S. Greenberg, Chairman  
Bruce Josephy, Vice Chairman  
John P. Valengavich, Secretary  
Jack Halpert  
Jeffrey Berger  
William Cianci

### **Members Absent:**

### **Staff Present:**

Dimple Desai  
Thomas Jerram

### **Guests Present**

Mr. Valengavich moved and Mr. Halpert seconded a motion to enter into Open Session. The motion passed unanimously.

## **OPEN SESSION**

### **1. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**

Mr. Valengavich moved and Mr. Berger seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the February 28, 2022 Meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

### **2. COMMUNICATIONS**

Director Desai informed the Board of a teleconference with Staff from the Auditors of Public Accounts.

Mr. Berger provide Members with an update regarding the on-going Legislative Session.

### **3. REAL ESTATE- UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **4. REAL ESTATE – NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Valengavich moved and Mr. Halpert seconded a motion to go out of Open Session and into Executive Session at 9:49. The motion passed unanimously.

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**PRB #:** 22-013  
**Transaction/Contract Type:** RE/ Lease  
**Origin/Client:** DAS/ DMV

**Statutory Disclosure Exemptions: 4b-23(e), 1-200(6)(D) & 1-210(b)(24)**

Mr. Valengavich moved and Mr. Halpert seconded a motion to go out of Executive Session and into Open Session at 10:09. The motion passed unanimously.

**5. ARCHITECT-ENGINEER - UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**6. ARCHITECT-ENGINEER - NEW BUSINESS**

<b>PRB #</b>	22-016
<b>Origin/Client:</b>	DCS/NCC
<b>Transaction/Contract Type</b>	AE / Amendment
<b>Project Number</b>	BI-CTC-565
<b>Contract</b>	BI-CTC-565-CA
<b>Consultant:</b>	The Morganti Group, Inc.
<b>Property</b>	Norwalk, Richards Ave (188) – Norwalk Community College
<b>Project purpose:</b>	CA Services for B-Wing Renovation
<b>Item Purpose</b>	Amendment #1 for Extended CA Services for HAZMAT Removal

**CONSULTANT FEE:** \$61,625 (NTE)

At the August 22, 2019 SPRB Meeting, the Board approved, under PRB #19-139, the Consultant’s Contract (BI-CTC-565-CA) for the completion of the “B-Wing” Renovation Project from schematic design phase through project close out. The overall compensation rate for this basic service was \$690,315.

Under this proposal (PRB #22-016), DCS is now seeking Board approval of Amendment #1 to the Consultant Contract to expend an additional \$61,625 (NTE) for extended construction administration services due to required removal of hazardous materials identified in the building envelope (roof and exterior walls) and all interior building materials, systems and finishes.

DCS provided the following support for the extended services:

The Construction Administrator shall provide the following additional services:

1. Management and supervisory support for implementation of the separate purchase order for a Hazardous Materials DAS Contract DAS 20PS approved contractor.
2. Norwalk Community College B-Wing is located between three (3) existing connected buildings fully occupied with students, faculty, and visitors. Providing public safety of a fully occupied and operational Community College campus during construction is a public safety priority.
3. DAS/Owner is expanding the Construction Administrator’s part time contract purchased scheduled to a full time supervisory staffing scheduled capacity on a daily basis. The Construction Administrator shall provide DAS/Owner with the supervision, monitoring and oversight of this work. Purchasing this additional supervision, monitoring and oversight support is necessary due to the lack of previously planned DAS/Hazardous Materials Project Management expertise staff to support this effort.
4. Services are for extending existing purchased CA Supervisor services to a full time capacity for a five (5) month duration. The five month services duration is an essential duration to appropriately address all building and safety issues involved in services covering initiation mobilization, close-out mobilization for the three (3) active months of demolition hazardous materials abatement services implementing the purchase order DAS/Owner’s vendor’s services.
5. The supervisor services of the Construction Administrator is for scope of work including complete building exterior envelope demolition and hazardous material remediation of the existing buildings exterior and all interior building materials, systems and finishes. The existing building’s structural frame and roof assembly shall be remaining for the General Contractor to begin their contract work.

DCS has confirmed for SPRB that funding is available for this contract.

As part of this contract amendment DCS states the overall construction and total project budget have been increased to \$14,720,000 (from \$14,320,000) and \$23,699,392 respectively.

