

JFK Pre-Referendum Committee

February 15th 2017

JFK Middle School Library

Called to order: at 6:30 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present: Joseph Muller, Mary Keller, Jason Walsh, Chris Rutledge, Trish Neild-Barry, Vincent Weseliza, Carmen Nuccio, Tom Arnone, Mark Gahr, Scott Kaupin and Mike Szlosek.

Absent: Tina Leblanc, Steve Sargalski, Jonathan Bilmes and Ray Peabody

Approval of Minutes:

A motion to approve meeting minutes from 2/01/2017 was made by Mr. Muller and seconded by Mr. Nuccio.

Mr. Weseliza asked for the minutes to be amended to reflect that he had asked for when it would be appropriate for the committee to put in input regarding building functionality.

The meeting minutes were approved, with the modification requested by Mr. Weseliza, by a vote 7-0-1 (Abstention by Trish Neild-Barry.)

Presentation from Committee Guests:

Following approval of minutes, the Committee welcomed Mr. Nardi from Silver, Petrucelli & Associates.

Mr. Nardi discussed the three proposals by the environmental firms which were provided in packets for the committee. He mentioned the three estimated proposals are fairly comparable. Mr. Nardi also noted these were estimates and each estimates a different number of samples with costs being given per sample and for the labor involved.

The Chair advised the committee would make a selection and then provide detail to the Town Council for approval to move forward.

Mr. Nardi advised he had been in contact with Steve Sargalski to discuss what information they would be gathering from the educators. They will be meeting with coordinators over the course of the next two weeks to discuss programming elements, spacing and departmental needs.

Mr. Nardi offered to answer any questions by the committee regarding their review of the documents provided at the last meeting.

Mrs. Neild-Barry inquired if the draft, at present, was just for needed repairs and does not yet include replacing portables or what would be considered “renovate as new”. Mr. Nardi confirmed that to be the case. Mr. Nardi further stated as they go through the programming, educational and spacing that such items would be explored and associated costs would be presented. This information would then be used to justify “renovate as new”.

It was also confirmed that the \$16.6 million in the initial draft alone would not be considered renovate as new.

The Chair asked if the committee could ask questions about the environmental estimates and Mr. Nardi agreed.

The Chair asked if the asbestos testing in the Fuss & O’Neill (F&O) estimate included destructive testing. Mr. Nardi said he believed it did include comprehensive asbestos testing (destructive and non-destructive).

The Chair also asked for clarifications on acronyms. PLM = Polarized Light Microscopy (an asbestos test). TMNOB is another type of test involving Transmission Electron Microscopy.

Mr. Nardi explained that all three estimates include testing for PCB, Lead and Asbestos but that the estimates reported them differently. He explained that:

- F&O’s estimate of \$19,375 includes everything
- Mystic’s estimate of \$25,370 also includes everything but with different sample volumes.
- Langan’s estimate breaks their estimate into buckets of services
 - Lead and Non-Destructive Asbestos testing = \$14,270
 - PCB Sampling & Testing = \$4,310
 - Destructive Asbestos Testing = \$4,510
 - Total for all sections = \$23,090
 - All three sections combined comparable to other two estimates
 - If needed, fees for a roofer or mason could run up to \$4,000

Mr. Muller asked Mr. Nardi how many he thought were needed.

Ms. Keller explained that it was discussed F&O and the 210 samples and they would take as many as were needed non-destructive and then, if needed, they would take additional destructive samples. She continued that understanding the difference in sample volumes could be important if asked about it in front of the Town Council.

The Chair asked if the Mystic estimate included destructive testing. Mr. Nardi replied that Mystic’s estimate does not specify. Mr. Nardi says he believes it does but is not 100% sure.

Mr. Nuccio asked Mr. Nardi for his professional opinion on the estimates. Mr. Nardi expressed that they had worked with F&O the most, Langan the 2nd most and that they do not often work with Mystic. Based on cost and experience he would recommend F&O.

Mr. Muller and Mr. Nardi mentioned experience with F&O for state jobs and the Enfield High School project.

