

Stratford High School Building Sub-Committee

Meeting Minutes

March 16, 2015

❖ **CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Stratford High School Building Sub-Committee was called to order at 5:33 pm on March 16, 2015 in Stratford Town Hall room 213 by Alan Llewelyn, Building Sub-Committee Chair

❖ **PRESIDING**

Alan Llewelyn, Building Sub-Committee Chair

❖ **BUILDING SUB-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

Mr. Bob Chaloux, Mr. Joseph Corso, Mr. Len Petrucelli, Ms. Stephanie Philips, Mr. Ken Poisson, Mr. Jason Santi, Mr. Clarence Zachery

❖ **BUILDING SUB-COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT**

Mr. Eric Lazaro, Mr. Dan Senft

❖ **OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Town Engineer John Casey, Superintendent Janet Robinson, Turner Estimator Lynn Temple, Antinozzi President Paul Antinozzi, Antinozzi Vice President George Perham, Antinozzi Project Manager Bill Mead, STV Traffic Study Engineer Patrick O'Mara, STV FEMA Re-mapping Tim Casey, CREC Project Manager Richard Snedeker, CREC Project Controls Manager Brian Greenleaf

❖ **OPENING REMARKS**

Alan Llewelyn opened the meeting by thanking everyone for their hard work, including the BNC and the Town Council, for moving the project concept forward.

2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Agenda: A copy is attached at the end of the report

Alan Llewelyn: Requested a to approve the agenda

Jason Santi: Motioned to accept agenda

Len Petrucelli: Seconded, all were in favor

3. **APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 19, 2015 MEETING MINUTES**

Alan Llewelyn: Requested a motion to approve.

Richard Snedeker: Requested to clarify some missing information from the previous meeting prior to the Motion to accept. The discussion resulted in all blanks being filled-in.

Jason Santi: Motioned to approve meeting minutes

Len Petrucelli: Seconded, all were in favor

4. **STV PRESENTATION ON KING STREET TRAFFIC STUDY**

Patrick O'Mara: Patrick O'Mara is a licensed engineer that executed a traffic study examining closing King Street. The first task was to determine who is using King Street. The second is where those people will then go once King Street is closed. The third is how closing King Street will then impact the traffic operation of the streets in the vicinity.

The peak am and pm traffic was evaluated and re-routed (on paper) as if King Street were closed to examine what impact the nearby streets might receive. The railroad bridge located on Main Street was noted as a major obstacle to widening that road, should that course of action ever be chosen.

The King Street STV Traffic Study Presentation is attached at the end of the minutes.

Discussion:

Stephanie Philips: Did you foresee any improvements to the current traffic conditions without closing King Street?

Patrick O'Mara: Explained his understanding of current work being done by ConnDOT on Barnum Ave, which might help access to King Street, which could reduce traffic on Main Street.

5. **STV FEMA RE-MAPPING PROPOSAL APPROVAL (ANTINOZZI & or STV)**

Tim Casey (STV): Explained FEMA maps which include the "Flood Insurance Rate Map" and the "Flood Boundary and Floodway Map."

At some point in time the culvert was extended to the edge of the property, but the FEMA map was never updated. STV proposal is to update the FEMA map to show the current Flood zone as it should be (at the edge of the property), not extending into the middle of the field as it did before the culvert was extended and the area around the culvert was filled.

Discussion:

Len Petrucelli: Asks how long it would take to update the FEMA map.

Tim Casey: I estimate 4-6 months, but FEMA says Sixty to ninety days with no guarantees.

Jason Santi: When we build the high school, we are probably going to have to relocate or resize that culvert.

John Casey: Yes, it would be moved and resized all together and finished so we don't have to go back to it.

