Town of Seymour

Building Review Committee



Minutes

Place: BOE Conference Room – 98 Bank Street Date: 5-3-12 Time: 6:30 p.m.

1. Meeting called to order by: Chairman Paul Wetowitz at 6:35 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call:

Members of the Committee	Present	Absent	Late (time)
Scott Andrews		X	
Bruce Baker	Х		
Tim Connors	Х		
Nicole Klarides-Ditria	X		
Jennifer Magri	X		
Fred Messore	X		
Wayne Natzel	X		
Dennis Rozum		X	
Paul Sponheimer	Х		
John Stelma	X		
John Uhelsky	X		
Paul Wetowitz	X		
Total	10	2	

Others Present: Don Smith, Rick Belden – joined later by MaryAnne Mascolo and Bill Silver from Silver Petrocelli

4. MOTION: to approve the prior Meeting Minutes of 4-19-12

Members of the Committee	Motion	Yes	No	Abstain
Scott Andrews				
Bruce Baker	1	Х		
Tim Connors		X		
Nicole Klarides-Ditria		X		
Jennifer Magri		Х		
Fred Messore				X
Wayne Natzel		Х		
-Dennis Rozum				
Paul Sponheimer	2	Х		
John Stelma		Х		
John Uhelsky		Х		
Paul Wetowitz		Х		
Total		9		1

- 5. Public Comment None
- 6. Chairman's Report

- a. Discussion Chairman Wetowitz mentioned that he had received from the director of the NVHD a copy of the \$500k loan from Naugatuck Valley Savings Bank and the State Loan document that helped to fund the NVHD renovations at 98 Bank St. He has asked the town attorney to review the documents as there may be additional drawbacks in them. Mr. Belden asked to speak and was allowed. He mentioned that there are new car towing signs in the back parking lot which 100 Bank Street now appears to own. The owner of 100 Bank has contracted with a towing company to frequent the lot and remove cars parked there after hours and on weekends. There appears to have been some issues with bar patrons parking there. Mr. Belden suggested that the town attorney also check easements as if parking is an issue for this building we should know the legal status on that. Mr. Wetowitz also reported that he had not yet received any financial date form Mr. Caserta as had been requested. Through Mr. Belden via Ms. Magri the current operating costs for LoPresti School runs about \$63150 annually. Mr. Wetowitz will forward this information along to Doug Thomas for budget purposes. Mr. Wetowitz further informed the group that the town insurance company is being contacted in preparation for the insurance changes that will be needed once the building has been vacated in September. Mr. Sponheimer asked why the town had the costs associated with 98 Bank and not BOE. Mr. Belden offered additional clarity on that and the costs for the LoPresti building moving forward being somewhere between 0 and the \$60K currently depending upon its ultimate usage moving forward. Mr. Wetowitz explained the pending changes in personnel duties at Town Hall which would result in Mr. Caserta becoming the Operations Manager who then would be responsible for all the town buildings. Mr. Uhelsky questioned who pays for the plowing of the church parking lot used by LoPresti staff? Per Mr. Belden it is currently done by Public Works and the BOE pays a small stipend to the church for its usage.
- 7. Presentation by outside firm Silver Petrocelli and discussion regarding Building and Department Needs Review
 - a. Discussion Mr. William Silver from Silver Petrocelli and Associates was introduced and began his presentation. He stated that he had reviewed our meeting minutes and distributed to the committee members a written proposal for services. Mr. Silver provided background regarding his company, mentioned that they are currently the architectural firm for the Chatfield-LoPresti School project and explained the process that would be undertaken to assess the needs of all affected town departments. Interviews would be conducted with each department. A visual assessment of each building is also conducted. Minutes are produced from those interactions and a bound proposal of what can be done is produced for the committee. The proposal would include floor plans, estimates, etc. He clarified that architects assess space needs not construction. The price on the proposal includes a presentation to the BOS.
 - b. Discussion Mr. Messore asked if the \$ proposed was for a full study with renderings No it would be approximately another \$2500 to receive a proposal similar to the Stonington example that was shown. Per Mr. Silver at this stage we are only dealing with blocks of space. Mr. Messore also questioned the look-ahead. Per Mr. Silver 10 yrs is reliable, 20 yrs is a stretch. Mr. Sponheimer inquired as to the timeframe for a finished product. Per Mr. Silver that really depends on how quickly the meetings can be set up. It likely would be about 2 months in length before a 1st draft were to be available. A 1st draft would include interview minutes, then plans and estimates would be next. We would redline the draft, proof the results and this would be projected for July completion. Mr. Wetowitz mentioned that some buildings appear to be in bad

