

**Penfield Building Committee  
Sullivan Independence Hall  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room  
725 Old Post Road  
Fairfield, CT. 06824**

**Thursday, March 10, 2016**

[penfieldcommittee@town.fairfield.ct.us](mailto:penfieldcommittee@town.fairfield.ct.us)

**Present:** Mr. Bradley, Mr. Graceffa, Mrs. Nelson, Mr. Bass, Mr. Bellitto, Mr. Zieff, Mr. Plotkin, Mr. Speciale (via skype)

**Absent:** Mr. Pitaniello

**Others:** Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Warrington, Mr. Ben Danton, Mr. McDonald, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Dyer, Mr. Mayer, Mr. Vincent, Mr. Michelangelo, Mrs. Ewing, Mr. Tetreau

**1. Call to Order**

Mr. Bradley called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

**2. Confirmation of Quorum**

Quorum confirmed.

**3. Confirmation of Meeting Agenda and Order**

Mr. Bradley asked to move Item 7 to the beginning of the agenda because Mr. Michelangelo and Mr. Tetreau had to attend another meeting. There was a consensus and Item 7 was moved to the beginning of the agenda.

**4. Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes from 02/25/16**

Mr. Zieff moved and Mr. Bass seconded a motion to approve the Minutes 02/25/16. 7 in favor, 1 abstention (Bellitto). Motion passed.

**5. Project status report – Shawmut Design and Construction**

Mr. Vincent distributed the Three-Week Look Ahead Schedule.

Mr. Vincent said that the berm removal has been delayed due to late posting of Notice of Tree Removal. There is a 10 day waiting period required before removal and it was posted on 2/29/16.

Mr. Vincent reported that they mobilized last week. The site fence is up with the scrim. All erosion control is in place. He said that they are a little ahead of schedule and the demolition contractor is starting a few days early. The buildings are now separated. Mr. Vincent met with the building movers.

Mr. Chamberlain reported that a lot of the pavers are broken and were like this before the work started.

Mr. Vincent said that the Steel Contractor has filed for Chapter 11 and he has reached out to the second bidder.

#### **6. Project Oversight status report – Colliers International**

Mr. Warrington distributed a Construction Progress Report. He also had a power point which correlated to the report.

The summary to date – the contractor has mobilized; there is temporary construction power; there is construction fencing and soil/erosion controls in place; there is selective salvage in the locker rooms and bathrooms, preparations underway for demolition; site utilities demo and capping include sanitary sewer, water, gas and electrical.

#### **7. Continuing agenda item: Design, scope, cost and funding impact, timing and feasibility regarding proposed increase in building height. Report from Shawmut regarding cost. Report from DeStefano & Chamberlain regarding changes in parking lot grades and drainage patterns as well as identification of any potential FEMA/building footprint conflict. Report from Joe Michelangelo regarding Flood Management Certificate and FEMA funding regarding proposed increase in building height. Decision whether or not to proceed regarding proposed increase in building height.**

The final cost from Shawmut to increase the building height 1 foot with free board to comply with DEEP requirements is \$361,053.00, excluding possible modifications to the parking lot.

Mr. Michelangelo said that he has confirmed with DEEP that the revised plans met their criteria. DEEP had comments on the proposed rip rap revetment and existing bulkhead. He said that we will get the Flood Plain Management Certificate. The \$500,000 has been approved and DEEP also will support an additional \$300,000 grant. Therefore, if the building is raised the additional foot, we will be eligible for \$500,000 and potentially an additional \$300,000. He said that the Flood Plain Certificate has to be in place before the work is started.

Mr. Bellitto asked if getting rid of the bulkhead is a condition of getting grants. Mr. Michelangelo said no. Mr. Bellitto expressed concern that if we make a decision to keep the bulkhead in place that it will be a problem later on. Mr. Michelangelo said they did not say the bulkhead must go. Mr. Plotkin pointed out that the correspondence says they recommend the bulkhead be removed. Mr. Bradley asked if work involved with raising the building is FEMA eligible for reimbursement. Mr. Michelangelo said yes, this should be an eligible cost. The additional work in the parking lot and site would not be eligible. He said, in regard to FEMA reimbursement, the project is not capped at a certain limit. He said the benefit of the \$500,000 grant is that it counts as the Town share in regard to eligible costs.

Mr. Tetreau joined the Committee and invited questions. Mr. Bradley asked if the building is raised is the change less than material and no need for going through a new approval process with Town Projects and what are the implications of accepting or rejecting the grant. Mr. Tetreau said that DEEP has the regulation, tied to the grant, that we raise the building an

additional 1 foot. He said that residential buildings also have to be raised 1 foot. DEEP gets involved because it is a V Zone Flood Plain. The Town routinely meets FEMA and grant requirements.

