

Stratford High School Building Renovations Subcommittee

Regular Meeting Minutes

May 16, 2016

1. Call to Order

The Regular meeting of the Stratford High School Building Renovations Subcommittee was called to order at 5:34 p.m. on May 16, 2016 by Chairman Alan Llewelyn.

❖ Presiding

Alan Llewelyn, Chairman

❖ Building Subcommittee Members Present

- Bob Chaloux
- Jack Dellapiano, Principal, S.H.S.
- Eric Lazaro, BOE
- Alan Llewelyn, CM. BSC/TC/BNC/PWC
- Len Petrucci, VCM. BOE
- Stephanie Phillips, Zoning
- Ken Poisson, Teacher, S.H.S
- Jason Santi
- Dan Senft, via phone
- Clarence Zachery, BOE, COO

❖ Building Subcommittee Members Absent

- None

❖ Others in Attendance

- John Casey, Town Engineer
- Beth Daponte, T.C. Chair
- J. Vincent Chase, T.C.
- Rich Ruggerio, Director of Facilities, BOE
- Shannon Hovan. Antinozzi Assoc.
- George Perham, Antinozzi Assoc.
- Lisa Yates Antinozzi Assoc.
- Ty Tregellas, Turner
- Rich Snedeker, CREC
- Elizabeth Craun, CREC

2. Approval of Agenda

- ❖ Alan Llewelyn: Requested a motion to approve the agenda
- ❖ Len Petrucci: Motioned to approve the agenda
- ❖ Jason Santi: Seconded approval of the agenda
- ❖ Alan Llewelyn: Requested a vote to approve the agenda, all were in favor.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- ❖ Alan Llewelyn: Requested a motion to approve the April 18, 2016 regular meeting minutes
- ❖ Len Petrucci: Motioned to approve the minutes
- ❖ Clarence Zachery: Seconded approval of the minutes
- ❖ Alan Llewelyn: Requested a vote to approve the minutes, all were in favor.

4. Town Council Update (Llewelyn)

- ❖ Alan updated the Subcommittee on the actions of the Town Council in the last meeting specific to this project

All of the last three motions forwarded to the TC from the BSC/BNC were passed 10-0.

The Town Budget was also approved

The CIP budget that was tabled by the TC has nothing to do with the SHS funding

- ❖ Alan requested a motion to take item 8 out of order.
- ❖ Jason Santi motioned to take item 8 out of order
- ❖ Jack Dellapiano seconded
- ❖ Alan requested a vote to approve the motion to take item 8 out of order, all were in favor.

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

- Selection of Independent Structural Engineering Review Consultant
 - CREC Summary of Recommendation
- ❖ Rich Snedeker explained the process that CREC went through to provide the subcommittee with a recommendation for this consultant. Elizabeth Craun P.E. ran the process for Rich while Rich was on vacation. Elizabeth forwarded the CREC summation of the respondents to the committee members in the past week.
- ❖ Elizabeth Craun reported first-hand how CREC determined who we were recommending among the six respondents, and why. The qualifications were analyzed and first ranked without any knowledge of the fee proposals. Then the fee proposals were ranked and incorporated into the comparison matrix. CREC is recommending E2 Engineers of New London, they ranked the best out of the top three, and also happen to be the lowest fee of the top three ranked firms.
- ❖ Jack Dellapiano asked who Antinozzi has had the most experience with?
- ❖ Lisa Yates reported E2 and DiBlassi
- ❖ Rich Snedeker reported that CREC asked Antinozzi and IES about E2, and received favorable reports on the firm.
- ❖ Jason Santi motioned to recommend E2 Engineers to the BNC, for ISER consultant, in amount not to exceed \$21,000
- ❖ Bob Chaloux seconded
- ❖ Alan requested a vote on the motion, all were in favor
- RFP for Third Party Code Reviewer (TPCR) Posted 4/28/16
(this is a tight schedule – attached)
 - a) Proposals Due 6/2/16 (If requested by the subcommittee, CREC will do Preliminary Ranking, Top 3 Move Forward)
 - b) Decision Needed by BSC during 6/20/16 regular meeting

c) Decision by Town Council Requested During Regular TC Meeting on 7/11/16

Award Contract 7/12/16, Notify Town Attorney and Purchasing Agent, Issue "Notice to Proceed". A Two-Phased Review, First Phase Begins 8/9/16.

