

# Stratford High School Building Renovations Subcommittee

## Regular Meeting Minutes

February 18, 2016

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The Regular meeting of the Stratford High School Building Renovations Subcommittee was called to order at 5:39 pm, on February 18, 2016, in the Stratford High School Teacher's Lounge, by Alan Llewelyn, Chairman.

#### ❖ PRESIDING

Alan Llewelyn, Chairman

#### ❖ BUILDING SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Jack Dellapiano, SHS Principal; Alan Llewelyn, BSC Chairman, BNC; Len Petrucelli, BOE Vice Chairman; Stephanie Philips, Zoning Commission; Ken Poisson; Jason Santi; Dan Senft; Clarence Zachery, BOE COO

#### ❖ BUILDING SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Bob Chaloux; Eric Lazaro

#### ❖ OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

John Casey, Town Engineer; Dr. Janet Robinson, Superintendent of Schools; Beth Daponte, Town Council Chair; Ty Tregellas, Turner Project Executive; George Perham, Antinozzi Vice President; Lisa Yates, Antinozzi Senior Project Architect; Lenell Kittlitz, CREC Assistant Director; Brian Greenleaf, CREC Project Controls Manager; Rick Camara, IES Mechanical Engineer

#### ❖ OPENING REMARKS

Alan Llewelyn opened the meeting by thanking everyone for their hard work.

### 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Emailed 2/12/2016)

**Alan Llewelyn:** Requested a motion to approve the Agenda

**Len Petrucelli:** Motioned to approve the Agenda

**Clarence Zachery:** Seconded

**Alan Llewelyn:** Requested a vote to approve the Agenda, all were in favor.

**3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

**• January 14, 2016: Regular Meeting Minutes (Emailed 01/28/2016)**

**Alan Llewelyn:** Requested a motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting

**Ken Poisson:** Motioned to approve the January 14<sup>th</sup> regular meeting minutes

**Dan Senft:** Seconded. There was no additional discussion. All were in favor

**4. REMINDER: MARCH 2016 MEETING SCHEDULE GOES BACK TO THE THIRD MONDAY**

- 2016 Holiday Adjustments Are Completed As Of Today's Meeting**
- Remainder of 2016 BSC Meeting Schedule Will Be Third Monday Of Each Month  
Subject to Possible Change by Future Decisions of the BNC**

**Alan Llewelyn:** Reminded everyone that the schedule is returning to normal following 2016 holiday adjustments, subject to change by the BNC

**5. TOWN COUNCIL UPDATE (Llewelyn)**

**Alan Llewelyn:** Touched on tonight's public presentation immediately following this meeting. Brian and some of the other team members have indicated they're ready to go, it should be a great opportunity to bring the new Town Council and the general public up-to-date on the work that has gone into the project thus far.

**6. INVOICES AND BILLS (CREC)**

- **Sustainable Engineering Solutions Payment Application No. 1 (Invoice No. 1776)  
\$2,049.50 (Copy Attached)**

**Alan Llewelyn:** Asked if there was any discussion concerning the Commissioning Agent's first invoice for the project?

**Brian Greenleaf:** Reported that this is a reasonable invoice for the work performed to-date.

**Len Petrucelli:** Motioned to approve the SES Payment Application No. 1

**Jason Santi:** Seconded. There was no additional discussion. All were in favor

**7. COMMISSIONING UPDATE (CREC OR SES)**

- **OPR Meeting Held with Architect, IES, and CREC 1/21/2016**
- **Additional Owner Information Requested by CxA 1/21/2016, Provided to CxA 2/2/2016 (With Local Stakeholder Input). This is a "Living" Document, Adjustments can be Made Later, and Can Be Revised.**
- **Meeting to discuss potential summer uses of SHS held 2/11/2016  
Included: Public Facilities; Parks; Recreation; BOE; CREC (See Attached Email Dated 2/11/2016 Summarizing the Meeting).**

**Alan Llewelyn:** Invited Brian to update the committee on commissioning activities to date

**Brian Greenleaf:** Summarized Commissioning activities to date, including finalizing the Owner's Project Requirements. He noted that there has been a strong effort put into determining the potential summer uses of the completed facility, which is necessary to properly design the mechanical systems. We needed to identify if and where the facility would be in use for things like Summer School, Athletics Department uses, Parks and Recreation uses, community uses, etc. As a part of that effort the Commissioning Agent's Commissioning Plan is adjusted as well.

**Rick Camara:** Confirmed Brian's explanation. Since receiving the information about the identified Summer uses Rick has resized the necessary equipment to ensure the facility will be properly climate-controlled to suit the identified uses. It only increases the size of equipment slightly more than what we were specifying when we thought the facility wouldn't be used during July and August.

**Stephanie Philips:** Agreed with this effort noting the completed SHS building would potentially be the most energy efficient building in the districts inventory, and programs would likely be relocated there to take advantage of that added efficiency.

