

**ENFIELD HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
March 24, 2016**

A meeting of the Enfield High School Building Committee was held at Enfield High School located at 1264 Enfield Street, Enfield, Connecticut on March 24, 2016.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**           The meeting was called to order at 6:31 pm by Randy Daigle
2. **MOMENT OF SILENCE**
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
4. **FIRE EVACUATION ANNOUNCEMENT**

5. **ROLL CALL**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Randy Daigle, Virginia Austin, Doug Maxellon, Joe Muller, Tim Neville, Wendy Osada, Greg Strich, Gina Sullivan (7:00)

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Gina Cekala, Walter Kruzel, Jim Nasuta, George Rypysc, Lynn Scull, Donna Szewczak, Laura Vella

**ALSO PRESENT**

Jim Giuliano, Dean Petrucelli, Amar Shamas

6. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve the Regular Minutes dated March 10, 2016

Seconded by Ginny Austin

Motion passes by a show of hands

Abstained by Dr. Ginny Austin, Mr. Greg Strich

7. **COMMITTEE GUESTS**

Matt Meier, Enfield Police Department, Traffic Division Supervisor

Mark Squires, Enfield Police Department, Traffic Division

Randy states one of the things we initially tried to do as part of this project was to get a traffic light at the top of the hill due to the amount of traffic that will be coming out of here at certain times. Unfortunately, due to the traffic report that was submitted to the State, the State found that it was not needed. It was not required for this project. That is something that we would still like to pursue. We can't pursue it as a building committee but we want to make sure that through the Town, either the Board of Education or Town Council is still pursuing it. We want to keep it on the burner, it is needed. Being that it is on route 5 a State highway, it is out of our jurisdiction. The Town needs to give the State its blessing. We are hoping to have some funds available to contribute towards that, knowing that the Town would have to pay for it if the State says no. We are trying to come up with another traffic report so the State will say yes. Even if it's a manned one, that is during certain hours, when school is being dismissed or sports are being discharged. We don't know how to pursue it. The Town did it and it went nowhere. A lot of parents are nervous about it. Committee members are nervous, we have kids in the school. We are looking for some direction from the Town on how we go about doing this.

Doug states we are doubling the capacity of the school. I know the original traffic study only took a small window of route 5 to do their study. From what I understand there are a lot of accidents that you have on record that weren't included in the study. There is only one exit in and out of this facility, with buses and parents and kids.

Wendy states I have a son who just got his license a few months ago and he just started driving here. He is coming from the south and making a left hand turn. When I have driven him, you can sit there, and I timed it, for 2 to 3 minutes waiting for the traffic coming from the other direction because there are no breaks in it. There are a lot of young drivers. I don't know what was given to the State. Just between 2009 and 2012, there was 12 accidents reported right there. If you expand that and include down to South Street (road) and up to the 190 overpass, there was 54 accidents. This is a very heavily traveled corridor. For the volume of students and buses and cars, I cannot image that the State said no. What do they base that on? What threshold do you have to pass?

Mark Squires states they level everything as a level of service. You saw in the report itself, level of services 2 times a day was level E service. Level E is a poor level of service. Those 2 times correspond with arrival and dismissal of school. I'd have to look at the language of the study and criteria that the State has. It has something to do with the length of time and the level of service that you have during arrival and dismissal. That's why the State said it's not required. I don't think they said they weren't going to do it or they wouldn't allow it. They said they weren't going to pay for it because it was not required at the time. My position on the issue in 2013 was that I think it is needed. I agree with everyone here that it is needed. You have 16 and 17 year old inexperienced drivers trying to exit a non-signalized exit intersection in a 45 MPH zone, if people are traveling at 45 MPH. There is a time distance that is going on, there is a judgment call that needs to be made when they don't have the experience behind the wheel. The traffic study on its face, on paper, is correct if our numbers are correct, we did the counts out there. I'm not suggesting that they are wrong but that is what they based their decision on as I read the traffic study. I don't know if having another traffic study here, spending the money, I don't know what that is going to do for you. It might be good. They might find out results for you. Ultimately, the unreported factors like I just reported are covered. I think it's needed. When they asked for the study I did pull some numbers in house. I don't remember the number of accidents, but I did go all the way to Post Office road and all the way up to Frew or Franklin. They are going to be looking at accident that are a result of directly leaving here. Did Planning & Zoning make the request?

Randy states initially they did.