Mr. Nuccio inquired if F&O would do everything they would need and if the grounds were excluded. Mr. Nardi replied on the first part that F&O does and, on the second, Mr. Nardi confirmed the grounds were excluded.

The Chair clarified that grounds such as fields were excluded but areas such as under the windows were not. Mr. Nardi confirmed this to be the case.

Mr. Arnone advised that when this is presented to Town Council the Chair should also have a representative familiar with the technical aspects of this testing to assist.

Mr. Walsh said he noticed that two of the companies (F&O and Langan) went through the trouble of providing detail to explain the process and what would be done whereas Mystic did not. Mr. Arnone and others on the committee also noticed this.

The Chair inquired about “nice to haves” example of the water bottle fill, car charging stations etc. and wanted to know when that discussion will be held. Mrs. Neild-Barry and Mr. Nuccio mentioned that students are not allowed to have water bottles in the classrooms unless the temperature or a medical excuse says otherwise. Mr. Nardi advised that would in fact be discussed later on in the process as well as a discussion on alternative energy solutions.

Mr. Arnone brought up the Clean Energy possibly getting grants.

Mr. Walsh also said he has some ideas about alternative energy.

Mr. Nuccio advised he spoke to Steve and they had a meeting with department heads to start getting ideas on programming. They discussed what they currently have and what the ideal would be. Mr. Nardi confirmed that there have been some conversations and they were looking to set up additional meetings in the near future.

Mr. Weseliza asked if any guidance had been given (to the coordinators) as to how far to go with their ideas, comparing the conceptualizations at first to a perfect scenario that would then need to be scaled back. Mr. Nuccio agreed Mr. Nardi characterized it as a wish list that would later get scaled back. Mr. Nardi also advised there is a balance based on need and budget.

Mrs. Neild-Barry inquired about “swing space” to move students when wings are being renovated. Mr. Nuccio also commented that the space would be very tight. Mr. Nardi confirmed he would put together a phasing plan for this.

Mrs. Neild-Barry continues on this topic and brought up the idea of moving the 6th graders to Hale as an option to free up space to move 7th and 8th graders around during repairs. She further suggested this be brought up to the Board of Education before they relinquish Hale to the Town as this could be a superior option to trailers and additional portable classrooms.

Mr. Nuccio did confirm something similar was done about 15 years ago when part of the 6th grade was moved to Alcorn. There was general agreement amongst the committee that this was an idea worth looking into. Mr. Nardi mentioned that the options are either moving students to another location, renting portables (which is extremely costly) or, if there is an addition to the school, then the addition would be completed first and students could be moved into said addition. In further discussion, Mrs. Neild-Barry commented that there was a concern over maximum space allowable to achieve the best state reimbursement rate possible.

Mr. Nardi mentioned that a school can go over that maximum square footage but that would impact the reimbursement. Mr. Weseliza replied that we should first look at the space requirements and weigh that against the cost impacts.

Mr. Arnone said that could benefit the bond reimbursement.

Mr. Muller mentioned the project would be charged for the moving expenses.

Mr. Walsh said it was a good idea but that we would have to be conscious of the logistical and material needs but is definitely worth looking at.

Mr. Szlosek said this would have to be considered very soon because, at present, there is no budget for next year for the Hale building. The budget proposal for next year would have to be modified accordingly.

Mayor Kaupin arrived and was asked if Hale is still a school and he confirmed it has not been turned over to the town yet. Mrs. Neild-Barry explained her previously-mentioned idea to Mayor Kaupin.

Ms. Keller asked about the timeline. Mr. Nardi said that if the referendum passes in November then a design phase is entered and it could be that construction doesn't start until 2018 or 19 which would mean multiple fiscal years have to be considered.

Mayor Kaupin will check on how this may impact the bond (on Hale) as planning and construction would include more than one school year.

Mr. Arnone mentioned the importance of having a plan for this.

Ms. Keller asked how the committee goes about determining this is an option and what the timeline would be.

Mr. Kaupin advised of some discussion by the Board of Education. If an educational use of the building is approved by the state then bond repayment is held off. Mayor Kaupin gave hypothetical examples. Mr. Nardi advised to keep this option in mind but emphasized the need to complete the programming piece of this in order to fully know what space is needed.