- ❖ Rich Snedeker told the committee that CREC is willing to do the evaluations of the proposals similar to how we did the ISER evaluation that was voted on tonight.
- ❖ Stephanie Philips asked for an explanation of this consultant's purpose in the project
- ❖ Rich Snedeker explained this is because the State doesn't perform these reviews any longer, so it's either up to the local appointed officials (they've already rejected that offer and authorized to hire someone on their behalf). Rich also explained that this reviewer is required to be independent of any consultant already on the project, and that it is difficult role to fill because very few firms have experience or expertise in jobs requiring this skillset. The firm we hire needs to be acceptable to the local appointed officials so the pool of candidates is very small (if we're very lucky we'll get three candidates, if we're power-ball-jackpot-lucky we might get four). Rich also reported that this has the potential to cost between \$50,000 - \$70,000, and our budgeted number for this was \$40,000 - \$50,000. Demand for these services is extremely high.
- ❖ Jason Santi voiced his agreement with how efficiently the ISER selection went with CREC doing the evaluation for the committee. The process works well and still gives the committee a chance to review the recommendation prior to voting.
- ❖ Jason Santi motioned to allow CREC to perform the initial evaluation of the proposals for TPCR consultant and to report back the subcommittee.
- ❖ Len Petruccelli and Dan Senft seconded
- ❖ Alan requested a vote on the motion, all were in favor to let CREC handle 3rd Party Code Review proposal evaluations (screen proposals and provide a recommendation at the June meeting) similarly to the structural review process
- Interior Design Theme Progress Report – initial discussions have taken place but nothing to report. Carry over agenda item.
- Site Logistics – nothing to report. Carry over agenda item.

5. Energy and Environmental Protection

- ~~Solar P/V Panels Cost Benefit Analysis (DBS Energy)~~ – Tabled due to DBS not being available to do their presentation, will try to reschedule but may not be available for the June meeting.
- State Site Inspection by Jeff Bolton has been requested - This inspection may have taken place, Jeff Bolton told Rich Snedeker he intended to do it on a certain date, but has not yet responded to attempts to verify that it took place. Carry it over to next month's agenda.

6. Invoices and Bills (CREC – See Attachments)

- Eagle Environmental (Haz-Mat Consultant) – Invoice # 13657: \$3,120.00 (No Contract Yet)
- ❖ Rich Snedeker – work is ongoing, fitness building tested clean of hazardous materials.
- ❖ Ken Poisson – why is the contract not signed? Rich Snedeker asks John Casey for status. John Casey – final contract in the making, will reach out to Rich when it is ready for signature and execution.
- ❖ Ken Poisson – any special handling for tennis courts? Rich Snedeker – probably not, though asphalt in soil may be a factor. Soils in this area were characterized not suitable for fill.
- ❖ Rich – Eagle is currently just billing for testing. This is the second invoice. Presenting it for approval now to speed payment once the contract is executed.
- Antinozzi Associates Invoice # 10: \$167,043.15
- ❖ Rich – invoice amount matches schedule of values for April 2016 in contract.
- Sustainable Engineering Solutions Pay Application # 2: \$500.00

- ❖ Rich – this is the commissioning agent.
- ❖ Chairman proposes handling these 3 invoices together.
- ❖ Motion to approve – Jason Santi. Second – Bob Chaloux.
- ❖ Motion carried unanimously, Eagle/Antinozzi/SES invoices approved. Originals will be provided to John Casey before the end of the meeting.

- CREC Reimbursable Legal Expenses: \$35,025.00
- ❖ Invoices for legal services performed by CREC’s legal team at the Town’s request due to their Town’s legal team not being able to respond quickly. These are the exact amount billed to and paid by CREC (no mark-up). This bill is being presented all at once (some paid invoices are older) due to the way that the lawyer originally presented their invoices. CREC requested more detail and itemization for the charges. The itemized billing also includes all the work necessary to complete CREC’s contract with the Town, but we have clearly delineated that work as not reimbursable to CREC. CREC’s contract with the Town includes “reimbursable expenses” such as these.
- ❖ Stephanie Philips – did the Town attorneys look at these contracts? Rich – yes, for example the CM one had ~ one year of interactions. Rich – all were signed off on by the in-house attorney or an attorney hired by the town.
- ❖ Stephanie Philips – did this result in additional costs over using the town attorney? Rich – we do not have enough information to answer this question. Doing it this way was necessary due to workload and the change in Town attorney, but cannot quantify additional costs (if any) with currently available information.
- ❖ Motion to approve – Jason Santi. Second – Bob Chaloux.
- ❖ Motion carries unanimously.