Dean states we hired MMI, who is the civil engineer and they are also traffic engineers. They performed a study, did a traffic count and submitted it to the State Traffic. State Traffic came back and said not only do you not need a light, they do not want you to put up a light on their State highway. We asked what if the Town wants to put up a light? They said we don't want the light there. They actually took it a step further than what you just said. State Traffic said they do not want a light. Traffic counts don't justify the light. They don't want anyone to put lights up on their State highway. They want control of where they go and where they don't go. The State Traffic stated it is not needed and don't want the light there. If you recall, we actually pushed and said we want the light there and they said no, they didn't approve a light there. I remember we asked what if we pay for it, we want the light there and they said no we will not give you approval to do that. Things probably have changed 3 years later, traffic count could be different on the road. They don't tell you if you are on the threshold, they give you a yes or a no.

Wendy asks do they average out for the whole day or will they look at certain period of time? Do you know what they base it on?

Mark states I know it's in the study. If you read the study it will explain it to you.

Dean states there is a blimp in the morning and the afternoon, it's all taken into consideration.

Doug asks if they did a count, it would have been the count at that time?

Tim states it would have been 700 or 800 vs. 1,500.

Dean states they did the actual count on 5, then the count out of the driveway at the high school. Then MMI has to add in the additional load that they know is coming. That was all part of the study. They do add the load that is anticipated.

Tim states it is a school zone. You were saying it's 45MPH, isn't a school zone lower?

Mark states I don't think it is defined by statute. It needs to be properly signed.

Dean states the count couldn't justify the light.

Mark states that goes to the level of service that you have.

Doug asks what is needed to give it another try?

Dean states it would be a different traffic count on route 5.

Amar states what you need to look at is called warrant studies. There are several warrants they need to go through to justify a traffic signal. It's not just the count. It's multiple warrants. If you don't meet a certain number of warrants, that's what kicks in a signal or not. You don't focus on the counts, but the warrants. Maybe have the traffic engineer shed some light on how the process works so you are more informed.

Randy states get MMI back and even if we have to do another one.

Mark states if you're going to do another study, wait until after your school is open.

Randy states that is what I brought up earlier. It's a catch-22, if we wait it takes several years, then our project is going to be closed out.

Tim states our concern is the waiting, something is going to happen. At Alcorn they never had a light until that kid was killed. We don't want to get to that point. I don't want to be dramatic but we know high school kids, inexperienced drivers, we know what goes on. Particularly if they are going right and left. Going left, first of all they go into the wrong lane, they have to wait for the traffic and they are not good at waiting. How do we boost it up to get somebody's attention?

Greg asks if the State criteria changed between the time when the original study was done and present time?

Dean states have the factors changed?

Amar states it goes back to the traffic engineer how they developed the study. What warrant criteria was eligible to kick it to a traffic signal vs. no signal? There is certain criteria you have to meet to be eligible for a signal.

Greg asks what I'm questioning is have those warrants changed?

Amar states the expert in the field is the guy who is going to be here telling you here is how the State looks at the traffic signal warrants. Those are the criterias you have to meet.

Mark states you want to find out how far off you are.

Wendy states we need to get a hold of the State criteria, we need to get the accident reports, we need to have the engineers come back and talk to us. And, what is it going to take to get police directing traffic there every morning and every afternoon and for large events?

Mark states you have to hire an officer. Otherwise, the Council would have to appropriate funds to fund something like that.

Tim states even then you have to make sure they would be available.

Mark states it's overtime or private duty. It would be an officer called in special for that. They wouldn't have any other duties.

Wendy asks what about the S.R.O.'s?

Mark states they aren't going to pull them out of the school for that. There is a lot of focus on having them in the school.

Wendy asks before school started and after school ends?

Mark states it is still occupied.

Tim states I'm not confident we are going to get this done before the school opens. What would it take to ban a left turn out of there?

Mark states they tried that. You were talking about warrants, they do things like 8 hour and 4 hour traffic volume. They do things like pedestrian, school crossing, is it a coordinated signal system which route 5 is. Meaning when one signal goes off they all talk to each other. We talked about re-timing some lights and they don't want to do that because everything is set to flow. That is probably what they are going to use for the State. The police department is in an advisory position. You really need to get that traffic engineer in here for a consultation.

Amar states get the list of warrants and say here is our analysis, to see how close or far off you are.

Doug asks do the warrants factor in 16 year old drivers?

Amar states the MUTCD is national. They look at crashes, volume, pedestrian traffic. All these factors play into it.

Wendy asks can we agree that we want to get what the State warrants are? Get a new accident report and then have the engineers talk to us?

Randy states I think we should get the engineer back and have him do that.