- shape. Can they help to project the \$ for repairs? The firm would provide data on a sq footage basis for renovation expenses. Mr. Baker asked if after the initial stage the next phase of referendum S/P will be able to assist with that as well? Per Mr. Silver absolutely. If graphic solutions are required that would extend the timeline for delivery.
- c. Discussion Mr. Uhelsky questioned whether asbestos, elevators and code requirements would be addressed. Per Mr. Silver it is often tough to tell some of those things, ex. PCB's in windows they don't estimate but can ask for requirements it would be approximately another \$7K per building for that type of analysis. Mr. Belden cautioned that once you test you must remediate so you must be careful here. There is an asbestos management plan for 98 Bank Street already. He also mentioned that if the high school is being considered as a site for the BOE then the OCR report that was done last year will need to be considered as there are code compliance issues there. Mr. Silver stated that they would advise of the risk, not estimate \$. Mr. Uhelsky asked about radon testing. Every 5 year testing requirement for the school buildings.
- d. **Discussion** Mr. Messore asked if 20 copies of the report were included and if that also included an electronic version. Mr. Wetowitz inquired as to what has been the experience with other towns that have undertaken this type of project. Mr. Silver stated that some towns have struggled with the energy to take it to the next level post review. Mr. Messore asked if there would be an implementation recommendation. Yes and phasing can be done.
- Discussion Mention was made of the Public Works building possibly being included given the town interest in the ADS building. Mr. Messore spoke a bit more about the ADS building and its attributes. Could end up with a walk away from the DPW building - is that something that should be considered? Mr. Baker commented that he believes that to be out of scope. Mr. Connors questioned the cost of adding another building to the architectural review. Mr. Silver would expect that to be \$3K or less. Mr. Baker commented that if the ADS building is in it changes things dramatically. Mr. Sponheimer was under the impression that there was an outside bid on the building. Per Mr. Messore as of Thursday there was not. Mr. Messore asked if the proposal would cover a presentation to public forums. BOS is included. A public hearing may be required and Mr. Baker offered that perhaps the meetings could be done concurrently. Mr. Wetowitz expressed that he is not certain what is happening yet with NVHD and it may not be realistic to have them move. Mr. Messore mentioned that it might be better if we had a breakdown by building of the \$ needed for the proposal. He would like more detail. Mr. Baker reiterated that we are not looking at just a few but need to look at all buildings. Mr. Connors commented that we still need to address the BOE needs. Mr. Baker asked that if we are stuck with NVHD what can be done with the building? Mr. Sponheimer commented that he felt as if this effort has mushroomed. What is the BOE preference? Need to consider a lot more. Mr. Baker stated that he felt that it needs to be determined if the Derby Avenue building is in play or not. Mr. Wetowitz stated that we should be going to the BOS to get further direction and ask for outside help. Mr. Baker agreed that the BOS needs to give answers ASAP as soon LoPresti will be empty and will be trashed. We need to decide now.
- f. Discussion Mr. Messore questioned whether the report would give a maintenance schedule, for example if a roof needs repair or if that is a secondary report? Per Mr. Silver, maintenance is tough and different than a capital plan which would include larger scale items. Mr. Messore mentioned that he felt we need to execute and have answers to as many questions as possible. Mr. Smith commented that the roofs at LoPresti and 20 Pine Street would have been done as part of code compliance. Per Mr. Belden and Mr. Natzel, LoPresti needs some work and 20 Pine

Street needs roofing since the middle school moved. Mr. Smith thinks that this all may have been addressed already.