- Alan Llewelyn:** If we were to touch that culvert how would it fit into the reimbursement equation? Would it be considered project scope or not project scope?
- Paul Antinozzi:** If it in fact the culvert is on-site, it is most likely eligible but, if it isn't, then it would not be eligible.
- Bill Mead:** The Phase 1 Environmental report shows that in between 1951 and 1965 is when the area got filled. With more research there might be more aerial photos found.
- Jason Santi:** Can we build on the wetlands?
- John Casey:** Yes, but it needs to be engineered.
- Paul Antinozzi:** Since the preconstruction and design time schedule has started, the question becomes, do we wait for this six month period to pass or do we pull the trigger and go forward with a design? Asked Tim Casey for his opinion.
- Tim Casey:** It's a process that should result in a successful remapping, because the reality is the flood zone has moved from the middle of the field to the edge of the property.
- Alan Llewelyn:** Is this more of an administrative process or a process where you would have to run calculations and it becomes more complex? In other words, is it simply acknowledging that the culvert was extended and the map was never updated?
- John Casey:** We would still have to run the calculations and a survey. Currently there is only a 42" pipe, if we are working on the pipe then we want it properly sized.
- Jason Santi:** Reminded that the work we are proposing cannot result in additional flooding of down-stream properties.

- John Casey:** Whether we were doing the High School project or not, the pipe is already too small and would need to be upgraded.
- Paul Antinozzi:** Is this a fairly common process? Has this been done before?
- Tim Casey:** Yes, we have done this before. There was one case where we were proposing to construct into, and move the floodway but, in this case, it has been done already and we are basically updating the map.
- Jason Santi:** Suggested approving Antinozzi's to move forward with the design assuming the remapping will be granted.
- Len Petrucelli:** Agreed with moving the design forward.
- Paul Antinozzi:** Offered to design the new building to avoid the flood zone as it's currently shown. This would allow the sub-committee to avoid the whole remapping process.
- Jason Santi:** Since this project will create more impervious surface, aren't we responsible to upgrade the pipe to handle the additional run-off that we'd be creating?
- Paul Antinozzi:** Not necessarily, we would likely handle all of the additional run-off that we're creating in sub-surface retention.
- John Casey:** Agreed that the surface run-off and the culvert size are separate issues.
- Alan Llewelyn:** Is there an approximate cost for STV to update the map?
- Tim Casey:** Yes, twenty-nine thousand nine-hundred dollars. This includes, a survey, a hydraulic analysis, the application itself, and the innovation of change on the map.
- Ken Poisson:** Paul what happens with the design work completed if we grant STV the job and the remapping doesn't go through?
- Paul Antinozzi:** Then we would go to plan B. Can I go ahead a design just the East side of King Street? Yes, we can start the design on the East side of King

Street, but it prevents us from doing a comprehensive study of the entire facility from the beginning. Even though we're building the Academic Building first, the plans need to all be done simultaneously.

Ken Poisson: What is the worst case scenario if they say no six months down the road? Do we lose six months or do we lose three months?

Paul Antinozzi: In either case, you lose six months if you decide to hold off. If you decide to go ahead and have me proceed with the design assuming the remapping will happen, if worst comes to worst and the FEMA map doesn't work out as planned, then we could easily transition into the design option B. If you have me proceed respecting the current mapping, then we won't lose any time, but you do lose some desirable qualities of the preferred layout.

George Perham: Another option is we could start design option A on the east side of King Street.

Paul Antinozzi: In concept can agree with George's suggestion, because Tim Casey reported that we should have an initial read about the FEMA map in about 2 months.

Tim Casey: Yes, if after 60-90 days FEMA comes back and says we want you to redesign the pipe size or something similar then we know that what we are proposing is a concept they are willing to work with.

Paul Antinozzi: So maybe we work on the East side for the first 2 months.

Bob Chaloux: What is the probability that the FEMA map does come through and they do update it?

Tim Casey: It will be about a 98 percent chance that the map will get updated.

Alan Llewelyn: Requested a motion to start the authorization process to get an increase to Antinozzi's contract in the amount of twenty-nine thousand nine-hundred dollars for STV to do the remapping of the FEMA flood zone.

Jason Santi: Motioned to start the authorization process not to exceed twenty- nine thousand nine-hundred dollars.

John Casey: I believe this is the fourth amendment to Antinozzi's contract.