Dean asks do you want me to get MMI at the next meeting?

Randy asks if we can get the report and he will distribute out for everyone to have. Then we can get MMI here.

Tim asks is there anything about a school zone?

Mark states there may appear to be school zones in town that don't statutory qualify as school zones. There may be signs that say 25 MPH, but it may not be a statutory enforceable speed limit. There is more to it than there being a school on a street. We'd have to check.

Tim asks if they can check.

Mark agrees.

Tim states we were talking about interrupting the flow, if we were to pay for an officer to be out there, it would interrupt the flow twice a day. Does State traffic get upset about that?

Mark states I don't know what they would have to say about that.

Randy asks what is the procedure? Do we put a request for a police officer into the department and could you guys say no the State won't allow us to? If it's a State highway do you say yes or no?

Wendy states Town Council has to appropriate the funds.

Mark states this might be a special circumstance and would have to be considered a little differently. The normal procedure for hiring an officer for a traffic related event would be the company or firm would pay the private job rate for the officer for the times they want. It is a minimum 4 hour block. If you were to get the Town Council on board, I don't know if it would be something they would consider and they appropriate money to come out of an overtime fund, that would be different.

Randy asks does anyone have the authority such as a private security firm?

Mark states no one else can direct traffic.

Mark states every town is different and sometimes they will grant a flagger. If you're hiring an officer for an event, I don't think it will be an issue for the State. If you're hiring an officer everyday for 2 times a day I think the State is going to want to be involved. You are going to be impacting the roads.

Randy states this is something we can only go so far, it has to go to either the public or the Council. As a building committee we are trying to keep it on the burner. Bring it up to the Town Council. There needs to be an outside movement. It is out of our charge. We would be willing to pay for it as it is affecting our kids.

Doug states we have to keep pushing.

Greg asks is there an appeal process?

Mark states it is an administrative hearing.

Tim states we have to stir the pot. I will ask our State Representatives when they come to a meeting. I think it is necessary to do something.

Randy states we can stay on the light issue, but maybe talk to the Council and come up with the funds for the first month for an officer.

Ginny asks if one S.R.O. can stay in the building and one can go out?

Randy states he thinks they can't leave the building.

Ginny states we have 2 S.R.O.'s.

Tim states we just had a meeting and have a M.O.U. It has to go through the Town. We may want to get it on the school board meeting agenda and the Council meeting.

Randy thanks the officers for coming and for the help you have given us.

## **8. ARCHITECTS REPORT**

Dean states we have 5 outstanding shops drawings and 5 RFI's outstanding. The architects and engineers punched out the B wing this past week, the gymnasium, locker room and are scheduled for CO in a few more weeks. It is virtually complete. There is clean up work. Gilbane is currently painting and finishing the floor with the school colors and logo. We had a meeting last week to coordinate that with the P.E. department to be sure all the striping and line work is the way they wanted. Per the request of the building official, the structural engineer came out to the building this week to inspect a few areas, the auditorium so that is proceeding. The building official and I now have a weekly phone conversation to keep up with each other. One item the building official is challenging is the locker room count. The building official is going above the written requirement of the code and asking the owner, in this case the principal of the school, to dictate the maximum occupancy of the various locker rooms and team rooms. The building official will be looking for this information soon. I haven't gotten all that information yet. I will need someone to put a squeeze on the P.E. department. Andrew asked the P.E. department to get me those numbers and I haven't gotten them yet. They want to hear what the worst case user scenario in each locker room is going to be. We calculate occupancy based on the code criteria. The building official is asking what the district is going to put in those rooms. It is information that I need and I don't have yet.

Doug asks what happens if it's more than your calculations?

There are certain thresholds that trigger second doors and doors swinging in a different direction.

Tim asks if the Superintendent is aware of this? I would make him aware.

Randy states no he is not aware yet.

## **9. PROGRAM MANAGERS REPORT**

Jim states he met with John Wilcox to review the cash flow and to make sure we're reconciling cost between our building committee and the Town. There is some review that John is going to go back and do and get back to me. Mainly what I met with him to review was all the incidental purchase orders like for SES, smaller P.O.'s and I want to be sure we have a handle on it as far as costs. I received some guidelines from the School Construction Grants unit. It may have some effect on FF&E on the last package. The State came out with guidelines on March 22<sup>nd</sup> but they are making it retroactive to projects.

Randy states things that were eligible are no longer eligible. This all has to do with the budget and Malloy looking for money.

