

## MINUTES

### Seymour High School Athletic Field Committee Meeting Thursday, March 19, 2015 @ 7:00 p.m. Seymour Middle School Library

**Members Present:** Sean Walsh, Jay Hatfield (7:36), Jack Liedke, Tim Sadick, Paul Sponheimer, Ed Strumello, Theresa Conroy, Paul Roy (Alt.), Nicole Klarides-Ditria, Bill Paecht

**Members Not Present:**

**Others Present:** Larissa Shacket, Daniel Robinson, Ty Sirowich, Madeline Lynch, Jim Galligan, Nafis & Young, Bill Aniskovich, WBA Group

**ITEM #1: Call meeting to order.**

Meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

**ITEM #2: Pledge of Allegiance**

Everyone saluted the flag and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ITEM #3: Public Comment**

A Call was made for public comment.

Public comment was then closed.

**ITEM #4: Chairperson's comments**

Nicole Klarides-Ditria discussed a few items from the special meeting on March 12, 2015. She ended up speaking with the superintendent, Christine Syriac and the principal, James Freund and explained to them the Board's approach to the turf field. They were upset about the timeline and she explained to them that the intent is to have all the ducks in a row, get all the different timelines set so everyone knows what's going on when they vote on April 6 whether graduation will be held on the field or not. They were very understanding.

The Board is waiting on the Turf contract, which is almost done. Jim Galligan will discuss at tonight's meeting the timeline. The town council is looking into the paw patent to make sure that is not a copyright issue. Mr. Galligan will also discuss the co-op issues with the turf and/or bleachers.

Finally, Sean Walsh's comments, made during Committee Member Comments during the March 12 meeting, were addressed regarding using the money for the turf versus the town roads. This money is to be used for the turf complex. Theresa Conroy got the town the money, which was very difficult to get.

Chairperson's comments were then closed.

A Motion to seat Paul Roy as alternate member for this evening's meeting.

Bill Paecht Second: Theresa Conroy

Motion: Vote: 7--Yes 0 No 1--Abstain

**ITEM #5: Approve minutes from March 12, 2015 meeting.**

Motion to approve minutes from February 19, 2015 meeting.

Motion: Ed Strumello Second: Theresa Conroy

Vote: 7 – Yes 0 – No 1 – Abstain, Bill Paecht

Item number five is closed.

**ITEM#6: Discussion with engineer regarding project timeline.**

Mr. Galligan reiterated that if graduation is held on the field in June that they could make the schedule fit however the problem with that is it will cost the project a lot of money. He feels the project would be better off if graduation could be moved because they could start in the middle of May and be guaranteed the work will be done by the time fall sports begins. He stated it really comes down to dollars but he can't say exactly how much. He stated again that if push came to shove and graduation was held on the field he could do it. From a construction standpoint, from a design standpoint not accounting for any situations, bad weather, bad season, they could meet that schedule. They will simply put restrictive times on the contractors and they're going to put a price on those restrictive times. It will be less expensive to have these guys start earlier in the year and be able to do everything at a reasonable pace. As an example he put a three month schedule on the site contractors. They would have the second half of June to July and August and they'd have to be done. That contractor will be paying his guys overtime for Saturday work, overtime for night work. He will include that in his price to do the job. Same goes for the turf guys. Same will be true for the rubberized asphalt. There's going to be a premium put on time and they will charge you.

If he was told that graduation could be moved, he thinks you will be saving a lot of money and in a budget that is as tight as it is, those dollars are important.

Nicole asked the expected tentative completion date of the fields if the graduation could not be moved. Mr. Galligan thinks the first couple weeks in September the fields would be ready because that is what he put in for the contractor. The contractor will have liquidate damages and face financial penalties if they do not finish. That is how Mr. Galligan will be able to make sure the fields will be ready.

Tim Sadick added that with liquidated damages, rain dates do not apply to that if you go by the DOT books. So just because he says it has to be done in 60 days, the Board still needs to take into consideration bad weather because that doesn't go against that clock. So he feels that starting early will be huge.

