

Trumbull High School Building Committee
MINUTES
December 10, 2008

The Vice-Chairman, Mr. Lemay called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Ms. Bivona, Mr. Doyle, Ms. Flynn, Ms. Gottlieb, Mr. Lemay, Mr. Jenkins, Ms. Timpanelli, Mr. McCabe, and Mr. Ronnow (arrived at 7:12 p.m.).

Also Present: Brian Holmes O&G Ind., George Wiles of Wiles Assoc., Steven Burgess of JCJ Architects, Jeff Elliott of JCJ Arch., Atty. Schopick and Al Barbarotta of AFB.

Approval of Minutes:

Ms. Bivona and Ms. Gottlieb moved and seconded to approve the November 12, 2008 meeting minutes with the following amendments: first page, bottom paragraph, correct the spelling of the word “ad hock”, the last sentence on page 1 to add “CM” to the phrase “reviewing the contract”.

VOTE: Motion to approve as amended passed 7-0-1 (Flynn abstained).

Owner’s Rep Update:

Mr. Barbarotta reported that ad hock meetings have taken place at THS with the superintendent, Ms. Timpanelli and department heads. The meetings have been very productive. Mr. Horton will need an additional 2,000 sf. for the music program. The BoE has directed that the house principles stay in their respective houses; not be moved to the admin. area (front of the building) as indicated in the plan.

Mr. Barbarotta explained that this project has a very aggressive schedule, and would like to move forward with the asbestos this coming summer. The goal will be to be go out to bid April 2009 and be under construction this summer.

Mr. Barbarotta reported that through the process the budget is constantly looked at, as is the construction schedule.

Architect’s Update – Like New Renovation:

The Chorus area has been reduced, the orchestra/music theory is an overlapped area, the band will have its own designated area. This represents the request of the music director to have 3 distinct areas, not the 2 previously shown on the plan.

Mr. Elliott reviewed the auditorium plan with the THSBC members, the auditorium would be placed at the front of the building (Strobel Road side) along with new bathroom facilities, the main administrative area, a health suite, and the band & music areas (currently the house admin. area is shown in the front of the building), but will be moved to the center of the houses per the BoE’s directive. The auditorium will seat 1100 people. Mr. Barbarotta clarified that the 1100-seat capacity is for programmatic use, the superintendent has indicated that the 1100 is the equivalent of two classes attending a program in the auditorium simultaneously.

Mr. Elliott reported that the auditorium is shown to have two circulation areas (one for the public during after school hours and the other with an interior circulation for school hours). This was designed for security reasons. Images representing the auditorium design were distributed to the building committee members for their review. The auditorium is not designed as a theatre, the building committee members were asked to keep that in mind as they reviewed the

images. The THS auditorium schematic design was also distributed at this meeting representing a view from the stage area and a view from the proscenium area. Technical drawings of the auditorium were distributed to the building committee members at this meeting. In response to a question from Mr. Lemay, Mr. Elliott stated that there are two schools of thought with regard to the control booth; one is that it would be an open area in the back of the auditorium and the other that it be an actual booth. The bathrooms are located in the side lobby area - easily accessible, but not in the main lobby. The chairs/seats are 14 across with aisles at the end; there are a total of 4 aisles. The wall sections will have 3" of rigid insulation and that is the same with the roof, (prime LEED areas). As the mechanicals are designed more LEED would be integrated into the design.