TMG Fee for Basic Services (PRB #19-139)	<u>COST (\$)</u> <u>(BASIC)</u>	<u>COST (\$)</u> <u>(SPECIAL)</u>	Total Cost	C. Budget (\$)	(%) Budget
Schematic Design Phase	\$28,980				
Design Development Phase	\$28,980				
Contract Document Phase	\$28,980				
Bidding and Review Phase	\$28,980				
Construction Administration Phase	\$545,029				
Project Close Out	<u>\$28,686</u>				
TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#19-073) (A)	\$689,635			\$14,320,000	4.82%
<u>SPECIAL SERVICES:</u>					
Design Phase Contingency (removed)		\$5,000			
<b>PRB #22-016 Special Services (B1)</b>					
CA Services for HAZMAT Removal		<u>\$61,625</u>			
TOTAL SPECIAL SERVICES(B) + (B1)		\$61,625			
TOTAL FEE (PRB #22-016) (A) + (B) + (B1)			\$751,940	\$14,720,000	5.11%

Staff had following questions for clarifications:

1. What is the overall scope of this project and status? Previously the project scope was renovation and upgrades of 32,000 sf space. Which buildings are supposed to be demolished and abated?
2. Provide a map of the entire project that will be overseen by the CA (old and new scope)
3. What is the status of the project?
4. What was the time commitment by the DAS staff for this demolition/abatement scope?
5. Why was this scope not included in the original contract?
6. Is there any impact on the Architect's roles and responsibilities as a result of this scope?
7. The TMG proposal identifies the duration as 3 months for this demo/abatement project. Why DCS is asking for 5 months?
8. Why DCS is asking half time commitment for oversight of this new scope?
9. Provide a copy of the PO for the demo/abatement work.
10. This additional CA oversight will be at the beginning of the GC work. Is there a schedule impact on the project or the substantial completion date? Provide the substantial completion date.

**DCS Response:** Our apologies. Due to a number of impacts, we were not been able to generate and deliver to you, responses to your inquiries regarding the CA Amendment for Morganti Group BI-CTC-565-CA.

Please let me know the target date for the next opportunity on the board's calendar/agenda to consider the amendment, and we'll focus and target our time to properly prepare and respond.

**Staff Response:** The process is that it will be suspended while the Board awaits DCS's responses. Once responses are received, upon review and completion of the review, the Board will schedule it for an appropriate meeting date.

In short, it all depends on when the Board receives the responses.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends **SUSPENSION** of Amendment #1 in the amount of \$61,625 for extended CA Services related to HAZMAT removal for this Project until the clarification is provided to the above questions.

---

**FROM PRB #19-139**

PROPOSED AMOUNT: \$694,635

AUGUST 16, 2019 UPDATE

At its meeting held on July 25, 2019, the State Properties Review Board voted to suspend this item pending clarification of the following issues:

1. Page 16 of CA's contract; Section II. CA's Scope – says CA will provide pre-design services and design phase services. Please clarify where in the compensation “pre-design services” is listed in Exhibit B (Page 31) of the same contract.

DAS PM - Response: Any type of CA “pre-design services” the CA may need to support will be done during the Schematic Design Phase.

CA contract correction should be noted as; Page 16 of CA's contract; Section II. CA's Scope – CA will provide ~~pre design services and~~ design phase services.

SPRB Director Response: Please provide documentation defining “pre-design services”. If these services are to be provided during the Schematic Design (SD) phase, why are these services not included in the SD phase? Also, on page 17, Item A – Project Management and Reporting; Master Project Milestone Schedule references “major pre-design”. The staffing matrix/schedule provided by TMG as part of their proposal, shows these “pre-design services” to start early in the phase (even before the Schematic Phase) – 7/1/2019 for 30 days. Based on all these documents, the “pre-design” services are not required if the Architect is already in the Schematic Design phase.

DAS PM - Response: The Architect has completed their ‘pre-design’ services. TMG shall be sent a request – accepting the removal of the cost for the ‘pre-design’ phase services from their proposal for acceptance. DAS shall revise the CA's contract pages 16, 30 of 31) noting the fee reduction. In addition DAS shall revise the SPRB memo with this reduction. The revised documents shall be sent to DAS Legal – paralegal support staff for SPRB.

