

**PENFIELD BUILDING COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, March 13, 2014 at 6:00 p.m.
Sullivan Independence Hall
1st floor Conference Room
725 Old Post Road, Fairfield, CT 06824
penfieldcommittee@town.fairfield.ct.us**

Members Present: James Bradley Andrew Graceffa
William Sapone Ian Bass
Jane Nelson Robert Bellitto Jr.
Rich Speciale (via skype) Ellery Plotkin

Members Absent: Ken Jones

Also Present: Joseph Michelangelo-Public Works, Thomas Steinke-
Conservation, Gerry Lombardo-Parks & Recreation,
Twig Holland-Purchasing, Phil Ryan-Purchasing

1. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bradley at 6:05 p.m.

2. Confirmation of Quorum – There was a quorum.

3. Confirmation of Meeting Agenda – The members accepted and confirmed agenda.

4. Approve Minutes of February 27, 2014 meeting – The chairman asked if there were any changes to be made to the minutes. There being none, the minutes were approved.

5. Organizational matters - Chairman Bradley distributed a draft project schedule and there was a discussion among the committee members on various dates listed. There was a discussion on what to review at the next meeting, and Mr. Bradley advised that Thomas Steinke will attend the meeting on March 27, to discuss issues related to conservation which may be of importance to the project. An insurance update may also be scheduled for the next meeting. At a future meeting, Gerry Lombardo of Parks & Rec will discuss uses of the pavilion.

6. Update on electrical/security systems by Joseph Michelangelo, Director of Public Works, continuing discussion on area flooding, building construction – Mr. Michelangelo advised the committee that work on the temporary fire protection system has been completed. Work on the security system will be completed shortly. Work will begin shortly on the new fencing, weather permitting. Mr. Michelangelo reported that all of the electrical circuits were being tested, and it appeared that there was much less damage than expected. The full report will be presented at the next meeting. There was a brief discussion on similarly checking the plumbing system and then mechanical systems in April.

7. Presentation and discussion regarding FEMA requirements, elevations and design standards by Jim Wendt – Jim Wendt gave a brief summary of the FEMA regulations as they applied to this building and the options to repair, replace, and/or elevate. He said he was more familiar with the residential requirements. There were questions about the value of the existing building and implications for the 50% rule and upgrades to existing building codes that might be required or desired. If damages and repairs exceed 50% of building value, it has to be elevated to meet current FEMA requirements. There is no option to spend less than 50% to avoid having to raise the building. It is strictly a damage calculation, and based on what it would cost to return the building to its pre-damaged condition. There is no option to self insure if the damage cost exceeds 50% and the building is not elevated to the new FEMA standard.

Improvements, if undertaken at the same time, to the building could count towards the 50%. The 50% rule does not include soft costs or the value of the land. It only involves the assessed value of the building and damage to the building. There was a discussion on how to best value the building. In residential properties they generally look at the tax assessor records. Since it is new dwelling, the as built costs could be an influence on the appraisal, and there is little depreciation. There are certain costs we don't have to consider; preparing plans, repair parking lot and exterior lighting.

Any changes made to the bulkhead or surrounding beach area would not be included in the calculations. Similarly, if additional scour protection is added beneath the building, that should not factor into the building cost. Mr. Wendt was asked about the consequences of non-compliance for the town. There might be higher flood insurance rates or other penalties that FEMA might impose on the town.

If the cost exceeds 50%, changes can be made to the building, elements removed or revised, so long as the new structure follows the current FEMA code.

There was a discussion on what would happen if the cost was under 50% and then an unforeseen issue arises which would increase the costs to over 50%. It was discussed that the building would then have to meet the new FEMA standard. However, it was felt that those issues could be worked out between the town and the insurance company, and that tight control of the construction process should avoid the issue, such as having a clerk of the works monitoring the project on a day to day basis.

The committee was advised that the original field card for the Penfield pavilion address, found on-line, was dated 1913 and assessed the property at \$6.4M. It was believed that the Tax Assessor has updated card in his office.

There was some discussion on the information provided to FEMA by residents, and their possible application to the pavilion property. Mr. Wendt believed the assessed value and damage estimates were being negotiated between the insurance company and the town and likely those would be the numbers used in the analysis.

There is no variation in FEMA requirements between occupied residential space and other non-occupied buildings such as the pavilion. The decks also would need to meet the current FEMA standards.

8. Review of tasks and schedule, discussion on issuing Requests For Proposals For Professional Services – Jim Bradley then introduced a draft of an RFP for professional services and the committee then discussed how best to proceed. The committee discussed having the professionals come prepared with options. Twig Holland then clarified the town bid process. She suggested that the lead professional should be a structural engineer, not an architect and the committee after some discussion was in agreement. There was then a discussion concerning having a separate estimator, so as to have an independent source of cost data. It was generally agreed that a separate estimator should also be hired.

There was a discussion on the process for funding, and the need to obtain approval from the town bodies once an option was recommended, and having the support of the engineer and estimator when presentations are made. Before that approval, the committee can only undertake the preliminary studies and estimates needed to go before the Boards and public for approval.

The committee then discussed the bid and selection process, and Mr. Bass suggested getting fresh ideas on how to proceed from those bidding on the project. There was a discussion on what would be delivered to the committee before a selection was made.

There was a discussion on whether to go with a request for qualifications (RFQ) before the RFP. After some discussion it was believed that an RFQ was not necessary.

Ms. Nelson asked for copies of the actual documents Purchasing sends out and what would be received in writing. Ms. Holland explained that after the RFP is posted, documentation would be received and distributed to the committee, that the committee would develop a rating matrix, and that the committee would meet with a select group of bidders who would make presentations on their ideas for the pavilion. It was agreed that the committee would review draft RFP's at the next meeting.

9. Presentation by the Flood and Erosion Board on future plans regarding area flooding – Given the extended discussions above, the Chair then asked Mr. Grauer, Chair of Flood and Erosion, if he would mind waiting until the 27th to give his report. He agreed, and distributed a written report to the committee members to prepare for his presentation.

10. Old Business – None discussed.

11. New Business – None discussed.

12. Public Comment – Mr. Camarro gave his comments on elevating the pavilion in stages, and also suggested that a town engineer follow the project and work with the committee.

14. Adjourn- Mr. Sapone motioned to adjourn, Robert Belitto 2nd, and the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Tesei