**Jason Santi:** Asked if the facility mechanical systems are being designed so the Town doesn't need to condition the entire facility when only a portion is being used?

**Rick Camara:** Explained the design of the mechanical systems, and that they are "sectioned" so Jason's concerns are addressed.

**Alan Llewelyn:** Asked if there was any further discussion on Agenda item 7 (there was no further discussion)

#### 8. REVIEW OF CURRENT BUILDING PLANS, SCHEDULE, AND BUDGET

- **Antinozzi Associates Personnel Changes**
- **Operable Windows as an Add-Alternate? (See Attached Email Dated 2/11/2016)**
- **Town Sign-off of "Final" Design**

**Alan Llewelyn:** Introduced Item 8 and invited Antinozzi Associates to begin the discussion

**George Perham:** Explained that Bill Mead had to be shifted full time to a previous project that he was working on. Lisa Yates is the Project Manager now, otherwise we are status quo.

**Alan Llewelyn:** Asked George if Bill was still available to consult on the project?

- George Perham:** Yes, Bill is still with AA, and everyone else that has been associated with the project is still on board.
- Lisa Yates:** Confirmed that Bill is still corresponding about SHS on a regular/continuing basis. "He's only 30 feet away".
- Alan Llewelyn:** If there is no further discussion about the AA personnel shift, Brian can begin the discussion about the possibility of the SHS project including Operable windows (there was no further discussion about the AA personnel shift).
- Brian Greenleaf:** Explained that this was an issue that came up during the development of the Commissioning Agent's Owner's Project Requirements. The CxA needs a definitive answer on whether this committee wants the facility to have operable windows or not.
- Len Petrucelli:** Voiced concern about the security of the first floor if those windows could be opened
- Stephanie Philips:** Expressed that it would be a good feature to provide if possible. The Soto project included some operable windows, but not all spaces.
- Clarence Zachery:** Agreed, but he (and **Jason Santi**) voiced concern over what the budget impact would be.
- Ty Tregellas:** A very preliminary ball-park number for this would be approximately \$100 per window.
- Lisa Yates:** And there would probably need to be two operable per room.
- Clarence Zachery:** Being that it's not a significant amount of money, I think it's definitely worth putting on the plate as an option.
- Janet Robinson:** Will this have a negative impact on the mechanical equipment?

**Rick Camara:** If this building was going to have a chilled-beam cooling system I would advise not to have operable windows because the open windows would allow humid air to enter the building and that is problematic for chilled-beam systems. Rooms such as science labs which are required to maintain negative air pressure from other parts of the building could also be problematic. In the old-days we would provide operable windows as a means to get fresh air into a building, now modern mechanical systems bring in abundant amounts of fresh air. If you provide operable windows you're relying on the occupants to only open them on days when it's appropriate to open them, but if you don't provide operable windows then that reliance on occupants is eliminated and they will still be getting plenty of fresh air from the mechanical systems.

**Several BSC members** discussed the pros and cons, the potential high or low locations of the windows, whether they would be sliding, awning, or hopper-type, etc.

**Brian Greenleaf:** Explained that these were all decisions that could be made later, at this point we really just need to get the committee to decide if this is a feature that they want or not. We could even make it an alternate to the base bid.

**Stephanie Philips:** Will the State reimburse for operable windows?

**Brian Greenleaf:** Yes, they are reimbursable.

**Len Petrucelli:** I'm still concerned about first floor windows security-wise.

**Janet Robinson:** If it comes down to security vs. fresh air, I will opt for security.

**George Perham:** In our case most of the first floor spaces aren't classrooms.

- Dan Senft:** Agreed with the statement that Rick Camara made about reliance on people to do the right thing. People make mistakes, forget to close windows, etc. I'm concerned with that aspect of having operable windows. This could have a huge impact on the savings that the new efficient mechanical systems are trying achieve.
- Stephanie Philips:** We had this same conversation regarding Soto, and we looked at Birdseye and Franklin where they have operable windows and on certain days they prefer them over the HVAC system.
- Clarence Zachery:** To a lot of people, no matter what you're doing to the mechanical system to bring in fresh air, those people don't think it's fresh air because it's still coming from a mechanical system.
- Jason Santi:** Still concerned with the windows being secure.
- Stephanie Philips:** They can maintain security. And this is our only chance to make that decision, these can't be changed later and receive the same type of reimbursement.
- Wally Kadeem:** Asked if the fire code gets involved in this decision?
- George Perham:** The fire code is a non-issue in this case.
- Brian Greenleaf:** Security-wise, and I believe this was discussed during one of our design meetings, aren't these windows only allowed to open a maximum of 5" – 6"? Another consideration is the outdoor noise factor, particularly for those rooms that face busy roadways.
- Lisa Yates:** Yes, the opening size Brian is referring to is correct. Brian is also referring to the classroom acoustical standards of which we are required to comply. I researched the past 4 or 5 schools that AA did and I determined that we didn't use operable windows in sound-sensitive areas.