Bob Chaloux: Seconds, all were in favor

6. **SUMMARY OF DESIGN MEETINGS HELD ON 2/26, 3/5, AND 3/12 (3/5
CANCELLED DUE TO SCHOOL CANCELLATION)**

Paul Antinozzi: These design meetings have been very valuable coordination meetings with Turner and Stratford High School Staff including Joe Corso to discuss the technical design aspect of this project.

Alan Llewelyn: On the last conference call, it was made clear that these meetings are strictly informal brainstorming type meetings discussing a list of different technicalities involved with designing a school of this magnitude.

Paul Antinozzi: These meetings are typical of what you see throughout the process. As soon as this project gets rolling, we will be having coordination meetings bi-weekly at our office. We will record minutes and they will be widely distributed to keep the proceedings transparent. Turner, CREC, and any relevant consultant will be attending these meetings. They are open to the public but, unfortunately, they often take place during business hours.

Jason Santi: Any recommendations regarding SHS should be referred back to this committee whether it is from the Architect or another source.

Alan Llewelyn: Feels that CREC's role as owners representative is sufficient coverage for the Town's interests.

Bob Chaloux: Wants to make sure that nothing falls through the cracks during these meetings. He cited examples provided by the BOE, and the surprise of the Elizabethan Theatre.

Paul Antinozzi: Some of the issues Bob brings up are a result of the order that the meetings occurred, had they been scheduled differently then there would not have been an issue. Paul took full responsibility for the late inclusion of the Elizabethan Theatre, it was entirely his idea. Part of what architects do is to bring ideas forward that might seem improbable but cause people to think. He thought that in light of state grant money possibly funding the construction, it gave us an opportunity to do something that we wouldn't have been able to do otherwise. He admitted that the idea and its timing didn't take into account other dynamic's going on in Stratford at the same time, and it's currently out of the plan, never to be brought up again.

Bob Chaloux: Didn't realize that the decision had been officially made to axe the theatre.

Ken Poisson: Noted that the Theatre could be revived as a part of the special legislation ask.

Lynn Temple: Stated that the way the way the auditorium portion of the project is sectioned off, the theatre design concept could be revived at a later date, whether State funded or with some other funding source. Turner has seen this happen in other towns.

Brian Greenleaf: Noted that the Town Council has approved the concept of a \$102 million project. There is an additional \$7 million price tag to do the theatre, which if that's something that this Sub-Committee wants to do then we have to get that language into the special legislation request rather quickly.

Jason Santi: Suggested that regardless of the source of the idea, whatever is brought to light that hasn't been vetted by this Sub-Committee should be shot-down immediately.

Alan Llewelyn: Stated he will come up with a procedure with Rich to make sure that the committee is informed about the happenings at the brainstorming sessions.

Jason Santi: Asked who holds the design meetings?

Richard Snedeker: Stated they have been occurring in Joe Corso's office, but for the time being we have all the information that we need from Joe, so we are moving the meetings to Antinozzi's office.

Jason Santi: Asked who chairs the design meetings?

Richard Snedeker: Said these meetings aren't that formal, we don't have an official Chair.

Alan Llewelyn: Voiced his understanding of these types of meetings, saying they are brainstorming sessions, like might occur in a business lunch where ideas are noted on cocktail napkins for further exploration later.

Jason Santi: It would be a good idea to have someone from the council or other town interests be at these design meetings so that every idea gets heard.

Paul Antinozzi: The designs meetings are part of our contract. They are also used to make sure us as professionals are extending the correct information to the BSC and others.

Jason Santi: Acknowledged his understanding of Paul's explanation. But also said that when design ideas are involved then those should be brought to the Sub-Committee.

Paul Antinozzi: Agreed with Jason.

Alan Llewelyn: This is why we have had CREC there from the beginning, to be the Town's eyes and ears.

Len Petrucelli: Asked when the Sub-Committee will receive the minutes from the Design meetings?

Richard Snedeker: The minutes are in the works and the members will start receiving some from past meetings shortly. They won't be as formal as the minutes of the Sub-Committee meetings.

Stephanie Philips: Would it be okay in the minutes if you could tell us when you are meeting, so that should any BSC member is interested in attending we could have that option?