Ms. Keller had question on the draft report and the report she sent about the JFK Pool. She brought up items such as pool plumbing and filtration systems and mentioned there were issues with corrosion. She also said there were issues with the interior of the pool noted in the report. Ms. Keller also brought up issues with dehumidification and spoke of the locker rooms mentioning only one toilet in the girl's locker room and the need for more. Ms. Keller also advised that the pool work needs to be done by certified licensed pool plumber specialists.

Ms. Keller also reminded the committee that food is prepared on site and this should be considered.

Ms. Keller inquired if the school looked into transgender bathroom renovations. Mr. Walsh also commented on this issue. He suggested that the build be forward thinking so that some bathrooms be designated multi-gender.

Mr. Nardi will bring that up with central office and inquire on policy.

Mr. Walsh inquired if the locker rust was due to chlorine in pool area and if there is something that can be done in the locker rooms for air quality and humidity to minimize rusting if the pool is kept.

Mr. Nardi said that if the school was renovated as new and the pool was kept that the ventilation systems would be drastically improved.

Mr. Weseliza inquired as to the advantages and disadvantages of changing to a pitched roof. He mentioned that the aesthetics of the building may be improved with a pitched roof.

Mr. Nardi said they have had similar requests in the past for reasons such as mechanical storage or aesthetics or concerns over flat roofs having more leaks and stagnant water. Mr. Nardi also mentioned that the quality of the roof work and materials were more important but that they would look into the roof shape.

Ms. Neild-Barry inquired if solar panels would be an option for the roof. Mr. Arnone brought up solar considerations with Enfield High but the payback period was long. Mr. Nardi advised based on a school this size it would take 15 to 20 years to see the payback. Geothermal payback is 5 to 7 years and may be more cost effective. Mr. Nardi advised that these options will be investigated and costs will be provided.

Mr. Weseliza asked if an outbuilding can be incorporated for onsite storage. Mr. Nardi said that any square footage would go towards state standards but will review and confirm.

Mr. Gahr advised that additional storage would be good for athletic equipment (e.g. track mats). Mr. Arnone said this has been a historical problem. Mr. Nuccio advised possibly turning one of the boy's shower areas into storage with door leading outside. Mr. Nardi did explain that this is a shelter facility so it may not be an option to eliminate showers.

Mr. Arnone inquired how the reimbursement rates work for spaces also used by the town (in this case as a shelter). Mr. Nardi advised he would inquire. Mr. Nardi also mentioned that the reimbursement may not be the same for these areas but he would research.

Mr. Arnone inquired about the generator and the reimbursement rate for replacement. Mr. Gahr said it was original. Mr. Kaupin confirmed we are rebuilding a school not a shelter. Mr. Nardi confirmed the pitch is that the showers are for the students not just for a shelter.

Mr. Walsh asked if we could seek funds from other sources for shelter items. Mayor Kaupin explained that becomes a bonding issue. He further explained that when a question goes out for referendum that the dollar amount is the maximum amount to spend regardless of the source of the funding (bonding, grants, etc...).

Ms. Keller asked if the generator was based on school or shelter needs. Mr. Gahr said the generator would need to be replaced regardless. Mr. Arnone asked again how the state will look at the generator replacement. Mr. Walsh asked if the generator capacity was different for a shelter vs. a school. Mr. Nardi said he would look into these items.

Mr. Weseliza asked about distinguishable entrances. He mentioned it was confusing as to which door to enter for which event and that doors and entrances should be distinguished. Mr. Arnone also mentioned parking lot entrances and lighting was lacking. Mr. Nardi said these items would be examined.

Mr. Weseliza also inquired about security needs and asked when these items were added. Mr. Nardi advised those needs would be discussed with appropriate town resources and would be addressed further in programming.

Mayor Kaupin added that a resolution was on the Town Council's agenda to transfer funds to Silver, Petrucelli & Associates for the environmental testing. He also mentioned that Silver Petrucelli or the committee would make the selection of companies to use.

Ms. Keller confirmed with Mr. Nardi that the committee would need to add the 10% markup to the total for environmental studies. This was confirmed.