- Len Petrucelli:** I'm no longer as concerned with the first floor windows security-wise, now that I've heard the window openings will be so small.
- Alan Llewelyn:** That leads me to my question, if the openings are that small will they provide enough fresh air to even make this discussion worth having? I also want to get back to the impact on the building's automatic temperature control system if we have operable windows, especially if we're talking about having summer uses in the building, which again goes back to the discussion about reliance on people to do the right thing. Do we want to take that kind of risk and possibly blow all the potential energy savings that a state of the art building is supposed to provide?
- Ken Poisson:** If we have a state of the art building, and therefore the occupants are happy because the building is cool when it's supposed to be or warm when it's supposed to be, then why should we concern ourselves whether the windows open at all? And I can speak from personal experience, and Jack can back this up, ½ of the kids coming into any given room will argue for the windows to be open and the other ½ will argue for them to be kept closed. Now the teacher needs to waste the first two minutes of class adjusting the window to try to keep everyone happy.
- Alan Llewelyn:** Asked if Ken is saying he likes the idea of taking away the window option and letting the temperature control system do its job?
- Ken Poisson:** Agreed with Alan's restating of his previous statement.
- Jack Dellapiano:** Opts for whatever option will make the building more efficient.
- Clarence Zachery:** Cited an example at another school without operable windows where classes had to be cancelled on a fair-weather day ("not hot out"), because the sun shining in the windows heated the interior of the building too high and there was no way to vent that heat out.

- Rick Camara:** Explained that in the design of these mechanical systems, the air conditioning system is separate from the ventilation system. So for the particular situation that Clarence described to occur at SHS both systems would need to fail before you would need to close the school.
- Jason Santi:** With all of the factors cited above, I would opt to go without operable windows.
- Brian Greenleaf:** If I'm interpreting the general consensus of the group correctly the desire is to go with the existing planned non-operable windows?
- Beth Daponte:** I think the operable windows are still a good idea, if for nothing else but the psychological factor.
- Alan Llewelyn:** Is this something that we need to decide tonight?
- Brian Greenleaf:** No this doesn't need to be decided tonight.
- Alan Llewelyn:** Then for the sake of time tonight, I think we should keep this as an open item for further discussion. Our next item is about Town sign-off of "final" design.
- George Perham:** Hopefully in the coming week AA staff can get together with the Superintendent, the Principal, and anyone else who they deem necessary such as Department Heads, to conduct a room by room review the layouts that we have developed. This is vital to complete now because it could have bearing on the structural grid layout.
- Len Petrucelli:** Who in town needs to sign-off?
- George Perham:** Janet, Jack, and whoever else they designate.
- Beth Daponte:** The Town Council doesn't have to sign-off?

- Clarence Zachery:** This sign-off relates to the Ed-Specs which were the BOE requirements for the project.
- Brian Greenleaf:** The final plans do get signed off by Town Council, this current sign-off that we're discussing is a step along the way in the process.
- Beth Daponte:** Will there be Harkness tables in the rooms or are the rooms being designed for Harkness tables?
- Clarence Zachery:** No there will not, we do not have the space to use Harkness tables. The furniture that we're pursuing will allow the teacher to arrange the student desks into a Harkness shape, but they won't be actual Harkness tables.
- Janet Robinson:** During the public presentation later tonight you'll see the furniture that we're specifying allows for maximum flexibility in how it can be arranged. Plus keep in mind that our classrooms run at about 28-30 students per room.
- Alan Llewelyn:** If there is no further discussion we'll move onto Item 9 (there was no further discussion)

9. **NEXT STEPS: DESIGN DECISIONS, DESIGN SCHEDULE, & SUB-COMMITTEE DELIVERABLES**

- **Inventory List of Existing Historical/Valuable/Sentimental Items (Stratford Heritage)**  
**Items Already Identified:**
  - **Coach Walter A. Czekaj Memorial (Fitness Center?)**
  - **AD Ray Needham Memorial (Gymnasium?) (Bio for Needham)**
  - **JFK Memorial (Auditorium?)**
  - **Previous Building Committee(s) Memorialization(s)**
- **Interior Design Theme(s) Progress Report**
- **Time Lapsed Photography/Progress Photography/Drone Photography/Webcam?**

- **Hiring Independent Reviewer for OSG Review (RFP Release Approximately March 2016)**
- **Hiring Independent Structural Reviewer for Code (Exceeds Threshold Limits Building)**
- **Site Logistics – Additional Property? (See Town Council Agenda for 2/8/2016 Item 5.3.2)**
- **Technology Consultant**

**Alan Llewelyn:** Went through the items related to Coach Czekaj and Athletic Director Needham, and the general sentiment of the BSC to continue with both of these memorials respectively, the Fitness Center will most likely be named for Czekaj and the main Gymnasium will likely be named for Needham. As far as the Auditorium, discussion is on-going regarding JFK, this isn't something that needs to be decided tonight. And inside the building entrances we currently have plaques memorializing the previous building committees. We've also discussed things like the various trophies and awards that are located in the school, the school administration can decide if they want to carry all of that stuff forward to the new school.