Paul Antinozzi: Yes.

Ken Poisson: Asked for Paul to clarify, the participants of the design meeting do not want it to turn into a huge affair where too many people show up and it becomes unproductive?

Paul Antinozzi: Yes, that is correct. We have a limited time to accomplish the work necessary to build this school on schedule and within budget.

Lynn Temple: These design meetings are to build on what information we receive from the BSC. Further, they bring information from three different aspects into one presentation for the BSC. The School Grant aspect, the Design aspect, and the Construction aspect all need to work hand in hand, together, so the process flows smoothly. Antinozzi, Turner, and CREC have been doing a great job organizing this information and regurgitating it back to the BSC, to be passed to the BNC and to Town Council.

On other jobs where CREC is not involved these same meetings take place. They are not meant to be secret meetings but, to serve as preparation and brainstorming meetings where the public is invited. New ideas, recommendations, and suggestions are generated at these meetings and immediately introduced to the BSC before any authorization is made. It is not any sort of exclusion but, more of a regular process that occurs on every project.

Richard Snedeker: One of the great ideas that came about in the last meeting at Antinozzi's office is to assign someone from the BSC to bring to the attention of BNC that the Town needs to do a feasibility study on the part of the original building that is going to be left. This was Paul Antinozzi's idea. This is the time to start that process.

- Paul Antinozzi:** It's time to do a feasibility study because three years from now when we leave that building standing, you need to have valid answers on future plans with that building. Do you want to "Mothball" it for a small period of time or do you want to use it for a future BOE building? The feasibility study will tell you what the best decision will be.
- Jason Santi:** Asked if the building can be demolished as a part of this project?
- Len Petrucelli:** Asked if we can do the work on the left-over building at the same time as this project?
- Paul Antinozzi:** Informed everyone that currently that building is not in the project budget, and it's not currently under the control of this High School Sub-Committee.
- Alan Llewelyn:** Reinforced the value of Paul bringing this topic to the committee's attention now, so the timing of the decisions will allow the work to be done simultaneously once the building is cut free. We all have to understand that this will not be part of the grant. It will need its own funding.
- Jason Santi:** The Town could provide the Bond funding for all the work at the original high school building, and we could still make the work there a part of this overall project.
- Alan Llewelyn:** Paul, can you put together a budget scope for the feasibility study?
- Paul Antinozzi:** Yes.
- Brian Greenleaf:** Pointed out that if it's not going to be reimbursed as a part of the High School project then it would be best to keep it completely on another project's books.
- Lynn Temple:** We don't have money in the budget to demolish or renovate it. It is not part of school project but these questions still need to be answered.

Stephanie Philips: These suggestions make sense, it is a separate project, it should have separate bookkeeping, and a separate committee with a different perspective. This BSC needs to ask the BNC to ask the Town Council to authorize the funding to begin studying the building for future uses.

Bill Mead: Described two scenarios for possible future uses. One is BOE use, and the associated parking lot delineation that would be required by differing grant funding amounts. The second is if that building is to be used for elderly living, it could impact the design of the school very quickly. The outdoor sports field might be reduced because of the required parking the elderly housing would take. This is why a feasibility study done now is important.

Jason Santi: Why can't we demolish the building and get rid of it now?

Paul Antinozzi: It's part of the town fabric. There will likely be people in town who will lobby to keep it.

Jason Santi: Disagreed with saving the building due to its condition and location.

Clarence Zachery: There isn't currently money in the budget to tear it down.

Stephanie Philips: We can't arbitrarily say tear it down without going through the process and getting it through Council.

Paul Antinozzi: With the feasibility study we can give the BSC, BNC and Council a report as to the level of effort that is required to manage this building.

Stephanie Philips: We will make a request for the Engineering department to send out an RFP for a feasibility study.

Jason Santi: Made a motion for the BSC to ask the Building Needs Committee to put out an RFP for a feasibility study for the original High School building.

Len Petrucelli: Seconded, all were in favor.

7. **PRESENTATION ON NEXT STEPS FOLLOWING TOWN COUNCIL MEETING**

Brian Greenleaf: The first step is to submit the ED049R with rationale and cost estimates developed by Turner, Antinozzi, and CREC to the State.