SPRB Director Response: OK (savings of \$4,320)

2. What is the status of the Architect contract (what phase)? Is CA providing any services?

DAS PM - Response: SPRB on 3/21/2019 approved the Architect's contract. The Architect's services are in the Schematic Design Phase. DAS intended the CA provide design phase services supporting all project phases. The CA is not under contract and have not been authorized to provide any services.

SPRB Director Response: OK

3. Page 16 – under Section II, Scope – the sentence “The Construction Administration shall not commence any ..... from the DAS Project Manager” is duplicate.

DAS PM - Response: SPRB is correct, there appears to be a sentence typo duplication.

**SPRB Director Response: OK**

4. Page 24, Section II (I) – Construction Phase Services – it lists 424 calendar days (construction phase) plus 90 calendar days. However, the proposal from TMG dated June 6, 2019 states 1,188 calendar days plus another 90 days for closeout. Does this mean that the design phase services has no time limits in terms of calendar days and that the fees for those services are not to exceed?

DAS PM - Response: The TMG proposal of 1,188 calendar days reflects the staffing efforts and anticipated duration of services required and being purchased by DAS for each project phase.

**SPRB Director Response: Form 1140 identifies 300 days from pre-design to bidding/contract award; 385 days for construction; 45 days for project closeout, totaling 730 days from Predesign to project closeout. TMG's proposal states 1,278 total days as project duration. Why is there a huge discrepancy in the number of project duration days between CA's and Architect's estimate? Please provide Architect's contract project schedule. Does this mean that Architect's contract might need revision?**

DAS PM - Response: DAS The Architect's contract schedule reflects solely the time duration for their team to produce each design phase documents which correlates to their 'notice to proceed authorization'. TMG's proposal includes each of the design phase documents durations for the Architect to complete their documents plus additional weeks/months to review the Architect's documents and cost estimate working with the DAS/PM and other related meetings. The Architects contract does not need revision.

**SPRB Director Response: OK**

5. In the TMG proposal dated June 6, 2019, CA has excluded MEP coordinator during Preconstruction and Construction Phase. Who is providing these services during these phases?

DAS PM - Response: Both the attached DAS RFQ 3-10-2018 Legal Notice and TMG RFQ submission did not require/include MEP coordinator CA services. DAS plans on hiring a Consultant to do a coordination documents review prior to acceptance of documents for bidding using a "RediCheck" review.

**SPRB Director Response: OK**

6. Please clarify the difference between the Consultants construction phase services (424 days plus 90-day close out) in Exhibit A(I), page 24 of the CA Contract with the Architect's estimate of 385 days and a 45-day close out, Form 1140, Item 3, Scope of Work; Schedule.

DAS PM - Response: Construction Duration is 385 days PLUS 10% is 39 days – total equals 424 days.

The CA Contract duration, per "boiler plate language" DAS Contract Form "(214) Construction Administration 3.5.15.doc."contract (IV. Contract Duration) is set and specific.

See below portion copied from the contract template document.

"Nothing contained herein shall limit the State's rights pursuant to Articles VIII, IX, and X of the contract.

**IV. CONTRACT DURATION**

The Construction Administrator's construction phase services shall be for a time period of \_\_\_\_\_ (use construction contract time plus 10%) \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_) calendar days (the Construction Phase Time), plus an additional ninety (90) calendar days for project closeout, commencing with the date set forth in the written notice to proceed sent to the Construction Administrator by the DAS Project Manager. Said number of calendar days may be extended in writing by the Commissioner of the DAS, hereinafter referred to as the Commissioner. A reasonable fee shall be determined by the Commissioner for an appropriate level of services for the extended time. The parties recognize that during the extended time the level of staffing and/or services may be decreased, which shall be considered by the Commissioner in the determination of a reasonable fee."

**SPRB Director Response: OK**

7. Please clarify the status of the Commissioning Consultant (Cx) that was included in the June 2018 RFQ. Who is providing these services?

DAS PM - Response: DAS plans to hire a Commissioning Consultant when this project has obtained Construction Phase funding from a DAS On-Call Consultant contract provider. The fee proposal pricing CA received from Cx Consultant's (holding to a fee when a project's construction date is years away) DAS has found was expensive adding considerable project cost. It is in DAS best interest in obtaining a fee for a Cx Consultant closer to the time of construction. Using DAS On-Call Consultant's will have controlled current acceptable fees schedule.