**Jack Dellapiano:** Doesn't think the administration has any authority to arbitrarily discontinue displaying any special recognitions, so at this point the plan is to carry them all forward to the new facility.

**Len Petrucelli:** Agrees with Jack's statement, it's the smart thing to do.

**Alan Llewelyn:** If there is no further discussion (there was no further discussion) we'll move onto the next bullet under Item 9 which is Interior Design Themes, which I will ask George to address

**George Perham:** At this point we don't have anything to report on this matter, which we first mentioned last month to "plant the seed". We typically try to reach out to the community on these public projects to see if anyone has a thought on what they feel the interior should look like. Some school districts say "just go with

the school colors throughout", other districts might say "this is a historical part of town and we want to reflect that". This might be a case to develop a separate subcommittee to work on the look of the interior. I'm thinking that subcommittee starts with Jack and Janet, and whoever else they think, but we need to get this going soon.

**Len Petrucelli:** I agree that the Principal, and the Superintendent should be on that committee. I also think the BOE COO should be on that committee.

**Alan Llewelyn:** I think there should also be at least one BOE member on that committee

**Len Petrucelli:** Opted out of being the BOE member on that committee

**Alan Llewelyn:** Unless there is further discussion (there was no further discussion) we'll keep this as an open item and move onto the next bullet under Item 9 which is project progress photography

**Brian Greenleaf:** I don't believe we have any specific money budgeted for this right now, but it is something that a lot of Towns do during their big high-profile projects. For example, a ballpark figure with the company Multi-Vista for webcam and progress photography might be in the range of \$60,000 or more. The benefit to this type of consultant is they are taking photos as systems are being installed so you know and can research what is behind the walls and ceilings when the project is complete. If you wanted to reduce that scope to only include progress aerial shots and exterior webcam, then I'm sure you can get a much lower price.

**Ty Tregellas:** Some districts utilize the school's photography program to do this

**Len Petrucelli:** I was going to ask if there was some way to involve the students? I think the taxpayers would oppose spending much money on this

**Jason Santi:** I agree and think this should be done in-house.

- Wally Kadeem:** Taking a picture from time to time shouldn't cost \$60000. This is unnecessary to spend that kind of money.
- Clarence Zachery:** The problem of the idea of having students do the photography is that you'll be putting students onto a construction site.
- Ty Tregellas:** Turner will be taking progress photos along the way, but not to the extent that a Multi-Vista would. If for public relations purposes you want to set up a camera on the roof of the existing building and/or take progress photos or set up time-lapsed photography of the new building going up, that is another level that Turner doesn't provide under our contract.
- Alan Llewelyn:** As a part of the regular Turner reporting, Turner will be including photos, is that correct.
- Ty Tregellas:** Yes
- Jason Santi:** We already have a project website, can't we just put the pictures there rather than spend more money?
- Brian Greenleaf:** There is a cost to set up the webcam.
- Ken Poisson:** Will the webcam will be live?
- Brian Greenleaf:** Yes
- Len Petrucelli:** So that should only be a one-time charge?
- Brian Greenleaf:** Except you will need to pay web-hosting fees which could be up to \$600 per month.
- Len Petrucelli:** This project is set to go for five or six years, now we're approaching that too expensive number again.

- Brian Greenleaf:** We can look into that further and get some better pricing
- Alan Llewelyn:** That leaves this item open for a future meeting, unless there is further discussion we will move on to the next bullet on the agenda (there was no further discussion).
- Brian Greenleaf:** Hiring Independent Reviewer for OSCG Review (RFP Release Approximately March 2016). This is the State review of the final plans, which is no longer being performed by the State. They now request that the local Fire Marshal and local Building Official perform that review, or the local officials can utilize the services of an independent reviewer to do it for them. In this case we've already discussed this with the local Building Official and Fire Marshal, and they have opted for an independent reviewer instead of doing it themselves.
- Len Petrucelli:** Where is this stuff coming from? It seems like we're continually hiring another consultant.
- Brian Greenleaf:** Per the State grant process, we have to complete a code review of the final plans. We knew this was coming and we budgeted for it. This is something that needs to be put out to bid.
- Clarence Zachery:** The State used to do this instead, but they aren't anymore and are pushing it to the municipalities. The municipalities are typically saying that the project is either too complex or too time consuming for them to do and that requires the hiring of an independent reviewer.
- Alan Llewelyn:** We are targeting releasing this RFP sometime around March. Just like we have done with all the other various sub-consultants, we'll have a review committee and interviews.
- Jason Santi:** Does that include the independent structural reviewer?
- Brian Greenleaf:** No, that's separate.