The Ed Specs will be revised and approved by the Board of Education.

The new bonding authorization can be done as soon as possible in a more conservative approach. We would want to do this sooner rather than later. We could bond sixty-two million but that doesn't necessarily mean that we have to spend the entire amount.

Jason Santi: There are two options. Are those the same price?

Brian Greenleaf: We have been very conservative with our estimate and the one-hundred and two million dollar grant will cover either option.

Stephanie Philips: Is it possible to get all the necessary work in order before the next Council meeting?

Jason Santi: Asked if CREC has been working with the Mayor's office or other Town administrators yet?

Brian Greenleaf: We have a meeting scheduled with Steve Nocera, the Chief Administrative Officer for the Town. We will check to make sure we have the correct deadline dates.

When you write your Special Legislation, you will state that you're submitting complete bonding authorization before August 1 and that is when you will get your new grant from the state.

Jason Santi: Asked if CREC has been working with the Town's Legislative delegation yet?

Len Petrucelli: Stated that he will be meeting with Stratford Rep. Terry Backer tomorrow on another matter, and will bring up these BSC issues to him during that meeting.

Brian Greenleaf: Confirmed that CREC has been in touch with Laura Hoydick and she is ready to help whenever we get the information to her.

Bob Chaloux: Commented on the timeline presented by Brian and made suggestions about listing who the responsible parties are for the various steps and the drop-dead due dates.

Brian Greenleaf: Acknowledged Bob's good suggestions. He then verbally explained the due dates for the near future steps. He assured the group that there aren't really any "drop-dead" dates to worry about.

Janet Robinson: Reminded Brian that the Legislative session is finite and that would constitute a deadline.

Jason Santi: Agreed with Dr. Robinson.

Brian Greenleaf: Acknowledged that he already was very aware of that deadline.

Jason Santi: Stated the appropriate Town processes to complete the necessary steps, and the approximate time frame that those steps would take. Urged CREC to seek guidance from the Town's administrators very soon. Suggested Susan Collier and Steve Nocera.

Ken Poisson: Suggested Steve Nocera was the most appropriate point of contact.

Clarence Zachery: Suggested to move the meeting with Steve Nocera sooner than the already scheduled meeting on March 26.

8. **REPORT ON BONDSURE PROGRAM (CREC)**

Alan Llewelyn: Because the meeting was running long, requested a motion to table items eight and nine for next month.

Jason Santi: Asked if the remaining agenda items were time sensitive?

Alan Llewelyn: Confirmed that we have completed all of the time-sensitive agenda items tonight.

Ken Poisson: Made the motion to table those items.

Len Petrucelli: Seconded, all were in favor.

9. **CM CONTRACT WITH STATFORD UPDATE (TURNER)**

This item was tabled to the next meeting by the motion in item 8 above.

10. **ADJOURNMENT (APPROXIMATELY 7:00pm)**

Alan Llewelyn: Request a motion to adjourn.

Len Petrucelli: Motioned to adjourn.

Ken Poisson: Seconded, all were in favor.

Adjournment The meeting was adjourned at 6:48 pm by Chairperson Alan Llewelyn.

Minutes submitted by:
Edwin Martinez
Project Coordinator
CREC Construction Services

AGENDA

STRATFORD HIGH SCHOOL SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING

March 16, 2015

(All Items are Subject to Tabling at the Discretion of the Committee Chair Due to 7:00 pm end time)

1. Call to Order (Approximately 5:30 pm)
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of February 19, 2015 Meeting Minutes
4. STV Presentation on King Street Traffic Study
5. STV FEMA Re-mapping Proposal Approval (Antinozzi Assoc. and/or STV)
6. Summary of Design Meetings held on February 26, March 3, and March 12 (March 5 cancelled due to school cancellation)
7. Presentation on Next Steps Following Town Council Meeting
8. Report on BondSure Program (CREC)
9. CM Contract with Stratford Update (Turner)
10. Adjournment (Approximately 7:00 pm)