- CREC Contract Amendment # 1
- ❖ Rich – contract as originally written does not always align with how the project is being carried out. Example – the contract has a 2% fee applied for change orders. Fee is based upon 2% of GMP, project has gone from 56M to 126M.
- ❖ Alan Llewelyn – what is the fee/price difference? Rich – currently, monthly fee is ~ \$16,000. Would go to ~\$32,000 plus the lump sum if amendment approved. CAO and Town Attorney have signed off on this.
- ❖ Jason Santi Noted – contract amendment, so must go to Town Council and Building Needs.
- ❖ Motion to approve (allow to move on to BNC and TC) – Jason Santi. Second – Len Petrucelli.
- ❖ Stephanie Philips – what is the \$32,000 based on. Rich – based on 2% of construction costs (not total cost). Stephanie Philips – is this rate (2%) standard for these sorts of projects, and is the percentage normally static regardless of project size?
- ❖ Jason Santi – when this reaches council level, more information is likely to be required.
- ❖ Alan Llewelyn – is this the same terms and conditions as the CREC/West Haven contract? CREC will pull together more information for the next meeting.
- ❖ Motion carries unanimously.

7. Review of Current Building Plans, Schedule, and Budget

- 4/28/16 Code and Safety Meeting w/F.M. and B.O. (Antinozzi)
- ❖ Lisa Yates – successful meeting with Building and Fire. Fire Marshal would like to be included on future security discussions and review details of fire safety doors.

- Design Schedule Update

- IWWC, BZA, Zoning Approvals Schedule
- State DDR Meeting set for July 27, 2016
- State PCR Meeting set for September 13, 2016

- ❖ Lisa Yates – On target for releasing DD set to Turner on June 20. DDR with the State to follow in July. Early package (civil/structural/exterior handrails, all steel & concrete, etc.) will follow. Target of January start at Turner for civil/site and can be bid and move forward in March. Some discussion on the general construction versus early package schedules (“shovel in ground” date). Shovel in ground date is currently January 2017. Eric Lazaro – what are the plans for field house (moved or gone)? Answer – field house will be demolished. Alan Llewelyn – when is the 3rd Party Structural Reviewer needed? Answer – they need to be on board to prepare for the PCT. Bob Chaloux – does the review and phasing process minimize change orders? Answer – not necessarily, but it has other advantages (such as taking full advantage of summers).

- ❖ Project is on schedule for local approvals. May 18 is wetlands review date, the schedule allows for 2 months of review. Stephanie Philips – is the project being submitted to all boards at once? Answer – no, need to follow a sequence (wetlands, then BZA, then zoning). Current approach is paralleling Wetland and BZA, then going to zoning. These boards usually take the application in one month for consideration, and then put it up for vote the next. BZA presentation is scheduled for July 5th.

- ❖ Some discussion about the sequencing of public meetings (primarily whether BZA requires wetlands approval for placement on the agenda, or just zoning).

- ❖ Jason Santi – does the inland wetlands application include the culvert replacement? Answer – yes. The culvert will be moved approximately 10 feet upstream (new culvert constructed before current one is removed) to clear the new building footprint. Jason Santi – is there a plan that clearly shows this/what are the specifics of the construction? Is private property involved (may receive discharge, specifically)? Answer –all work will take place on the town property, but private properties are downstream. Jason Santi – is easement amendment from council required? Answer (John Casey) – no, current easement still applies due to no changes to the stream channel itself, and no substantial changes in culvert configuration. Less water will be discharged than is currently discharged. Concerns raised about “California Street” culvert which is undersized and any impacts to it. Answer – these potential impacts were reviewed by FEMA at the federal level.