- Jason Santi:** What is the timing estimate for hiring the independent structural reviewer?
- Brian Greenleaf:** Similar to this other code reviewer that we've been discussing.
- Rick Camara:** Explained that we should hire the independent structural during the DD phase because in the off-chance that they find something major wrong, we don't want to wait too long to know about that and then have multiple design team members scrambling to try to fix it while we're at the same time trying to maintain our schedule to complete CD's.
- Alan Llewelyn:** Can/should we overlap those and do both at the same time? We can decide which of the subcommittee members will get which independent reviewer later (structural vs code).
- Jason Santi:** Motioned to put both, the independent code reviewer for the OSCG review, as well as the independent structural reviewer for the threshold limits being exceeded, out to bid.
- Len Petrucelli:** Seconded
- Alan Llewelyn:** If there is no further discussion, all those in favor? (There was no additional discussion) All were in favor
- Alan Llewelyn:** Site Logistics is next under Item 9
- Brian Greenleaf:** This is on the agenda in case there are any new details that you can report regarding anything that may have come out of the last Town Council meeting. This was on the Town Council agenda and it may have gone to executive session, so the floor is open to our Town Councilor to discuss this.
- Alan Llewelyn:** There is nothing that I can officially report at this time, discussions are on-going. This moves us to the last item under Number 9 which is the Technology Consultant.

- Brian Greenleaf:** This is on the agenda to discuss assisting the BOE I.T. Director with the development of the technology design on the project. We had a discussion with Ed Molloy a few months ago where we began to quantify the role of the Technology Consultant vs. what the I.T. department would want to take on in-house.
- Janet Robinson:** Reported that the BOE used a Technology Consultant on the Soto School project.
- Len Petrucelli:** Asked for more information about the role of this consultant to be available to the committee before they make a decision
- Brian Greenleaf:** In a project of this size and scope there are a lot of technology items that do not fall into the normal scope of the architect's and engineer's work. Things like Smart Boards, final selection of computers, and the like.
- Clarence Zachery:** The technology "fixtures" is another way to phrase it. It's the add-ons to the infrastructure.
- Len Petrucelli:** Isn't this what we pay Ed Molloy and his staff to do?
- Clarence Zachery:** If Ed's group is required to take on this additional task, then if we have a technology problem in one of our schools then we don't have the staff there to fix it.
- Alan Llewelyn:** We need to be careful to not make the same mistakes that occurred on the Soto project, in that case the security system is not what the Town expected or wanted. We will need to have Town sign-off on whatever the Technology Consultant puts together.
- Clarence Zachery:** That's exactly right, the Technology Consultant works with Ed to determine the district requirements, the consultant designs the specifications, and the BOE I.T. Department ultimately approves or rejects that specification package before it goes to bid.

- Ken Poisson:** Ed Molloy and his staff do not have the time to do this work
- Brian Greenleaf:** For the March meeting we can bring a draft scope of work for this Technology Consultant for the committee to review.
- Alan Llewelyn:** (After **several members** agreed with Brian's suggestion) We'll look forward to reviewing that scope list at the March meeting.

#### **10. ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**

- **Solar Photo-Voltaic Panel Inclusion Status**
- **STV FEMA Re-mapping Update (Antinozzi and/or STV) (See Attached Bill Mead Email Dated 2/4/2016)**
- **We Still Owe the LOMR Results to the State, Followed by a State Site Inspection by Jeff Bolton (CREC is Coordinating the Site Inspection)**

- Alan Llewelyn:** What is the status of the Solar Photo-Voltaic panels in this project?
- Brian Greenleaf:** Reported that this scope of work is not presently included in the \$126 million dollar budget figure. After we get the bids back we can then look at potentially adding a separate phase for that work, if the bids come back under our estimates.
- Alan Llewelyn:** Is this scope of work reimbursable?
- Brian Greenleaf:** Yes it is reimbursable.
- Clarence Zachery:** Reported that doing this work as a separate phase is consistent with how it was done on the Soto School project.
- Stephanie Philips:** On Soto we did it as a separate phase because we thought about it later in the project. I thought that on this project we brought the issue up early enough to make certain this was included? I don't want to be in a position where we need to go back to the Town Council to request additional funding for this work.

