

ENFIELD HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
February 16, 2017

A meeting of the Enfield High School Building Committee was held at Enfield High School, 1264 Enfield Street, Enfield, Connecticut on February 16, 2017.

1. **CALL TO ORDER** The meeting was called to order at 6:55 pm by Randy Daigle
2. **MOMENT OF SILENCE**
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
4. **FIRE EVACUATION ANNOUNCEMENT**

5. **ROLL CALL**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Randy Daigle, Gina Cekala, Joe Muller, Tim Neville, Wendy Osada, George Rypysc, Greg Strich, Laura Vella

MEMBERS ABSENT

Dr. Ginny Austin, Walter Kruzel, Doug Maxellon, Jim Nasuta, Lynn Scull, Gina Sullivan, Donna Szewczak

ALSO PRESENT

Jim Giuliano, Dean Petrucelli, Amar Shamas

6. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve the Regular Meeting Minutes dated January 19, 2017

Seconded by Wendy Osada

Motion passes by a show of hands

Abstained by Joe Muller, Wendy Osada

7. **COMMITTEE GUESTS**

None

8. **ARCHITECTS REPORT**

Dean states we are at our contract close out phase of the project. As you recall we had our CA portion of our fee extended through January. This week we had 16 shop drawings that came in. All of them are the owners/operations manual, equipment. We are reviewing those and get them back as quickly as we can. We continue to work on the as-builts. We are waiting for the electrical mark ups from Gilbane, which we should be seeing any day now. We continue to work in close out with the SES comments. We continue to work with building and fire to close out the project, we're still answering questions, we're still revising code sheets for the building official in the D wing portion. We're working on an SK right now as a directive, the neighbor complaint through the town manager of the E wing stair and the amount of light that is spilling out of that stair in the night time. We're working up a PR to Gilbane so that we can get a cost associated with that corrective work.

Wendy states in the last email you said you still didn't have the last lists you needed from everybody, is that resolved?

Randy states the Town is 100% wrong with asking for as built to close out the project. Technically and legally we already have a CO for every portion of this building, so we do not have to provide them. The as built are associated with closing out a project. You get your OE manuals, training. It has zero to do with CO's. We already have a CO, a list was never provided that was promised a month ago. To date we still don't have a list. They're already off site, their (Gilbane) contract ends in February. Every time we go into a new month legally we have general conditions at \$86,000.00 plus a month we have to pay Gilbane. I've talked to the Town Manager and Mike Cerrato.

Wendy asks we are going to start paying \$86,000.00 a month?

Randy states we have through February, then we owe \$86,000.00 a month.

Tim states he will call the Superintendent.

Randy states they are saying we have a list of items that have to get done. Remember we had that meeting in the auditorium and they were going to give us a list that Friday? We never got it. They said they would give us a list the following Friday, never got it.

Gina Cekala asks what is that list specifically called?

Randy states items that she had concerns over.

Tim states items for the final CO.

Amar states when we had the meeting in the auditorium, the understanding was there would be a walk through the building and develop a list from the fire marshal and the building official. We have not seen the building officials list. We've seen partials, but not the final audit of that list.

Jim asks if the partials were per area, correct?

Amar states no, we had those when we were doing the actual area before the CO. After the D wing there were new lists.

Dean states we were also getting request for cut sheets. It appears that she is still actively working on the list.

Randy states we have demobilized. We don't have crews here. So then we'd have to pull people from somewhere else, at premium.

Gina asks why are we paying \$86,000.00 per month?

Randy states general conditions, as of March 1st.

Dean states we are out of CA contract in January, Gilbane is out in February.

Amar states if it is a small list we will gladly address it.

Gina suggests sitting down face to face.

Randy states we did.

Amar states we met with the fire marshals we were able to obtain their list. We had a 2 hour meeting and walked through line item by line item.

Greg asks if they are all closed?

Amar states within that list there are 2 ½ pages that are school issues. It has nothing to do with us, furniture locations, scenery that was brought over from Fermi. It had nothing to do with the building construction. A meeting would be greatly appreciated. We want to be proactive about it.

Randy states they are also going back up and popping ceiling tiles, which is something that has already passed over a year ago.