- 8. Seymour Housing Authority Presentation regarding their interest in Anna LoPresti School
 - a. **Discussion** Mr. Smith informed the committee that the presenter was unable to attend this evening.
- 9. Tour of 98 Bank Street NVHD and BOE Spaces (tour began at 7:47 and ended at 8:15)
 - a. Mr. Belden took committee on tour of BOE space and answered any questions presented. Mr. Wetowitz conducted the tour of the NVHD space as the director was not available and he was familiar with the space due to his position as Seymour Fire Marshal.
- 10. Discussion of Building and Department Needs Review presentation and take action as necessary
 - a. Discussion Per Mr. Sponheimer, Derby Avenue was not included how would it impact could they move more town departments. Mr. Messore felt that the ADS building might be a good option for DPW. 32K sq ft with 5K sq ft office space which could hold town departments. Mr. Stelma cautioned that the needs might overlap. Mr. Baker expressed concern as to why the town would want the building. He felt that a business belongs there that pays tax \$. It doesn't make sense financially the other way. Mr. Uhelsky asked what they pay in taxes. Mr. Wetowitz stated that perhaps that is what we should ask the board. Mr. Messore questioned whether or not we are using space properly? Mr. Baker stated that the RT 8 location makes no sense. Mr. Sponheimer mentioned that Scinto would be developing Fountatin Lake. Mr. Wetowitz asked Mr. Stelma as a member of the BOF if he had any feeling on how they would act on a request for funds. He felt it was somewhat dependent on tonight's budget vote. Mr. Smith commented that the DPW is smaller than years ago and that the town had recently approved \$ for that building for a furnace and a roof. He is in agreement with Mr. Baker - Why? Mr. Natzel offered that our charge does not include the DPW building. Mr. Baker offered that we should just do what we were initially instructed to so. This is a town building, we have problems to fix, let's get it done. Mr. Stelma inquired as to the procedure to get the studies approved.
 - b. Discussion Mr. Messore mentioned that he had funds in his budget since no funding had been asked for in the past 30 years for ED. You need a study to get state and federal funding. Every 10 years plan has to be done for town by state statute. Mr. Wetowitz stated that we need to recommend to the BOS that this needs to be done as without it we can't proceed. Mr. Messore asked Ms. Klarides-Ditria f the BOS has an expectation that some \$ will be needed. Per Ms. Klarides-Ditria she didn't think that was the case going into it as there was no allocation in the beginning. Mr. Messore believes that all things point to us being able to move forward and he doesn't believe that we can wait until the next budget cycle to do this. Mr. Baker asked if this would need to go to bid. Mr. Belden offered clarity that under \$25K no but it is good practice to solicit multiple proposals. Mr. Baker asked Mr. Wetowitz to ask for additional proposals and prepare a draft of what we want to send out. Mr. Belden cautioned that we may want to prequalify that this type of work has been done before and ask for references. Mr. Connors questioned whether or not our timeline will allow for this. Ms. Mascolo offered her opinion that she is very supportive of this firm and that they have done great work for us. They had vetted many architects as part of the Chatfield-LoPresti Building Committee. Mr. Wetowta will compile

the information that will be presented, providing additional detail and talking points. Mr. Smith reminded Mr. Wetowitz that he cannot solicit feedback from the committee members on his presentation via email as that would constitute a meeting under FOI.

c. Discussion – Chairman Wetowitz asked for a motion to allow him to speak to the BOS regarding funding at their May 15 meeting.

MOTION: To authorize the Chairman to make a proposal to the BOS in the amount of \$24K to obtain the proper personnel to conduct a needs assessment of the 4 buildings under review.

Members of the Committee	Motion	Yes	No	Abstain
Scott Andrews				
Bruce Baker	2	Х		
Tim Connors		Х		
Nicole Klarides-Ditria				
Jennifer Magri		Х		
Fred Messore		Х		
Wayne Natzel		Х		
Dennis Rozum				
Paul Sponheimer	1	Х		
John Stelma				
John Uhelsky		X		
Paul Wetowitz		Х		
Total		8	0	0

NOTE: Ms. Klarides-Ditira and Mr. Stelma left the meeting prior to this motion being made

- 11. Members discussion regarding the Seymour Housing Authority presentation, take action as necessary
 - a. Waived as the presentation did not take place. Many questioned the Housing Authority's true interest in the building since they have now been on the agenda twice and failed to appear both times.
- 12. Members discussion regarding the committee's mission, take action as necessary
 - a. **Discussion** Mr. Uhelsky expressed concern that there is so much information and so many needs that this all needs to be written down. Mr. Smith suggested that a public hearing be held to solicit public opinion. Mr. Baker felt that we need a \$ allocation first. Mr. Natzel questioned whether or not we should reconsider our prior meeting motion to tour the ADS building. Mr, Sponheimer stated as a taxpayer he felt that space should remain commercial and on the tax rolls. Mr. Wetowitz will defer making any tour arrangements at this time. Since there was BOE representation present Mr. Sponheimer asked what is needed by them and if they had a preference. Mr. Wetowitz provided a handout provided by Mr. Belden of a proposed space configuration of BOE space on the 2nd floor of the Community Center that would meet the needs of the BOE. Mr. Belden shared that he felt that 20 Pine Street seems to fit their needs. He felt of the buildings it would require the least amount of work and funds to fix it up. LoPresti would require much more work. Mr. Baker expressed his hope that while the EDC is looking at downtown that they also consider what the Community Center could provide as far as a sales value versus using LoPresti as a site.

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting at 8:38 p.m.

Members of the Committee	Motion	Yes	No	Abstain
Scott Andrews				
Bruce Baker	1	X		
Tim Connors	2	X		
Nicole Klarides-Ditria				
Jennifer Magri		X	*	
Fred Messore		Х		
Wayne Natzel		X		
Dennis Rozum				
Paul Sponheimer		X		
John Stelma			·	
John Uhelsky		X		
Paul Wetowitz		Х		
Total		8	0	0