- Brian Greenleaf:** Our first hope is that we can fit it in with the \$126 million, we'll have a clearer picture after we get the bids back.
- Janet Robinson:** Can we include this scope of work in the bids as an alternate?
- Brian Greenleaf:** That is a possibility. At this point we might be looking at an amendment to the Antinozzi contract to design the system.
- Clarence Zachery:** Offered to discuss this with the districts energy consultant on behalf of the committee. He will seek a recommendation from DBS Energy on the best course of action.
- Stephanie Philips:** Reiterated her previous disappointment that this work is not included in the base-bid for the project. She does not feel that the current Town Council who is already dealing with this project's budget increase will look favorably on another request for more funds.
- Jason Santi:** Agreed that the Town Council probably won't approve more funds for this project.
- Stephanie Philips:** Feels that we are at the drop dead point on this issue, and believes we need to know the numbers now so if we need more funds it can be included in the ordinance committee resolution that is currently moving forward. We can't go back in the near future and say that we need more money.
- Dan Senft:** Felt that from his experience in the roofing industry, some economies could possibly be achieved to allow us to incorporate the solar panels into the current budget. It's my opinion that the two should be integrated together, the roof and the solar panels both bid at the same time.
- George Perham:** Stated his recollection of the solar panels issue was that the design would always be done so the roof were solar panel-ready. But there was never a firm commitment that solar panels would be in

the base bid. The structure and the type of roofing would always be solar-ready.

**Stephanie Philips:** Believes that we conveyed to the citizens that this was included in the project, and a firm decision needs to be made now.

**Wally Kadeem:** Voiced his concern that the Town is in a deficit this year and next year. Expressed concern for the maintenance costs associated with the solar panels.

**Stephanie Philips:** Explained her understanding that the panels are maintained as a part of the agreement with the solar company. And noted that the panels save the Town money in the long run. Stephanie urged the committee to commit to inclusion of solar panels as a part of the base bid, noting her observance that everyone else is doing it on their projects, and that Stratford has been consistently doing it as of late whenever there is a new roof.

**Jason Santi:** Motioned to officially incorporate solar photo-voltaic panels into the project scope.

**Alan Llewelyn:** Requested Brian to speak to the implications of that motion.

**Brian Greenleaf:** Suggested that the design team and CREC would put together some rough numbers and bring them to the building committee for review.

**Jason Santi:** What is the life-span of solar panels?

**Brian Greenleaf:** Approximately 20-30 years.

**Jason Santi:** Voiced his opinion that the roof should have a similar life-span (all were in agreement).

**Alan Llewelyn:** Noted that Mr. Senft already spoke to that same concept by suggesting the two parts be bid simultaneously. We will let our

design people bring us some numbers during the next BSC meeting.

**George Perham:** There is an analysis that will need to be completed to determine the cost benefit. Already the academic building has some of the area filled with HVAC equipment. We need to see if the amount of solar that we can fit up there is worth the cost of the infrastructure, if there will be enough benefit to the Town.

**Wally Kadeem:** Noted that at this time the decision needs to be based upon the available room on the roof and the cost benefit to the Town.

**Brian Greenleaf:** Reminded everyone that the State grant request is moving forward at \$125.9 million, and that cannot be changed. So even if you decide to increase the Town Council ordinance to cover the additional scope of solar panels, if the total project cost exceeded the \$125.9, then the Town would be wholly responsible for the overage. We could open a separate project later and the new reimbursement rate for an Energy Conservation project is similar to the rate we have now, it would be slightly lower at 58% currently. That's why I was suggesting earlier that we let the bidding play-out, and we first try to fit it into the current budget, then we could explore our options if we can't keep it within the current project budget.

**Stephanie Philips:** I think I could live with that, if there is only a 2% reduction in the grant if we need to wait for a new one.

**Clarence Zachery:** This is why I believe we tend to do these panels as a separate phase. The first order of business is to get the school finished and then if we have the money we add this scope in.

**Dan Senft:** Restated his earlier statement that there might be some cost saving measures that we can look at to be able to include the panels in the current project. We were able to come up with over \$500,000 at

Soto. So I agree that we keep it as an option, see where we stand later.

**Stephanie Philips:** I agree, since we won't be losing much in reimbursement if we need to wait for a new project grant then this can remain as an option at this point. We have Town Council members here who are now understanding that we may be coming back to them if we can't find the cost savings, and some of the ideas discussed earlier may come to light later.

**Beth Daponte:** Are you saying that you'll be telling the public tonight that this is the budget and that there is a chance that you'll be asking for more money?

**Alan Llewelyn:** No, we can't report something that we don't know. At this point we move forward and either with value engineering, or Turner coming up with other cost-saving measures by utilizing their purchasing power, or something like that, maybe it will free-up some additional money so we can pick up some additional niceties for the school, as well as the Town.

**Len Petrucelli:** With solar panel installation, we're talking about something that doesn't need to happen for another two years.

**Brian Greenleaf:** Explained that this is the same way CREC does this on their schools, as a separate phase.

**Alan Llewelyn:** If there is no further discussion (there was no further discussion) we will move to the next bullet under Number 10, which is FEMA remapping. Attached to the agenda is an email from Bill Mead dated 2/4/16 that explains the current disposition of this issue.