SPRB Director Response: As per Item 15 of the RFQ Web Advertisement, it states that the Selected CA shall provide the additional services of a Commissioning Agent. Why is commissioning agent not involved during the design phase of the project? Will there be any coordination between CxA and CA and/or Architect? If yes, where is this covered in the CA's scope? Is DCS planning to hire CxA at a later date and manage CxA?

DAS PM - Response: DAS plans to hire a Commissioning Consultant when this project has obtained Construction Phase funding from a DAS On-Call Consultant contract provider. The CxA will be hired at the appropriate time to be involved during the design development phase. The Architect's contract (on page 7 of 17) and the CA's contract (on pages 17, 18 of 31) DAS has purchased both Consultant's services for their coordination with the CxA.

SPRB Director Response: OK

8. Please provide a copy of the applicable licenses for this CA contract.

DAS PM - Response: The attached DAS RFQ 3-10-2018 Legal Notice does not require licenses for this CA contract.

SPRB Director Response - OK

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends APPROVAL of this consultant contract in the amount of \$690,315. The CA fee of 4.85% of construction cost is within the DCS CA Services guideline of 5.0%. There is a savings of \$4,320.



PROPOSED AMOUNT: \$694,635

The "B Wing" of Norwalk Community College's West Campus building built in 1966 is in need of renovations. This existing structure consists of two (2) building floors of approximately 32,000 gross square feet supported on slab on grade foundation with perimeter utility tunnel confined spaces. The building requires comprehensive renovations and upgrades to classrooms, and laboratories, research laboratories, student support services and faculty services spaces. The existing heating, ventilation and air-conditioning systems (HVAC), mechanical, electrical, plumbing systems (MEP) are failing and in need of complete replacement. The existing Community College facility spaces need to be retrofitted to accommodate new technologies and programming. Common building areas such as corridors, toilet rooms, elevators, stairs and lobbies need to be modernized and code upgraded. All exterior doors, interior doors and windows need replacing to improve energy efficiency, access, safety and overall appearance. The "D Wing" of Norwalk Community College's West Campus building abuts the "B Wing" with an entrance area containing a two-story space enclosed with a glass exterior curtain wall system. The existing elevator serving the B Wing and D Wing is located adjacent to this space. The Architect's design services shall include a schematic design with separate cost estimate order of magnitude for consideration to the Owner to decide if this area should be additional project scope for inclusion in the project. If the "D Wing" entrance area is added to the project scope for the construction phase, there shall be no additional fee for the construction phase if the "D Wing" work can be accomplished within the Construction Phase Time and project close out period.

The overall construction and total project budget have been established at \$14,320,000 and \$23,699,392 respectively.

In June 2018 the Department of Construction Services (“DCS”) issued a Request for Qualifications for Construction Administrator (CA) Consultant Services and Commissioning (Cx) Consultant Services related to the “B-Wing” Renovation project. DCS elicited 11 responses to the advertisement of which all submittals were considered “responsive”. DCS then proceeded to review the submittals and after the completion of the internal review process, five firms were selected for short-listed interviews. These firms were as follows, Newfield Construction Group, STV Construction, Inc., KBE Building Corporation, The Whiting-Turner Contracting Company and The Morganti Group, Inc. The State Selection Panel consisted of 5 members and interviewed each firm for evaluation purposes based upon an established weighted ranking system. At the conclusion of the process DCS identified The Morganti Group, Inc., (“TMG”) as the most qualified firm.

This contract is for Construction Administrator (CA) Consultant Services for the completion of the “B-Wing” Renovation project from schematic design phase through project close out. The overall compensation rate for this basic service is \$694,635, that includes \$5,000 for design phase contingency.

The Construction Administrator’s construction phase services shall be for a time period of Four Hundred Twenty Four (424) calendar days, plus an additional ninety (90) calendar days for project closeout.

CSCU confirmed funding is in place for preconstruction services totaling \$197,020 via CHEFA Bond Funding for pre-construction services.