- ❖ Lisa Yates – schedule currently holds one month for wetlands approval, but can accommodate two months without impacting the overall schedule.

- ❖ For wetlands, if a public hearing is required for the application, it would take place in June.

- ❖ State DDR meeting is set for July 27. The project team is on track for this date.

- ❖ State PCR meeting is set for September 13. Rich Snedeker – if this date needs to move later, the schedule can accommodate it. This date may be delayed by the Town agency approvals. Alan Llewelyn – try to hold to this date, since later dates bring the project into the holiday period, which tends to be less efficient.

- ❖ Jason Santi - Question about culverts again – does the work end on town property (regarding specifically Barnum Avenue). Answer (John Casey) – yes, all work for this project is on town property. There could

be work (unrelated) later required on Barnum Avenue to join culverts but there should be no impact on this SHS project.

- Budget Update (CREC)
- ❖ Rich – email from Brian sent out included current amended budget. Still on target for 126 million total. Adjustments have been made for amendments that were approved at the previous month’s meeting. Budget is up to date as of last month’s meeting but will need to be updated after the current meeting.
- ❖ Vincent Chase Question – site acquisition. Rich – 25 North Parade has been purchased (for \$246,500), money is left in that line item should any additional property become available. Vincent Chase Question – do we anticipate the need to acquire additional property? Rich – It has always been a goal of this subcommittee to provide a full-sized softball field. Stephanie Philips – this is really a need. Previous town attorney was in discussions with property owner, new attorneys are involved so status is unknown by the building committee. Alan Llewelyn requests to CREC to investigate this and provide an update for next month’s meeting. Brian had been working with consulting town attorney to complete purchase of 25 North Parade Street. Jason Santi – this has already appeared on the agendas of other town agencies, so the desire to create the softball field is public knowledge already. Item is tabled by town council. Dan Senft – the current site plan allows for expansion of the softball field if additional property is acquired (the plan was developed this way due to the possibility but uncertainty of purchasing additional properties). Clarence Zachery – communication and coordination may need to be improved, a house was publically listed, sold, and renovated by the new owners and the Town missed the opportunity to purchase it at a relatively low price. Vincent Chase - current uncommitted balance - \$453,000. Is second property worth more? Ken Poisson – it is larger, so most likely. Desire to move on this as soon as possible expressed. Stephanie Philips question – who is the point person for the committee on land acquisition? (not answered) Concern expressed over funds available being listed in minutes. Rich – State will only reimburse for higher of two appraisals on the property, which keeps acquisition costs in line with market values.

9. Hazardous Materials Consultant Update

- Contract status discussed above.

10. Security Decisions (Antinozzi)

- Lisa Yates - 4/28/16: Sonitrol Meeting – Meeting went well. Discussed SchoolGuard glass and several different access systems for classroom lockdown. Options included double key locks, “shelter” system that uses a battery operated fob (with different functions and level of access) - \$100 more a door than manual keyed locks, additional system that does not have the school-wide access option - \$300 more a door.
- ❖ Question – security item in capital budget – is there money in this budget for Stratford High? Answer – there may be money for the current Stratford High, but not the proposed renovated building. \$40,000 from a grant is still left and is dedicated to Stratford High. Need to coordinate with the design team to determine the status of these upgrades (such as recently installed security cameras).
- ❖ Eric Lazaro – keep final details of security system out of public record (discuss in executive session).
- ❖ Rich and Lisa will try to get manufacturer’s reps in to talk with Town public safety officials. Ask building committee for members interested in attending these sessions. List of Town officials to be invited is discussed. Antinozzi will update the building committee as these meetings are scheduled.
- ❖ Stephanie Philips question – are batteries included with the systems? Answer – once at purchase, Town is responsible for replacements.

11. Commissioning Update (CREC or SES)

- Basis of Design (BOD): Document updated by design team and sent to CxA.
- Rich – discussion of things like doors that are essentially moveable walls, make sure that commissioning agent is looped in on design items like these as it will affect things like HVAC and end-user training.

12. Adjournment

- Discussion of State budget and potential summer sessions. Stratford is on list, where they need to be.
- Motion to adjourn: Ken Poisson. Second: Len Petrucelli. All were in favor.