**George Perham:** Explained that the summary is "it should happen any day now".

**John Casey:** Explained that the public notice that is required to go out as a part of that remapping is being sent out by the Town next week.

- Len Petrucelli:** Requested clarification about the public notice.
- John Casey:** Explained that the engineers have calculated who might be impacted by the change that we're requesting and FEMA requires those property owners to be given public notification of this process happening
- Jason Santi:** Asked if the existing culvert through the West parcel is being replaced?
- George Perham:** Confirmed the culvert is being replaced
- Brian Greenleaf:** Explained that after we get the final results from the FEMA remapping we will forward to the State and CREC will arrange for the State site inspection. This is another part of the grant process, and covers the final bullet under agenda Item 10.

#### **11. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS CONSULTANT UPDATE**

- **Eagle Environmental Initial Assessment is Essentially Complete (Asbestos Lab Testing is Nearly Complete). Will Wait for Residents to Vacate 25 North Parade Before Assessing**
- **Meeting With Town Officials Regarding PCB Testing Held 2/10/2016 (Turner)**
- **John Casey Attempting to Locate Plans from the Asbestos Abatement Project to Share with Eagle**
- **Architect Coordinating Exterior Bearing Wall Investigation with Eagle Exterior Sampling**

**Alan Llewelyn:** Unless there is additional discussion (there was none), this brings us to Item 11. Ty can speak to the Haz-Mat Consultant update for us.

**Ty Tregellas:** Rich Snedeker and I met with Eagle Environmental and Town Officials including John Casey last week and got an update on their status. Much of the interior sampling in the current SHS building is complete, the asbestos sampling has so far confirmed much of what was expected with multiple layers of tile and mastic

in some locations, and asbestos insulation anticipated behind the walls. The tunnels appear to have been abated, but they did find a sealed bag of asbestos waste that had been left behind. The exterior testing needs to be completed. And the PCB's are still a large variable that is being assessed, initially with the windows then we'll look at those results and make decisions on how to proceed.

**Jason Santi:** Asked about the existing oil tanks.

**Ty Tregellas:** We know there are two underground and they will need to be removed as we proceed.

**Jason Santi:** They were last replaced in the 1980's so they are within their lifespan and shouldn't be leaking.

**John Casey:** Confirmed Jason's last statement

**Ty Tregellas:** We haven't determined any firm cost estimate numbers at this point for the Haz-Mat abatement. We've allotted \$2 million in the budget.

**Alan Llewelyn:** Ty, please discuss the exterior bearing wall testing coordination, the next bullet under Item 11.

**Ty Tregellas:** Eagle was going to test the exterior walls to see if there is any asbestos or other hazardous material in the wall cavity. The architect and structural engineer needed to see within the wall in specific locations so they are coordinating the timing of those destructive wall tests to be the most efficient to the town for repairs.

**Alan Llewelyn:** Now that we are up to date regarding hazardous materials, we will move on to Item 12.

## 12. SECURITY DISCUSSIONS

- **Main Office Design**
- **Public Entry Points Design**
- **Operable Windows?**

- Alan Llewelyn:** Requested George or Lisa to discuss the Main Office security design features.
- Lisa Yates:** We are incorporating a man-trap vestibule at the entry. The resource officer will be stationed Adjacent to that location. We've also included security closets, or remote security offices, throughout the building, as well as cameras everywhere the law allows.
- Beth Daponte:** How many security officers will the school be planning to have?
- Jack Dellapiano:** The current school has one resource officer and two security guards. We anticipate the resource officer will be stationed in the new academic building, since the majority of students are in that building throughout the day.
- Wally Kadeem:** As a parent I would want an officer stationed in each building, so they don't need to run to the other building for a problem after-the-fact.
- Jack Dellapiano:** The school resource officer and one security guard will be stationed in the academic building and the other security guard will be stationed in the civic building
- Lisa Yates:** The way we located the remote security offices throughout the building gives a lot of flexibility as to how you do your security staffing.
- Wally Kadeem:** Expressed his concern that the number of officers scheduled is not enough.
- Janet Robinson:** This is an operational issue that we'll continue discussing even after the school opens.