9. PROGRAM MANAGERS REPORT

Jim states I am continuing to monitor the commissioning items as they're wrapping up. I am updating bond status worksheet with John Wilcox. I met with Gilbane a few weeks ago to review outstanding costs and ineligible vs. eligible. I was involved in monitoring the recurring C of O items, processing State change orders and monitoring of close out items.

10. PROGRAM CONSULTANT REPORT

George states he'd like to thank the building and grounds for the move of band and drama. They did it in one day. They put it in the band room and we moved it. I am getting questions from people on Nutmeg Avenue why this place is lit up like it is at night. I raised the question which is being addressed on why the 3 music rooms are echo chambers. Another question asked was why is the ticket booth, the lower part a different color wood than anywhere else in the building?

Amar states this wood paneling has colors, and it's the way you approach it. We went through the same exercises and the variations.

Dean states there is an alternating band, one band will appear light and one will appear dark. If you look from the other side, it will flip. What looks light is now dark.

George continues that the round circle talk through in the ticket booth is high.

Dean states he will look at it. The sound should be fine.

Wendy states at the back entrance/lobby by the gymnasium the water fill for the water bottle doesn't work.

Amar states when situation like that come up, if we are here we will look at it. All those issues should be reported to Mark Gahr and Jim O'Neil. They need to diagnose those issues first to see if it is a warranty issue or not.

George states in the auditorium, the control panel for the lighting on the stage, there is no way of securing that. There is no cover on it. The old one they had a chain link fence around it. That panel is completely open.

Dean states he will check.

Laura asked what happened with the cracked tile in the auditorium?

Amar states we are working on it.

Wendy states she was approached by a resident. On Nutmeg, is there two different fences? It's not being maintained in between and it is becoming a mess.

George states there is an existing fence that has been there forever and one for the retaining wall. It is not the building committee, it is public works.

11. CMR REPORT

Amar states we still have a couple of crews addressing the punch list items on site. We have plowed through the fire marshals list. We are in the close out mode of the project. We are cleaning up the last bit of things left to do. We are going to start reducing staff. Intent is to completely demobilize by the end of April.

12. COMMUNICATION SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT

Wendy states on January 26th Greg and I met with the traffic engineer, Sgt. Meier of Enfield Police, and Enfield Fire Lt. Ed Shirley, Enfield Fire Deputy Fire Chief Paul Januszewski regarding opening the Riverview Street gate, the issue is there is no direct access from the main road and should there be an emergency and emergency vehicles need to get to the building, they can open the Riverview gate. Nothing was ever said about that before I started this venture. Based on that fact I recommend that we drop the issue and not go back for a site plan modification. That safety concern makes sense.

Randy asks why is it a safety concern for that street and not the other street? Riverview has less kids. The other street has hundreds.

Wendy states because you have to have at least one. Now they have terms that I understand. Should we ask if we can open the Riverview Street gate and lock the Pearl Street gate? That's a whole different conversation.

Laura states it doesn't make sense, the fields are right there.

Randy states it's only for when school opens up and lets out to reduce the traffic.

Wendy states that Greg was at the meeting. Did you get any sense that they would change their mind to support unlocking that gate?

Greg states he agrees. We should solicit their assistance to help with the traffic light.

Wendy states at the same meeting we discussed traffic calming options within the boundaries of the property for such things as speeding, dangerous places to cross, veering wide around corners. With concerns about equipment and structures, the recommendation that was made is that the traffic calming issues we would consider would be ones that are based on pavement markings, signs and speed limits. We directed Malone and McBroom to do a traffic calming recommendation and we will bring this back. A drawing was shown of recommendations.

Greg states this is the minimal type approach. It was concluded at the meeting that we should try the simple things first. They recommended removal of the stop sign at the exit of the property onto Pearl street.

Dean states what they are recommending is a painted yellow line as a center line marking on the entire loop and signage, stop signs, speed limit signs and warning signs and 10 MPH speed limit signs.

Randy states the police wanted the stop sign at Pearl Street because if there is an incident the town is not liable. They didn't want people racing around there.

Wendy states Sgt. Meier said to get rid of it.