TMG Fee for Basic Services (PRB #19-139)	COST (\$) (BASIC)	COST (\$) (SPECIAL)	Total Cost	C. Budget (\$)	(%) Budget
Schematic Design Phase	\$28,980				
Design Development Phase	\$28,980				
Contract Document Phase	\$28,980				
Bidding and Review Phase	\$28,980				
Construction Administration Phase	\$545,029				
Project Close Out	\$28,686				
TOTAL BASIC SERVICE FEE (#19-073) (A)	\$689,635			\$14,320,000	4.82%
<b>SPECIAL SERVICES:</b>					
Design Phase Contingency		\$5,000			
		\$0			
TOTAL SPECIAL SERVICES(B)		\$5,000			
TOTAL FEE ( PRB #19-139) (A) + (B)			\$694,635	\$14,320,000	4.85%

- The June 2018 RFQ elicited 1 responses. The Selection Panel interviewed five firms and ultimately recommended the appointment of The Morganti Group, Inc., (“TMG”). The selection was approved by the DAS Commissioner Currey on 9/12/18.
- TMG is located in Danbury. This firm was established in 1916 and has 93 employees of which 40 employees are located in Danbury. License information was not provided.
- Aon Risk Solutions reported that over the past 5 years TMG has no general liability or professional liability claims.
- The submittal is accompanied by a Consulting Agreement Affidavit notarized on 3/14/2019.



Staff asked DCS to clarify the following:

9. Page 16 of CA's contract; Section II. CA's Scope – says CA will provide pre-design services and design phase services. Please clarify where in the compensation “pre-design services” is listed in Exhibit B (Page 31) of the same contract.

- Response: Any type of CA “pre-design services” the CA may need to support will be done during the Schematic Design Phase. CA contract correction should be noted as; Page 16 of CA’s contract; Section II. CA’s Scope – CA will provide ~~pre design services~~ and design phase services.

- ❖ Please provide documentation defining “pre-design services”. If these services are to be provided during the Schematic Design (SD) phase, why are these services not included in the SD phase? Also, on page 17, Item A – Project Management and Reporting; Master Project Milestone Schedule references “major pre-design”. The staffing matrix/schedule provided by TMG as part of their proposal, shows these “pre-design services” to start early in the phase (even before the Schematic Phase) – 7/1/2019 for 30 days. Based on all these documents, the “pre-design” services are not required if the Architect is already in the Schematic Design phase.

10. What is the status of the Architect contract (what phase)? Is CA providing any services?

- Response: SPRB on 3/21/2019 approved the Architect’s contract. The Architect’s services are in the Schematic Design Phase. DAS intended the CA provide design phase services supporting all project phases. The CA is not under contract and have not been authorized to provide any services.

- ❖ OK

11. Page 16 – under Section II, Scope – the sentence “The Construction Administration shall not commence any ..... from the DAS Project Manager” is duplicate.

- Response: SPRB is correct, there appears to be a sentence typo duplication.

- ❖ OK

12. Page 24, Section II (I) – Construction Phase Services – it lists 424 calendar days (construction phase) plus 90 calendar days. However, the proposal from TMG dated June 6, 2019 states 1,188 calendar days plus another 90 days for closeout. Does this mean that the design phase services has no time limits in terms of calendar days and that the fees for those services are not to exceed?

- Response: The TMG proposal of 1,188 calendar days reflects the staffing efforts and anticipated duration of services required and being purchased by DAS for each project phase.

- ❖ Form 1140 identifies 300 days from pre-design to bidding/contract award; 385 days for construction; 45 days for project closeout, totaling 730 days from Predesign to project closeout. TMG’s proposal states 1,278 total days as project duration. Why is there a huge discrepancy in the number of project duration days between CA’s and Architect’s estimate? Please provide Architect’s contract project schedule. Does this mean that Architect’s contract might need revision?

13. In the TMG proposal dated June 6, 2019, CA has excluded MEP coordinator during Preconstruction and Construction Phase. Who is providing these services during these phases?

- Response: Both the attached DAS RFQ 3-10-2018 Legal Notice and TMG RFQ submission did not require/include MEP coordinator CA services. DAS plans on hiring a Consultant to do a coordination documents review prior to acceptance of documents for bidding using a “RediCheck” review.



❖ OK

14. Please clarify the difference between the Consultants construction phase services (424 days plus 90-day close out) in Exhibit A(I), page 24 of the CA Contract with the Architect’s estimate of 385 days and a 45-day close out, Form 1140, Item 3, Scope of Work; Schedule.