- Alan Llewelyn:** Requested Lisa to continue the discussion about the next bullet, public entry points
- Lisa Yates:** The building has many, many more doors for exiting than are necessary for entry. The design is to only allow a minimum amount of entry points, so entry hardware won't even be provided at many of the exterior doors, only allowing entry at the doors where the Town wants to allow entry.
- Alan Llewelyn:** Thanked Lisa for that report, and noted that there is no reason to revisit the operable windows discussion (the last bullet point under Item 12) because it is now tabled to the next meeting (from Item 8). Since this was the last item on the agenda, is there any further discussion?
- Len Petrucelli:** Noted that there is only one current Town Council member on the SHS BSC.
- Beth Daponte:** Clarified that there are no Democratic Council members on the BSC
- Alan Llewelyn:** Noted that the BNC is scheduled to meet in March and he believes they will be taking up the business of looking at the membership of the subcommittee(s) for projects in Town at that time.
- Stephanie Philips:** Stated that she believes that this subcommittee needs to formerly request the BNC to look into the membership of the subcommittee to address the changing roles of people in Town since the elections.
- Jason Santi:** Stated that in the past only the BNC needs to appoint members to the subcommittees, the Town Council doesn't need to act on subcommittee appointments.
- Len Petrucelli:** Motioned to adjourn.
- Jason Santi:** Seconded.

**Alan Llewelyn:** Are all in favor?  
All were in favor.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:45pm by  
Renovations Subcommittee Chairman, Alan Llewelyn.

**Minutes submitted by:**  
Richard Snedeker  
Project Manager  
CREC Construction Services

# AGENDA

STRATFORD HIGH SCHOOL  
BUILDING RENOVATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING  
February 18, 2016  
Stratford High School

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

1. Call to Order (5:30 pm)
2. Approval of Agenda (Emailed February 12, 2016)
3. Approval of January 14, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes (Emailed January 28, 2016)
4. Reminder: March 2016 Meeting Schedule Goes Back To The Third Monday
  - 2016 Holiday Adjustments Are Completed As Of Today's Meeting
  - Remainder of 2016 BSC Meeting Schedule Will Be Third Monday Of Each Month  
Subject to Possible Change by Future Decisions of the BNC
5. Town Council Update (Llewelyn)
6. Invoices and Bills (CREC)
  - Sustainable Engineering Solutions Payment Application No. 1 (Invoice No. 1776) \$2,049.50  
(Copy Attached)
7. Commissioning Update (CREC or SES)
  - OPR Meeting Held with Architect, IES, and CREC 1/21/2016
  - Additional Owner Information Requested by CxA 1/21/2016, Provided to CxA 2/2/2016  
(With Local Stakeholder Input). This is a "Living" Document, Adjustments can be Made  
Later, and Can Be Revised.
  - Meeting to discuss potential summer uses of SHS held 2/11/2016  
Included: Public Facilities; Parks; Recreation; BOE; CREC (See Attached Email Dated  
2/11/2016 Summarizing the Meeting).
8. Review of Current Building Plans, Schedule, and Budget
  - Antinozzi Associates Personnel Changes
  - Operable Windows as an Add-Alternate? (See Attached Email Dated 2/11/2016)
  - Town Sign-off of "Final" Design

9. Next Steps: Design Decisions, Design Schedule, & Sub-Committee Deliverables

- Inventory List of Existing Historical/Valuable/Sentimental Items (Stratford Heritage)  
Items Already Identified:
  - Coach Walter A. Czekaj Memorial (Fitness Center?)
  - AD Ray Needham Memorial (Gymnasium?) (Bio for Needham)
  - JFK Memorial (Auditorium?)
  - Previous Building Committee(s) Memorialization(s)
- Interior Design Theme(s) Progress Report
- Time Lapsed Photography/Progress Photography/Drone Photography/Webcam?
- Hiring Independent Reviewer for OSCG Review (RFP Release Approximately March 2016)
- Hiring Independent Structural Reviewer for Code (Exceeds Threshold Limits Building)
- Site Logistics – Additional Property? (See Town Council Agenda for 2/8/2016 Item 5.3.2)
- Technology Consultant

10. Energy and Environmental Protection

- Solar Photo-Voltaic Panel Inclusion Status
- STV FEMA Re-mapping Update (Antinozzi and/or STV) (See Attached Bill Mead Email Dated 2/4/2016)
- We Still Owe the LOMR Results to the State, Followed by a State Site Inspection by Jeff Bolton (CREC is Coordinating the Site Inspection).

11. Hazardous Materials Consultant Update (Turner)

- Eagle Environmental Initial Assessment is Essentially Complete (Asbestos Lab Testing is Nearly Complete). Will Wait for Residents to Vacate 25 North Parade Before Assessing.
- Meeting With Town Officials Regarding PCB Testing Held 2/10/2016 (Turner)
- John Casey Attempting to Locate Plans from the Asbestos Abatement Project to Share with Eagle.
- Architect Coordinating Exterior Bearing Wall Investigation with Eagle Exterior Sampling.

12. Security Discussions

- Main Office Design
- Public Entry Points Design
- Operable Windows?

13. Adjournment (Approximately 7:00 pm)

Attachments: SES Payment Application No. 1  
Summer Uses Email Dated 2/11/2016  
Operable Windows Email Dated 2/11/2016  
Bill Mead Email Dated 2/4/2016