Randy states if he has that in writing then fine. To differentiate the property line, you should have a stop sign. Early on there was a discussion. It is a cross area.

Wendy states I'm assuming the next steps are to sit down with them and see what they think about this, then whatever they want us to do we'll have to get a price.

Randy states stiping is simple.

Wendy states on the traffic signal, although they weren't enthusiastic about it they agreed they would not advise against. The last time we talked about it, I thought it was going to be requested through the traffic division. It's back to being the building committee or traffic engineer. We don't have to determine if it is operational all day long or flashing only. Sgt. Meier brought up the bike path that is in the works. Because the light may require lane modifications or lane widening we need to coordinate with John Cabibo about the bike path.

Randy states our project is separate.

Wendy states I want to find out what's going on and make sure what we're doing is something that is going to have to be undone or will work appropriately.

Randy states we cannot modify, we cannot re-do lights. This project is getting done in a month. If we're going to be ordering light fixtures for streets it's going to 4 to 6 months.

Wendy states we are talking about laneage. Making sure you have enough feet width. We have to look at how wide the lanes have to be.

Randy states I think it has to be a separate town project. Any modifications to this is outside of our scope.

Wendy asks do you want me to sit down with the traffic engineer and look at the plans with John Cabibo and see if we can come up with something that works for all of us?

Randy states it is a different project outside of our scope.

Wendy states I just want to make sure what we spend money on doesn't have to be undone.

Laura states what you're saying is what it will look like if a traffic signal gets approved. We just want to have this conversation.

Randy states our jurisdiction stops at the street. The traffic light is not part of the building committee.

Wendy states we're paying for it.

Randy states we can appropriate funds for it, but it is outside our jurisdiction. The building committee has no say outside that boundary at the top of the driveway. Our charge is within our property line.

Tim asks if the State allows us to put a light in they are responsible for any change in lanes?

Randy states absolutely. The study, the change in lanes, all of it. We will pay for the light to help out but as far as traffic studies, change of lanes, removal of poles, that is the State because it is a State highway.

Wendy asks are we able to pay the traffic engineer for the work that is required on this to do the request?

Randy states no, we'd have to get special approval for that. Our footprint is the property line.

Wendy states I would still have to go to Malone and McBroom and have them put together the request that goes to the State and come up with designs for what the State requires for a by-pass lane or extra break down lane.

Randy states our charge was to ask them do we meet the merit points to authorize payment for a light.

Wendy states the answer is still no.

Randy states if it came back yes, then the State would take over the road redesign. We would not be paying for the redesign of the highway. We are trying to find out if we can get a light. All the calculations would be for coming onto our property and exiting our property. The road itself is a State highway.

Laura states, say they approve and they say it costs \$300,000.000 here is the \$300,000.00. It would then be up to the State to work with the locals to come up with that design. We get approved, we give them the money and we're out of the picture.

Randy states yes. Once they say yes you meet the points you can have one, now it's their project. We would assist by paying for the light like we agreed to.

Wendy states the difference between the hardware for the light vs. the engineering services, you're saying we can pay for the light we can't pay for the engineering services. I understand that now. I think we need more engineering services before we put the request back in again. I'm trying to look out for conflicts in advance. The police recommend that we look at that before we proceed. I will find out at this point can we put the request in and when it comes back see how it goes. I think it is in contradiction to what the police department is expecting. I will have to reset that expectation with the police department.

Randy states that has nothing to do with our project.

Laura states we could make recommendations. They may take them or not. We don't want to spend money with the traffic engineers when it is ultimately the State's decision.

Tim states it is not that we don't want to spend the money, legally we can't. I understand the confusion and the work that you have done is incredible but the State controls that.

Randy states we have authorization from the bond commission for the light fixture. We cannot spend a penny outside the property. We cannot even buy bleachers for the football field because the football field is outside our designated property.

Wendy states the light fixture is one thing, if it requires road widening, can we pay for that as well?

Randy states no, the top of the street is where our property line is. The road widening is not for us. The light is for traffic on our site.

Laura states when the State says we approve the light and they determine the cost. When they give us that cost is it just for the light?