- Response: Construction Duration is 385 days PLUS 10% is 39 days – total equals 424 days. The CA Contract duration, per “boiler plate language” DAS Contract Form “(214) Construction Administration 3.5.15.doc.”contract (IV. Contract Duration) is set and specific. See below portion copied from the contract template document.

“Nothing contained herein shall limit the State’s rights pursuant to Articles VIII, IX, and X of the contract.  
IV. CONTRACT DURATION  
The Construction Administrator’s construction phase services shall be for a time period of \_\_\_\_\_ (use construction contract time plus 10%) \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_) calendar days (the Construction Phase Time), plus an additional ninety (90) calendar days for project closeout, commencing with the date set forth in the written notice to proceed sent to the Construction Administrator by the DAS Project Manager. Said number of calendar days may be extended in writing by the Commissioner of the DAS, hereinafter referred to as the Commissioner. A reasonable fee shall be determined by the Commissioner for an appropriate level of services for the extended time. The parties recognize that during the extended time the level of staffing and/or services may be decreased, which shall be considered by the Commissioner in the determination of a reasonable fee.”

❖ OK

15. Please clarify the status of the Commissioning Consultant (Cx) that was included in the June 2018 RFQ. Who is providing these services?

- Response: DAS plans to hire a Commissioning Consultant when this project has obtained Construction Phase funding from a DAS On-Call Consultant contract provider. The fee proposal pricing CA received from Cx Consultant’s (holding to a fee when a project’s construction date is years away) DAS has found was expensive adding considerable project cost. It is in DAS best interest in obtaining a fee for a Cx Consultant closer to the time of construction. Using DAS On-Call Consultant’s will have controlled current acceptable fees schedule.

As per Item 15 of the RFQ Web Advertisement, it states that the Selected CA shall provide the additional services of a Commissioning Agent. Why is commissioning agent not involved during the design phase of the project? Will there be any coordination between CxA and CA and/or Architect? If yes, where is this covered in the CA’s scope? Is DCS planning to hire CxA at a later date and manage CxA?

16. Please provide a copy of the applicable licenses for this CA contract.

- Response: The attached DAS RFQ 3-10-2018 Legal Notice does not require licenses for this CA contract.

❖ OK

	SD	DD	CD	Revisions	Bid	
Start Date	8/1/2019	12/1/2019	5/1/2020	11/1/2020	3/1/2021	
End Date	10/1/2019	3/1/2020	9/1/2020	1/1/2021	5/1/2021	Total
CA Days	61	91	123	61	61	397
ARC Days	45	60	90	30	45	270
PE Fees	\$5,120	\$6,400	\$7,680	\$7,680	\$3,840	\$30,720
PM Fees	\$6,080	\$11,400	\$7,600	\$9,120	\$6,080	\$40,280
Sup Fees	\$0	\$2,320	\$4,640	\$6,960	\$4,640	\$18,560
Sch Fees	\$3,800	\$7,600	\$7,600	\$0	\$1,520	\$20,520
					Total Fee	\$110,080
					Avg Fee/Day	\$277.28
				x 127 excess days		\$35,214.51

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends **SUSPENSION** of this consultant contract in the amount of \$694,635. The CA fee of 4.85% of construction cost is within the DCS CA Services guideline of 5.0%. DCS staff is out and will need additional time to respond.

Norwalk GIS Map



**7. OTHER BUSINESS**

Chairman Greenberg had requested a motion to approve a Board Meeting Fee for Mr. Berger's continued meeting with Legislators and their Staff regarding Legislation proposed for the current Legislative Session. Mr. Cianci made the motion to approve a Board Meeting Fee for Mr. Berger, seconded by Mr. Valengavich. The motion passed unanimously.

**8. VOTES ON PRB FILE:**

**PRB FILE #22-013** – Mr. Berger moved and Mr. Valengavich seconded a motion to approve PRB 22-013.

**PRB FILE #22-016** – Mr. Valengavich moved and Mr. Halpert seconded a motion to suspend PRB 22-016.

**9. NEXT MEETING** – Monday, March 7, 2022.

The meeting adjourned.

**APPROVED:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
John Valengavich, Secretary