

HINSDALE SCHOOL RENOVATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

December 17, 2018, AT 6:00 PM

BLUE ROOM – TOWN HALL

Meeting Facilitator: Steven Frazier, Chair

Dave Carter, Vice Chair

Invitees: M. Bird, M. Shanley-Brady, D. Denning, R. Geiger, M. Hintz, N. Kelly, N. O’Dea, C. Perez, D. Pfenninger, M. Ruzbason, T. Sandonato, B. Stratford, and S. Vaill

1. Roll Call - N. O’Dea-Wyrick, M. Brady-Shanley, S. Frazier, R. Field, D. Pfenninger, R. Geiger, S. Vaill, C. Perez, N. Kelly, D. Carter, B. Stratford, D. Denning

2. Public Comment - C. Perez request that meetings not be held on the Monday’s that BOS meet.

3. Business

a) Floor plan review

b) Site plan options/discussions

Donald Smith, Civil Engineer, presented three site plans (copies presented at the meeting)

1. Option 1 - Limited Build - This option does not increase impervious surfaces on the site.

2. Option 2 - Limited Build - Relocation of the playground to further into the field, 16 additional parking spaces, a small amount of impervious surface added to the site. Increasing impervious area requires that the additional runoff is mediated. Cannot exceed pre-runoff amount.

3. Option 3 - Removal of 16,000 sq ft. of the old building. This would open up the stream with a 2:1 slope on the sides with 25 feet of embankment. It would support ten additional parking spaces on the Spencer Street side. Site improvements would be made to remediate flooding to address a choke point. There would also be a need to insert a headwall. Water would not back up onto the site, and it would remove all water issues up to a 100-year flood. An additional section would be added to the other side of the building. The new staircase would remain with an overlook and viewing into the water core. In the new building area, a variance would be needed to fully replace the 16,000 sq. ft. If you build smaller, you may not need the variance. A meeting with the state would need to be had ASAP to determine reimbursement for this particular option.

With Option 1 or 2, the flood level does not support runoff preventing the site from flooding. Option 3 does prevent the site from flooding. At 1.7 feet, the building will then overflow onto the street area.

Mr. Smith presented a relief culvert option. The choke point that previously caused issues was addressed in 1987. 750' of 48" pipe would be installed as a relief culvert. A right of way may need to be obtained if it enters other properties. This would be approximately 1.2 million. This does not remove the stream from under the school.

David Carter inquired about why Pearson was not expanded? Candy Perez commented Committee at the BOS level, the viability of Hinsdale of a project. Candy Perez, Pearson expansion would most certainly increase taxes. Batcheller and Hinsdale were considered due to the financial benefits. Candy Perez, said that elementary schools need work, no major work has been done since the 1980's they need to be updated no matter what building you talk about. David Carter commented back regarding the importance of education for new families.

The reimbursement rate for Winchester is 70% need clarity from the state on how this project would be reimbursed at the state level. Off-sight improvement is not typically approved by the State. However, the firm would seek approval due to the unique situation of this site.

Options 1 and 2 manage the flood issues, option 3 does remedy the flooding issue. The site will be under water, but the building would not be. Steve Vaill commented that he likes option 3.

Paul then reviewed the floor plan. No room layouts changed, one thing that did change is in renovating the building, the boiler room on the lower level needs to be moved to be moved to rooftop - mechanicals and sprinkler. The basement boiler rooms would be abandoned. No changes have been made from the previous discussion except for moving the mechanicals to the surface and roof. The roof is structurally able to handle the new weight. Solar could also be accommodated in the weight (this is not part of the scope of the job).

Candy is asking to investigate making the gymnasium able to accommodate recreation programming.

Bruce Stratford - Asked if the roof units provide proper ventilation, extensive dehumidification system would be added, this would be added to the waterproofing efforts, with sensors, Ozone would be also used.

Dean talked about being confident that his firm can mitigate the moisture, and solve all the infiltration issues to handle the moisture. On Option 1 and 2 we can keep this building within an acceptable level, we cannot keep the site dry in a 100-year event.

To keep the building dry, fill the masonry opening, doorways would be installed with floodgates. Doors would have gaskets.

- c) Facility conditions update based on architects/engineer's field visits.
- d) The opinion of probable construction cost

Paul presented the financials for Option 1 and 2 - The costs are broken down by construction division. There is a subtotal for costs and then an amount that would be reimbursable by the state. 12% contingency is added. Totaling 10,287,200 and the reimbursable amount would be \$3,796,000. The state tells you the final reimbursement value at the end of the project during the final audit (usually 2-3 years following student entrance to the building/completion). Dean recommended a meeting with the state with an option to investigate further.

Option 3 would cost \$21 million including a 16,000 sq ft addition and renovation of the remaining facility. We would need to investigate a reimbursement rate with the state.

- e) Schedule/Next steps.

Motion made by Steve Carter to investigate option 3 for a preparation meeting. 2nd by Steve Vail. Discussion by Doug Pfenninger clarity regarding floodgates, they simply get pulled up, and the outside sight would need cleaning, but the building would remain dry. Remaining moisture issue from the tunnel does that eliminate moisture in option 1 or 2. We are confident they can address any moisture issues.

Bruce asked about how mold is developed; the goal is to remove the moisture that causes the mold. All the mechanicals will assist with having a mold-free building. Bruce asked about previous works completed, and Dean said this is a common practice for their firm to address issues.

Going to the state is for an investigation, not the final process.

Vote: 5-0

Next meeting will be scheduled following the meeting with the state.

Follow Up Public Comment

Melissa Asselin - 228 Smith Hill Road - 2011 Torrington Area Health sighted the berm around the property has mold. Concern regarding the placement of the playground. All of the berms around the building would be removed in the planning process per Dean.

Rob Asselin - 228 Smith Hill Road - Electric Bill has anyone estimated the amount. Dean responded with that equipment cost will be estimated once the particular equipment is selected. Electrical expenses are likely to go up due to the fact you are adding AC, air exchange, etc. Gas would be selected for rooftop units. Other efficiencies will be added to improve costs (insulation, mechanicals).

4. Adjournment - Motion to adjourn at 7:24 PM.