Jim continues I don't think the impact is as much as it is on other projects. I emailed the State and asked the status on the sole sourcing phone system and have yet received a reply. The bid is out for the summer move (moving company). I walked the site and the progress is looking fantastic, not only the gymnasium area but the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> level of area A. I had State change order number 5 signed by John Wilcox and Dr. Schumann. I've had some exchanges with HAKS over their invoices.

## **10. PROGRAM CONSULTANT REPORT**

Jim states that George sent him an email that he would not be at tonight's meeting and to please report that he attended several move meetings and Monday there will be another meeting with interested movers. On Tuesday he will meet with the combined staff of Enfield High School to go over the move.

Doug asks with the change in the requirements of the reimburseables does that affect our budget to build the project?

Randy states yes, some furniture that was eligible will not be eligible.

Jim states it doesn't take away from what you have.

Amar states your city share grows.

Jim states the implementation of how they're doing it doesn't make sense. Usually it's July 1<sup>st</sup> when new guidelines come into play and it will effect from July 1<sup>st</sup> going forward. In this one situation the FF&E package was submitted in November and now as of yesterday when they came out and they're saying these items aren't eligible anymore with our new guidelines. How can you do that? We submitted it in November. It's not our fault it took you this long to review it.

Wendy asks if we can get our representative involved in?

Randy states it's budgetary.

Jim states I would wait until you get all your ducks in a row.

Dean states they are getting bombarded now with every building committee. Fortunately, it's very little for you, it's the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase of furniture purchases and most of it is purchased already. The desks and chairs you want to add to the classrooms at the end of the project is still eligible. It's things like gymnasium equipment and exercise equipment, things like that, they were eligible yesterday and not eligible today. For the most part you are ahead of the curve because you've already purchased it. If you want to purchase student desks and chairs they are still fully eligible. For instance laptop and ipads were eligible and as of today they are no longer eligible. They will buy desktop equipment but won't buy laptops.

Randy states the equipment is the only thing we foresee as of right now. The furniture that we are buying in this 3<sup>rd</sup> phase is eligible.

## **11. CMR REPORT**

Amar states in the gymnasium area we are about 3 plus weeks to turn over. We are wrapping up a couple of things on the exterior of the building. We looking to do final clean and air balance in the building just before April break. We will final clean during April break and turn over the space. Next phase is the A wing and that is moving very well. On level 3 we had all the ceiling inspected by the building official and fire marshal. All the ceiling tiles are being put in, all the lighting is on, the power is on. Second floor we are running the ceiling grid, in place already and that is progressing well. Looking at about 3 weeks for running ceiling grid on the first floor. And then we are progressing down to lower level flooring, it's going to start in about a week and a half on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor and then we set millwork and final clean that space. That is looking to wrap up on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor around mid-May. About 2 or 3 weeks later wrap up 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and then the 1<sup>st</sup> floor. That is the most extensive one that will carry us to the end. The stair tower is fully erected. Looking next week to pour the slabs and the stair tower itself concrete-wise, curtain wall on the main entrance arrived today. Then we will set up the balance of the curtain wall on the west side. As far as the D-wing/band wing the foundation is about 40-50% complete. Looking to erect steel around mid to late April, then engage in exterior wall construction. That is moving along fairly well. Site work, once the school is out for the summer break we're looking to remove the temporary walkway and start running the sidewalk in front of the building. We construct the new sidewalk then finalize our site work. We are on the last phase of move management. We are going out to bid this weekend, advertising and looking to receive bids mid to late April. Then, we will have the mover on board distributing materials. Things are going well. Working every Saturday.

Wendy asks about the compressor.

Amar states Penn equipment is one of the suppliers that the Town issued a P.O. to supply limited part of the equipment. He delivered the compressor, we're still waiting for the formal start up of the compressor. They send a manufacturers rep. They shouldn't have been using it and it got turned on. We are waiting for that vendor to arrive. We have been in constant one way communication to get them to send the manufacturers rep. They don't respond.

Wendy asks it got turned on prematurely?

Amar states it got turned on, we're not sure how.

Randy states it was installed. Penn manufacturer should have been here. They can't teach class. Can you give them an ultimatum that we need them here next week or we're going to hire an independent to come in and do it? We have emails and they don't have the professional courtesy to respond.

Wendy asks if there is a professional site where we can respond?

Amar states it is not professional to treat clients or contractors like this because we are national. They will be looking for feedback. That is national information.

Doug asks has Enfield paid them yet?

Randy states no. They haven't finished the job yet.

Doug agrees, put them on notice.

Ginny asks will that affect the warranty?