The Chair asked if the original resolution from the Town Council for Silver Petrucelli's costs + 10% and if that additional 10% could be added to the referenced \$20,000 for the environmental services.

Public Communications:

The Chair opened the floor to public comments. No public comments were offered.

Old Business: None

New Business:

The Chair asked if the Committee addressed item B under new business (Environmental Consultant Selection) first out of respect for Mr. Nardi's offer to remain. No objection was offered.

Item 6B: Review & Selection of an Environmental Consulting Firm

Mr. Muller motioned to open discussion, seconded by Ms. Keller. No objection to discussion.

Mr. Muller said he would go with F&O given prior experience but would also listen to the recommendations of Mr. Nardi.

Mr. Nardi said they have worked with F&O more but they have a good relationship with both Langan and F&O and that cost might be a deciding factor. Mr. Nardi did confirm these are just estimates and that we do not know for certain yet how many samples are needed.

Mr. Walsh brought up the fine-print on the Langan estimate in case additional samples are needed.

The Chair noted that when adding the 10% fee onto the F&O estimate, the total becomes \$21,332.50 and that the Langan cost would be fairly similar. The Mystic estimate would be between \$27,000 and \$28,000. Mr. Weseliza and Mr. Walsh corrected the Chair on the Langan total, putting it (with the 10% fee) between \$25,000 and \$26,000.

The Mystic estimate was ruled out by the Committee based it having the highest cost and the least amount of information.

The Chair asked if someone from public works or anyone could join him in his presentation to the Town Council. Mr. Szlosek said he would bring that up with Public Works.

Ms. Keller asked questions on Langdon estimate and, specifically what was meant by the "reimbursable" expenses. Mr. Nardi explained that the "reimbursable" cost would be related to Langan task 3 and would be between \$2,000 and \$4,000 and would be a cost if such roofing or masonry work was needed. He also said that F&O has a similar line of print in additional costs.

It was further clarified that those would be costs that would have to be reimbursed to the Environmental Consultant.

The Chair inquired as to what would happen if the Environmental Consultant wound up costing more than originally anticipated. Mr. Arnone advised that we would expect them to hold true to the estimate but that would not be something this Committee would be able to anticipate. Mr. Walsh inquired if there any history with F&O doing that. There was nothing shared on this matter.

Mr. Nardi brought up the item of PCB testing. He mentioned it was not required to test for PCBs. Mr. Nardi said some districts have chosen not to test due to removal costs. He further mentioned that after further review of the estimates, Langan is proposing to inventory PCB containing items. If the project goes to construction and the items are inventoried and not tested, they would be removed and disposed of under the assumption they contained PCBs. Mr. Nardi said the benefit of that approach is that once removed it is assumed that PCBs have left the building and there is no need to re-test areas where caulking and windows have been removed. The down side is that a contractor may test on their own. If PCBs then come up, additional testing would then be required.

In summary, Mr. Nardi mentioned that F&O is not including testing costs. Langan is giving the option for testing and is showing costs.

Mr. Arnone asked if PCBs were tested for at Enfield High and Mr. Nardi said they were tested for. He further clarified that such testing at Enfield High was during the study phase or prior. Mr. Nardi also provided further clarifications on the costs between Langan and F&O.

Mr. Nardi recommended getting clarification from F&O on PCB testing and destructive asbestos testing.

The Chair asked of the impact if the Committee waiting until the next meeting to select a firm and then if the Town Council was not approached until March 6th. Mr. Nardi said he thought this was OK but also that the Town Council would only be approving a dollar amount and that the Committee would be selecting a firm. He recommended, if the dollar amount doesn't change, to go forward with Town Council approval for funding and, if necessary, make the company selection at a later date.

The Chair also asked if representatives from F&O and Langan could come to the next meeting to answer questions. Mr. Nardi will reach out to get clarification/breakdown further for review.

Mrs. Neild-Barry mentioned that if the Town Council was not going to allocate funds sufficient to cover Langan then it wouldn't make sense to ask for their presence.