Randy states all we are authorized to pay for is a light fixture. Not widening the road, not by-pass lanes, not striping.

Laura states so putting it in, the installation of it that's not part of the cost?

Randy states that may be a gray area. Installation is one thing, but the road it totally out of our jurisdiction. The referendum itself, won't allow that.

Wendy will send Gina an email and get an opinion.

Randy states If the State approves a light we have authorization from the Bond Council to pay for the traffic light and I believe the installation. When we initially wanted to do a passing lane the referendum didn't allow us to do that.

Wendy states when we got an estimate and we asked how much do we need to set aside? It was very clear they said it was 'this amount for the light' and 'this amount for road work'. We lumped those amounts together and said we put aside a half a million dollars.

Randy states the light itself it about \$300,000.00.

Wendy states then they added the \$200,000.00 on. We had that conversation here. When we were having the conversation and asking about how much money to set aside we said the light would be about \$250,000.00 to \$300,000.00 and potential road work you'd have to add another \$200,000.00. Was that a conversation we had? Dean recalls the conversation.

Randy states the bond commission approved \$300,000.00. They never said anything about road work.

Dean states we had a conversation about a half a million.

Laura states I remember the question does that amount include installation? Or, was that for the light itself.

Randy states the reason this was brought up is because the police department is apparently asking if we would pay to have a study done?

Wendy states no. Because we asked the police department if they would support putting in a light, they said yes but oh by the way there is already a bike path planned going in on route 5 and John Cabibo is in charge of that. Why don't you just sit down with him and make sure you guys aren't going to be in conflict with each other. They are not asking us to spend any money. The light itself may require a bypass lane. The traffic engineer said that.

Amar asked who set the \$300,000.00 number?

Randy states when we met with the bond commission and asked they went through what our charge is and it had to do with traffic so they would allow \$300,000.00 for the traffic light.

Amar states the best thing to do is to engage someone to get a consult.

Randy states the State said no.

Wendy states the State will not pay for the light but Malone and McBroom, our traffic engineers said if you ask the State and pay for it you have a great chance. We have not made that request yet.

Dean states the only request was have the State pay for it and they denied us.

Amar states to get a proper number/estimate, there are traffic signals and there are traffic signals. You don't know what you're going to be designing. It needs to be conceptually developed. What did you factor as the design costs? Someone has to pay for the design.

Wendy states we had this conversation, the total cost would be \$500,000.00.

Amar asks if that includes the design as well?

Tim states I think it's an assumption.

Wendy states if the traffic engineer was here and if we asked from start to finish what this whole thing would cost and he said it was \$500,000.00, we had that conversation. That's why we've been saying do we have \$500,000.00 left to pay for the light if necessary. I'd like bond counsel to end this conversation, let me get bond counsel recommendation on whether or not they have authorized just the equipment or does it include engineering services and potential road widening. That will answer the question of whether we pursue this or not.

Amar states even though you are renovate as new status and you are assumed fully eligible for the reimbursement rate, there are costs within the project that are not eligible for reimbursement. We submitted 15 State change orders and the total of those amounts that the State is deeming ineligible until final audit is \$3.6 million dollars. That \$3.6 million dollars and counting, the State is saying those

are all ineligible unless they have the opportunity to review them. The State is not very timely reviewing those change orders. Some have been there for a year. On top of that you have the final audit of the project, where the State will withhold 5% of the payment until the final audit takes place. It's very difficult to say yes, there is a half a million or a million dollars unless there is some comfort level of the eligibles vs. the ineligibles. You could be in a situation where five years from now the State could come in and do the final audit and they find more ineligibles.

Wendy states I am getting frustrated because at every meeting I have said do we have that \$500,000.00 and was given a definitive yes. I appreciate being given this new information now.

Amar states you are still dealing with an active project from a financial standpoint.

Wendy states my question has been do we have \$500,000.00 to pay for this? I have been given the answer yes. Nobody gave me this explanation before.

Amar states it is very difficult to pin point the dollars. I wish I could predict what the State it going to do.

Randy states we don't have control over what the State is going to deem eligible.

Wendy states I get it, I wish that had been the answer several times before when I asked this question.