Mr. Bellitto asked if we raise the building are we within the bonding resolutions already approved. Mr. Tetreau said that the charge doesn't get into any additional grants. The Committee has flexibility. He said 7.4 million dollars is approved for the project.

Mr. Bradley said that the Committee feels that the contingency is low and the proposal to raise the building one foot would wipe out the owners contingency. Mr. Tetreau said that he would encourage the Committee to have a proper contingency.

Mr. Bradley asked is the \$500,000 a significant issue to the Town. Can we reject the conditions required by the grant? Mr. Tetreau said that the Committee is not required to accept grants especially at this late date.

Mr. Bradley asked what the additional 1 foot increase in building height does for us. Mr. Chamberlain said that FEMA has been encouraging the 1 foot of free board in V Zones. He said State Code will eventually require it. He said that if we knew about this a year ago, the building would be a foot higher. Mr. Michelangelo said that free board is a cushion over the flood limit and that it was a factor of safety. Mr. Bradley asked if private residences are required to do this. Mr. Chamberlain said that building code is a trigger, not a FEMA trigger. Mr. Bass said that the State of CT requires a 100 year flood elevation. Mr. Michelangelo said that accepting the additional State money would require raising the building 1 foot.

Mr. Bass moved and Mr. Zieff seconded a motion that the Committee leave the proposed plan for the Penfield Project as is and forego additional changes to raise the building an additional 1 foot.

Discussion: Mr. Bradley referenced the parking lot and asked Mr. Chamberlain if the building is raised 1 foot, what would you have to do to mitigate the impact. Mr. Chamberlain distributed the Site Plan showing the additional elevation. He said that they have the ability to raise both ends. If pitch is a concern, we can level the parking lot. Mr. Bass asked if we are allowed to add fill in the beach area. Mr. Chamberlain said yes. Mr. Bellitto asked about run off with a leveled parking lot. Mr. Chamberlain said that with any scenario, the quantity of water is not affected. Increased pitch results in increased velocity. With both ends of the parking lot raised, velocity would be less.

Mr. Bradley noted that raising the building wipes out our contingency. Mr. Chamberlain said that the number does not include the added costs related to shutting the job down at this point.

Mr. Bradley requested comments from the Committee.

Mrs. Nelson said that this has been approved, we have the funding, we have a plan, let's start.

Mr. Speciale said he favors going on with the project and do not elevate.

Mr. Graceffa said that it is current best practice to elevate the building but given where we are, he doesn't want to go back to the Boards. He said to move forward with no changes.

Mr. Plotkin said to move forward with no changes. Our charge is not to find grant money.  
Mr. Zieff said no changes that would affect the contingency.  
Mr. Bellitto said to keep the project where it is.  
Mr. Bass agrees with everyone.

Vote: Mr. Bradley requested any final comments and called for a vote. All in favor. Motion passed.

**8. Review and approval of the Penfield Building Committee Finance Subcommittee duties and responsibilities**

This was tabled until next meeting.

**9. Review and approval of outstanding invoices and requests for payment**

Mr. Zieff moved and Mr. Graceffa seconded a motion to approve the following invoices:

Invoice #5423 to DeStefano & Chamberlain for revision of constructions drawings to raise the building, in the amount of \$10,020.00

Invoice #153232 to Colliers for attending building committee mtg 1/14/16, review project financials, meet with Town purchasing and review of project documents, in the amount of \$6,226.55.

Invoice #15492 to Colliers for construction oversight, in the amount of 6,323.88.

All in favor – motion passed.

**10. Discussion, comments and suggestions regarding project as related to local neighborhood and community.**

A letter has gone out to the neighborhood. The Chairman has been in communication with the local paper. The project will be discussed at Sherman PTA meeting. Residents can contact Shawmut directly for immediate problems or DPW.

**11. Public Comment**

Richard Dmochowski said that the finished grade was reduced from 12 feet to 11 feet and he feels this is detrimental to the neighbors. Mr. Bradley said that the Committee hasn't changed its position to protect the beach.

Jan Reber asked that the return of the pavers be on the agenda for next meeting.

**12. Old Business**

No old business.

**13. New Business**

No new business.

**14. Adjournment**

Mr. Bellitto moved and Mr. Graceffa seconded a motion to adjourn. Mr. Bradley adjourned the meeting at 8:05

Andrew Graceffa, Secretary

Ellen Marks, Recording Secretary

DRAFT MINUTES SUBJECT TO REVIEW, CORRECTION AND APPROVAL BY THE PENFIELD BUILDING COMMITTEE OF THE TOWN OF FAIRFIELD