Mr. Kaupin said that if the clarified estimates came back at over \$20,000 then then they can go back to Town Manager asking for a raise in the amount of the resolution.

Ms. Keller said that, for a purpose of comparison, F&O and Langan were comparable through their first two tasks. However, for a fuller comparison, F&O would need to provide additional information on PCBs and destructive asbestos testing.

Mr. Arnone, Mr. Gahr and Mr. Walsh also stated the need for F&O to provide clarification on the costs for these services as well as the importance of these services. Mr. Walsh expressed concern over future state requirements as well and that we should err on the side of caution.

The Chair reiterated the feeling of the Committee from the 2/1 meeting that if such testing isn't performed then it is a disservice to the town. He also mentioned concern over how it would look if the Committee decided to not perform such testing.

Mr. Nardi expressed may be best to go to council with a "not to exceed cost" of \$30,000 and in the interim he will seek cost and service clarification from F&O.

Overall costs were again discussed and Mayor Kaupin asked for clarification on the 0% fee. Mr. Nardi explained it was a mark-up from Silver, Petrucelli & Associates and was for their administrative services.

Ms. Keller asked for a total cost currently from Langan. The Chair replied that Langan was at \$25,399 with the 10% fee (including everything except the potential \$2,000 to \$4,000 roofing / masonry charge). The worst-case scenario under Langan would be approximately \$30,000.

Ms. Keller further inquired about the PCB testing vs. inventory process. Mr. Nardi further clarified about how debris would still be removed under the assumption that PCBs were present. Mr. Nardi gave examples of other projects they are involved with and how the project could be derailed if PCBs were found after referendum. Mr. Nardi advised it would be a risk to not test for PCBs and that it is foolish to not test and that it is best to have a clear picture.

Mr. Arnone said that not knowing the exact costs and requesting a not-to-exceed number might lead to additional questions. Ms. Neild-Barry asked if Mr. Nardi could get totals before the Chair presented at council. Mr. Nardi advised he would to get the information by the end of the week.

A motion was made to table the selection of an environmental testing consultant. The Chair asked for the motion to be rephrased to postpone indefinitely, citing the difference was that a tabled motion is one that would be reconsidered during the same meeting.

Mr. Muller then made a motion to postpone indefinitely the selection of an environmental testing consultant. The motion was seconded by Ms. Keller. With no discussion, the motion passed by a vote of 8-0-0.

With the item closed and no further questions, the Chair thanked Mr. Nardi for his time.

Item 6A: Rescheduling the 6/7/17 meeting to 5/31/17

The Chair asked if the Committee would object to rescheduling the 6/7/17 meeting to 5/31/17. The Chair cited the timeline and the need to submit for reimbursement in early June. The Committee agreed to the date change with no objection. The Chair advised he would communicate with the Town Manager's office to adjust the online calendar.

Item 6C: Programming Recommendations

It was mentioned there was nothing to discuss at this time and that meetings would be taking place in the near future.

Item 6D: Agenda Items for the 3/1 Meeting

- Further presentation from Silver, Petrucelli & Associates
- Updates on Programming
- Revisiting the Environmental Consultant Issue
- Updates from the Town Council

Committee Communications:

The Chair then opened the floor to Committee comments. Mr. Weseliza asked about the article published in the Journal Inquirer about the \$16 million being the final cost of the project. He advised having a mechanism in place to reach out for a correction to be made. The Chair took the opportunity to provide clarification.

The Chair mentioned he reached out to the JI reporter as soon as the article was published and that the editor was contacted. However, the editor chose not to make any substantive changes to the article.

Mr. Weseliza suggested that if a follow-up article comes out after this meeting that perhaps some clarification can be reported so the public is aware that a higher number may come out.

The Chair further clarified that comments were sent to the editor indicating the \$16 million being a preliminary number but unfortunately, the article was not changed.

Ms. Keller suggested speaking to this point in front of the Town Council as there might be concerns when the final number jumps. Mr. Gahr suggested that would help get the word out as the meeting is televised.

Adjournment:

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Weseliza and seconded by Mr. Nuccio. Motion approved by unanimous consent and the Committee adjourned at 8:20PM

■ EMR