Randy states we have the money, it's just the State has changed their rules on reviewing and deeming what is eligible and what is ineligible within the last few weeks. What was eligible when we had 3 million dollars is not ineligible.

Amar states the financials are tricky to pin down. We are now working towards the end of the project and hopefully there are no other surprises. We get directions to do more work and as a committee you decide what is a priority. Some of the elements are a must do.

Randy states that's why we want that list so we know what is ahead of us.

Wendy states I completely understand. I think at this point, I put this on hold.

Amar states in a couple of weeks Jim will present a summary of the financials to our best guess of that time.

Wendy states we need the bond opinion anyway. I will wait for you guys to tell me when we are comfortable.

13. OLD BUSINESS:

None

14. NEW BUSINESS:

Randy states all the invoices we will be bringing forward have been previously approved by the budget sub-committee.

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve Gilbane Building Company Requisition 45, dated January 31, 2017, in the corrected amount of \$853,111.00

Seconded by Laura Vella
Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve Sustainable Engineering Solutions, LLC Invoice 1998, dated January 31, 2017, in the amount of \$4,626.34
Seconded by Laura Vella
Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve Red Thread Invoice 608482, dated November 21, 2016, in the amount of \$3,784.29
Seconded by Laura Vella
Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve Silver Petrucelli & Associates Invoice 17-101, dated February 1, 2017, in the amount of \$41,417.68
Seconded by Laura Vella
Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve HAKS Engineers, P.C., Invoice CT0283-45, dated January 30, 2017, in the amount of \$2,132.74
Seconded by Laura Vella
Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve Insalco Invoice Number 6510, dated February 2, 2017, in the amount of \$51,675.03
Seconded by Laura Vella
Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to **Table** the Review and Approval of Insalco Invoice Number 6511, dated February 2, 2017, in the amount of \$40,307.26
Seconded by Laura Vella
Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Add to the Agenda CSG Invoice Number 14, dated February 13, 2017, in the amount of \$6,374.76
Seconded by Laura Vella
Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve CSG Invoice Number 14, dated February 13, 2017, in the amount of \$6,374.76
Seconded by Laura Vella
Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Add to the Agenda the following ATP's: ATP0014, ATP0206, ATP0229, ATP0274, ATP0274, ATP0278, ATP0279, ATP0280, ATP0281
Seconded by Laura Vella
Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve ATP0014 – FINAL – Rock Excavation for Site Utilities – North Side, in the amount of \$329,833.00

Seconded by Laura Vella

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve ATP0206 – FINAL – Existing Auditorium Walls, in the amount of \$16,371.00

Seconded by Laura Vella

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve ATP0229 – FINAL – Modifications at FACS Food Storage, in the amount of \$5,774.45

Seconded by Laura Vella

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve ATP0274 – FINAL – Request Additional Auditorium Exit Signs, in the amount of \$6,264.00

Seconded by Laura Vella

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve ATP0278 – FINAL – Gymnasium Display and Scoring Equipment, in the amount of \$1,912.00

Seconded by Laura Vella

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve ATP0279 – FINAL – Fire Lane Stenciling and Signage, in the amount of \$9,792.00

Seconded by Laura Vella

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve ATP0280 – ESTIMATED – Vent to Reduce Smell on D Roof, in the amount of \$3,399.00

Seconded by Laura Vella

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve ATP0281 – ESTIMATED – Wall Dividers in E146 and C125, in the amount of \$20,334.00

Seconded by Laura Vella

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Greg Strich to Approve ATP0277 – FINAL – Media Center Display Case, in the amount of \$19,753.00

Seconded by Laura Vella

Motion passes by a show of hands

15. EXECUTIVE SESSION

None

16. SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING

Motion made by Greg Strich to Cancel the Regular Meeting Scheduled for February 23 and March 2, 2017

Seconded by Laura Vella

Motion passes by a show of hands

NEXT MEETING WILL BE MARCH 9, 2017

17. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

a. Liaison Comments

b. Committee Member Comments

c. Good to the Order

i. Any Happy News

18. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to Adjourn the meeting made by Greg Strich

Seconded by Laura Vella

Motion passes by a show of hands

Adjourned: 8:10 pm