PENFIELD BUILDING COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, June 26, 2014 at 6:00 pm
Board of Education Center
2nd floor Conference Room
501 Kings Highway, Fairfield, CT 06825
penfieldcommittee@town.fairfield.ct.us

Members Present: James Bradley, Robert Bellitto, William Sapone, Ian Bass, Ken Jones, Jane Nelson (via Skype), Ellery Plotkin (absent 6:25-7:15), Richard Speciale, Andrew Graceffa

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Gerry Lombardo, Twig Holland, Tom Steinke, Ken Porcino, David Herr, Jim DeStefano, Judy Ewing, Rick Grauer, Dick Dmochowski, Genevieve Riley

1. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 6:06 p.m.

2. Confirmation of Quorum – A quorum was confirmed.

3. Confirmation of Meeting Agenda – The committee confirmed the meeting agenda.

4. Approve Meeting Minutes – A motion was made to amend the minutes to include a statement made by Ian Bass, the motion failed, and the minutes of June 12, 2014 were approved as written.

5. Organizational matters – There was a discussion on the procedures for budget tracking and approval of invoices. It was reported that Ms. Holland will prepare and distribute a spreadsheet listing the amounts committed and up for approval, and Mr. Sapone will prepare and distribute a budget summary to the committee. Invoices will be approved at the first committee meeting of each month going forward. However, Mr. Sapone distributed to the members an invoice submitted by DeStefano & Chamberlain, in the amount of $22,065. The committee asked for clarification and Mr. DeStefano said the invoice covered the Phase 1 investigative work, including the report on options 1-6, the invoice representing about 80% of the contracted not to exceed amount of $25,000, including all work as per the contract with the exception of going before the RTM and Board of Finance. Mr. Bradley requested that the Draft Report prepared for the June 12 meeting be put in final form. The committee also requested that more detail be included on future invoices. A motion was made to approve the invoice which passed, with all in favor except Mr. Bellitto, who abstained.

6. Presentation and discussion of costs associated with the design recommendations for foundation and building repairs by the project engineer and construction manager –

Ken Procino and David Herr, Shawmut Construction, and Jim DeStefano presented and participated in the discussion about nine options that were requested by the committee for further detail and estimates on June 12th.

- Option 1: Repair the Pavilion to pre-storm Sandy condition - $2,434,825 (10,252 sq')
- Option 2: Repair the Pavilion to pre-storm Sandy condition, with piling support added only where footings had failed- $3,214,100 (10,252 sq')
- Option 2A: Repair the Pavilion to pre-storm Sandy condition, with piling support added to West Wing - $4,520,928 (10,252 sq')
- Option 3A: Raise the building vertically, work under the building, then lower into position at new FEMA height- $7,267,109 (27,567 sq')
- Option 3B: Raise the building, move to the parking lot while piles are installed, then move the building back and set on the piles at new FEMA height- $7,101,896 (27,567 sq')
- Option 4: Install pilings in the parking lot and move the building back into the parking lot, set at the new FEMA height - $5,823,337 (27,567 sq')
- Option 5: Only raise the center and west part of the building (Phase II portion) to new FEMA height and leave the locker wing in place - $4,878,638 (27,567 sq')
- Option 6: Demolish the center and west wing (Phase II portion), reconstruct as a smaller elevated pavilion at the FEMA height, leaving the locker wing in place - $4,009,721 (14,000 sq')
- Option 7: Demolish the locker wing and raise only the Phase II wing to new FEMA height- $4,758,519(10,252 sq')

The timing for each option was also discussed by Mr. Procino, with only option 4 going into June of 2015, the other options having tentative completion by May 2015, provided funding approvals are timely received.

There was considerable discussion with committee members regarding each option. It was mentioned that any expenditure of $2.7 M or above will likely trigger full FEMA compliance. Mr. DeStefano repeated the recommendations outlined in the Draft Report and expressed his preference for Options 3A, 3B, and 7. Mr. Sapone expressed his view that Option 1 should still be considered viable,

though a number of members of the committee disagreed. Mr. Herr advised the committee that the estimated cost involved in just moving the building were about $1.5 M. The committee raised the option of demolishing the entire structure, salvaging materials and equipment, and then rebuilding to avoid the cost of moving the building. However, the committee was advised that a total demolition of both wings and rebuilding would likely delay the project another full year because of the need for additional approvals.

After a thorough discussion on each option, the committee eliminated several options to focus future discussions. Options 2 and 2A were rejected as being over the FEMA 50% limit. As between options 3A and 3B, the committee believed 3A should be eliminated for safety and cost reasons. Option 4 was rejected as being too disruptive to the function of a beach pavilion, because of its distance from the beach, and for the loss of parking. Option 6 was rejected because there was believed to be no need to re-design the west wing. The committee then reached a consensus on the following.

Option 1, while not recommended by the engineer, was to remain as a baseline, being the minimal scope and cost option. The scope and budget for Option 3B should be reviewed and confirmed. As to Options 5 and 7, there was a general consensus that the West Wing would be raised, leveled, temporarily moved inland, repaired at inland location, a new pile supported foundation would be installed and the West Wing moved back and set on the new foundation. The East Wing option for leaving the locker wing "as-is" at existing finished floor elevation needed further investigation, to see what FEMA issues would arise if the buildings were separated. The committee requested that the scope and costs for the option of demolishing the locker wing be confirmed and also requested costs associated with demolishing the existing locker wing and building a new, smaller locker facility attached to the raised west wing. This might involve reconstructing the locker area to be a changing area, perhaps with day lockers. Mr. Lombardo said he would need to discuss any program changes with the Recreation Commission. A request was made by the committee for the engineer to investigate and report back on the discussed locker wing options regarding FEMA issues as well as locker wing programming for size considerations and cost.

7. Review progress and priorities - No Discussion was had on this item

8. Old Business – None.

9. New Business – None.

10. Public Comment – Mr. Grauer discussed the possible use of rip rap on the building side of the bulkhead, and also was concerned about flooding. There followed a discussion with Mr. DeStefano on the bulkhead design.

11. Adjourn – At 8:56 p.m., a motion was made to adjourn which passed.