Mr. Wiles has been working with the Recreation Director and the Athletic Director. Mr. Wiles distributed a photo of the West Hill's pool with 1 meter diving boards. Mr. Wiles indicated that 6 lane pools typically limit how many teams can use the pool programmatically. The layout of the pool will be refined at the next ad hoc meeting. The preliminary design of the natatorium was distributed and reviewed by the building committee members. The design includes a lobby, corridor areas, 3 offices, an auxiliary gym, team room, warm-up area, toilet area, locker rooms labeled A & B (this allows for rotating the use of the locker rooms, instead of designating them as male or female), private shower(s) area, and a toilet area in the locker room area. The pool area will have spectator seating and a pool deck. There are currently two staircases shown, until the mechanical engineers weigh in on the matter. The field toilets are a separate area as well as the pool mechanical room and the pool equipment room. The design team recommends scheme #1 as a base to work off of, this includes a 6 lane pool with a deck, 1 or 2 diving boards and seating will be used as a base for estimating the cost of the design. Scheme #5 is shown as an eight lane pool (but will be reduced to six lanes after the budgets were reviewed at a previous ad hoc meeting), 2 one-meter boards with a ramp for the special ed. & elderly. The Pisces & THS teams can use the pool simultaneously; there is a separate tank which opens more water surface. Mr. Wiles indicated that one diving board would benefit the budget. Both the Athletic Director and the Recreation Director were pleased with this design. The spectator seating is movable, (possibly tables & chairs), stadium seating would be collapsible. Schemes #2, 3, & 4 were stepping stones to scheme #5 but have been dismissed.

In response to a question from Mr. Ronnow, Mr. Wiles stated that a 25 meter pool would be an extra stroke, no one in the FCAC has one and it would throw the timing off of the metes. A movable bulkhead would be cost prohibitive. The athletic Director and the Recreation Director support scheme #5. There are opportunities in the natatorium (a stand alone building) to look at LEED, all the systems could be sustainable, the budget will need to be considered throughout this process, and the architects will do everything possible to achieve the Silver LEED certificate. The building will have multi-generational needs and is being designed to those needs.

(Ms. Bivona left the meeting at 8:13 p.m.)

Mr. Burgess distributed a schedule and a timeline to the building committee members. The final design will be completed 12/14/09, THSBC possible approval of final design 12/09, BoE possible approval of final design 12/26/09, Town Council possible approval of final design 2/2/09. BoE possible approval of the EDO 42 is scheduled for the 02/23/09 meeting, BSF review March/April 09; bidding will take place May/June 09, a joint meeting to award contracts with the Building Committee, BoE and the Town Council in mid-June 09. Construction will be scheduled for 12 months; full project will be construction from July 2009 through 2012. This is a very aggressive schedule.

In response to a question from Atty. Schopick, Mr. Burgess stated that the plan review would be the most expedient by having the State proceed with it, sometimes having an independent review is more expedient on a less complicated design, but is not the case with this project.

Mr. Barbarotta reported that after the bids are received and opened we will know the costs, the auxiliary gymnasium and the auditorium have a dotted line between them, indicating that if hard pressed when the bids come in, a decision may be need to made between the two. The bids will tell us what the project can afford.

The building committee discussed the pool and if the 6 lane pool could be an eight lane pool. Ms. Flynn spoke in favor of 8 lanes; Mr. Lemay indicated that both the Athletic Director and the Recreation Director have approved the six lane pool. Mr. Wiles stated that they had approved the 6-lane pool but added that the directors would be pleased with an 8-lane pool too. The diving pool area is what makes the 6-lane pool work because it adds surface space, and the ramp is another positive component. Mr. Barbarotta cautioned that the 6-lane pool is going to hard pressed, they would not be able to consider an 8-lane pool due to budgetary concerns. The THSBC understood and agreed.

Mr. Jenkins and Ms. Timpanelli moved and seconded to approve AMC Technology per AFB's recommendation for asbestos abatement of the THS (not including sampling) in the amount of \$8,700.00 dated December 2, 2008. The proposal was distributed and reviewed by the THSBC. Consulting fees are reimbursable, professional services do not need to be bid if under \$10,000.00
VOTE: Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Doyle and Mr. Ronnow moved and seconded to approve the JCJ Architect Invoice#1 in the amount of \$124,831.27 dated October 30, 2008. Reviewed and approved by AFB.
VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Flynn and Mr. Jenkins moved and seconded to approve the JCJ Architect Invoice #2 dated November 30 in the amount of \$102,834.45. Reviewed and approved by AFB.
VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Ronnow and Ms. Timpanelli moved and seconded to approve the AFB Application in the amount of \$2900.00.
VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

The next scheduled THSBC meeting will be on January 14, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. at the Helen Plumb Building.

There being no further business to discuss the THSBC adjourned by unanimous consent at 8:54 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Margaret D. Mastroni, Clerk