Randy states no, they'd be certified to do it. We would hire the 3<sup>rd</sup> party that they would be using.

Tim asks was it wired wrong when it first came in?

Randy states that was the voltage.

Greg asks how many safe work days.

Amar states we are at 545 safe work days.

Greg asks are we going to open the renovated section on time?

Amar states yes, with confidence.

Tim asks if you have any issues with P.O.'s?

Amar states furniture has been procured, we had conversations with Paul Russell and his group as far as their equipment vendor. We had a meeting with them to target them a time line to be in to install their infrastructure and there seems to be no issues there. The wireless projector issue – the wireless device they're recommending not to proceed with that. They tried it and it did not work properly.

Randy states everything but the sound. There is another one they are going to try and I told him to try it and report back.

Amar states correct.

Doug states Amar was going to get us access to the deficiency report portal.

Amar states the CX portal. Shawn has to grant them access.

**12. WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT REPORT**

None

**13. COMMUNICATION SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT**

Gina states she would like your opinion for the next newsletter that will be ready the week before Spring break. I'd like to highlight the gym opening. Send her some photos. Is there anything else anyone would like to see in there?

Tim asks if you can put pictures of the band uniforms in the newsletter?

Gina asks if she can use the photos from the meeting?

Tim states yes.

**14. OLD BUSINESS:**

Doug asks did we get a bond council decision?

Randy states no, he sent an email.

Doug asks Tim if he had any headway about the cleaning?

Tim states he called Andy the next day. He was going to call the head of the custodians.

**15. NEW BUSINESS:**

Randy states the following were discussed, reviewed and approved at the budget sub-committee meeting.

**Motion made by Joe Muller to Table HAKS Engineers, P.C., Invoice CT0283-032, dated December 22, 2015, in the amount of \$9,046.54**

**Seconded by Ginny Austin**

**Motion passes by a show of hands**

**Motion made by Joe Muller to Table HAKS Engineers, P.C., Invoice CT0283-031, dated December 16, 2015, in the amount of \$262.24**

**Seconded by Ginny Austin**

**Motion passes by a show of hands**

Motion made by Joe Muller to Add ATP0132 – Parging of the Existing Walls in Area B, in the amount of \$34,549.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve ATP-0132 – Parging of the Existing Walls in Area B, in the amount of \$34,549.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve ATP-0087 – Final – Added Demolition and Wall Parging at C-2 Custodial, in the amount of \$28,352.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve ATP-0116 – Final – Self Closing Gate at E-ST1, in the amount of \$4,645.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve ATP-0129 – Final – Automatic Door Opener in the amount of \$2,108.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve ATP-0131 – Final – Chemical Storage Rooms – Additional Revisions in the amount of \$34,809.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve ATP-0144 – Final – Window Sills at Area C1, in the amount of \$22,320.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve ATP-0145 – Final – Speakers in C-012 and C-004, in the amount of \$2,719.00 (with Mark Up)

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve ATP-0151 – Revised Final – Rated Chase and Access Panel per AHJ Revision 1, in the amount of \$2,922.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve ATP-0160 – Final – Area E Automatic Door Closure – Revision 1, in the amount of \$18,360.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Remove ATP-0164 – Estimated – Invert of Existing Sanitary in A Building, in the amount of \$9,064.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve ATP-0166 – Final – Infill Opening E017B with CMU, in the amount of \$2,189.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve ATP-0167 – Estimated – Paint to Address Graffiti Classrooms, in the amount of \$8,499.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve ATP-0176 – Estimated – Decoupler Line and Sump Capacity, in the amount of \$40,356.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Add Silver Petrucelli Application Number 16-439, dated April 1, 2016, in the amount of \$32,440.00

Seconded by Ginny Austin

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve Silver Petrucelli Application Number 16-439, dated April 1, 2016, in the amount of \$32,440.00

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Add CSG Invoice Number 3, dated March 15, 2016, in the amount of \$9,591.41

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Joe Muller to Approve CSG Invoice Number 3, dated March 15, 2016, in the amount of \$9,591.41

Seconded by Gina Sullivan

Motion passes by a show of hands

## **18. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

None

**Motion made by Greg Strich to hold the Next Building Committee Meeting on April 14, 2016**

**Seconded by Ginny Austin**

**Motion passes by a show of hands**

**19. COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

**Liaison Comments:**

**Committee Comments:**

**20. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to Adjourn by Joe Muller  
Seconded by Gina Sullivan  
Motion passes by a show of hand

Adjourned at 7:50 P.M.