Mr. Galligan used the example that if the site contractor has to work every Saturday, that is ten Saturdays he's going to have to pay time and a half on top of his regular 40 hour week. That equals two extra weeks. Starting in May with the same number of hours to do the job will prevent having to pay overtime. And that is just one trade.

If the project was started mid May, Bill Aniskovich feels the projected completion date is October 1, Mr. Galligan feels it is September 15.

Mr. Sponheimer mentioned that this project is considered a capital expenditure and that to the best of his knowledge, via a selectman in the Town of Seymour, per state statute, if the Board of Education does not relinquish the field for graduation it can go to the Selectmen who can override that because it's a capital expenditure. Paul Roy could not confirm if that were true. Bill Paecht couldn't confirm if the Parks Commission had jurisdiction over the fields but he is waiting on an answer. Mr. Sponheimer explained that the Parks Commission has the right to schedule, maintain, and control the fields in the Town of Seymour. The fields belong to the town. Parks have jurisdiction. State statute through the Board of Education states that buildings and fields on school property, as long as it is for a educational function, which graduation is, they are in control. So, for the graduation, the field is theirs. Parks will still be in charge of scheduling and maintenance. Town Council is looking in to this issue.

Mr. Walsh asked Mr. Galligan if the project was delayed what are the chances were that a preferred contractor would be lost due to being booked on another job. Mr. Galligan confirmed that could be the case. He also said some contractors simply wouldn't bid on the project because of the liquid damages and the premium on the job. Mr. Walsh then asked if the project was pushed off are there any chemicals that are temperature sensitive. Mr. Galligan stated that the biggest one is the rubberized asphalt because it's delicate to put down, but no later than mid-September. If the project started earlier, that would ensure it would get down before it got too cold. Nicole Klarides-Ditria asked Mr. Galligan when he anticipated putting the track down. Mr. Galligan said end of August, beginning of September. Mr. Sponheimer stated that if the track wasn't down in time, then spring sports would be delayed without a track. Mr. Galligan confirmed that if you miss the window then it will definitely impact next years spring sports.

Ed Strumello wants to know why Mr. Galligan and Mr. Aniskovich have differing completion dates. Mr. Galligan said it's because Mr. Aniskovich is more conservative than he is.

Mr. Paecht stated if they were unable to start on time, the track may not be an issue because there will be no money for one. Mr. Galligan said that realistically if graduation isn't moved, the biggest issue is that you could miss the window or putting down the rubberized asphalt. Since it's at the end of the project and it's the last thing to be put down, if you lose the window, you will have lost it for 6-8 months. Ms. Klarides-Ditria asked that if that happens, will the track be dug up and what will the access be to the field and will fall sports be possible. She also asked that if the field is accessible will the track be uneven and risk having people trip and fall on it. Mr. Galligan said there will be access to the fields and that there will be some minor spots that may be uneven because the project will not be completed.

Ms. Klarides-Ditria stated that there will be a representative at the Board of Education meeting to let the entire board know that the committee is proposing to hold graduation on the adjacent field.

Mr. Sadick asked that if the project was delayed and the track was not able to be put down before it got too cold and spring sports were effected, who would be responsible for bussing the track kids to their games? Ms. Klarides-Ditria stated it would be Board of Ed because they would be the ones who would have refused to move graduation.

Mr. Galligan spoke more about liquidated damages and that the committee would have to prove cost damages if the project wasn't finished on time. He said that the best way to move this project ahead smoothly and most cost effectively is trying to get started as early as possible. Four to five weeks on the front end could possibly save an entire season of spring sports.

Through the Chair, Mr. Sponheimer stated that the committees charge is to take care of the grant and get the field done. He suggested making a motion that it is the committee's intentions to start as soon as the weather allows. Ms. Klarides-Ditria isn't sure she wants to go there. The committee got their answer from the First Selectman's office and how he wants the committee to handle it. The Board of Ed will make their vote and then the committee will take it from there. Mr. Sponheimer feels that if the committee states that they would like to start as soon as possible then the Board of Selectmen will make a decision whether it gets started on time or not. Mr. Roy agreed that he didn't see why a motion couldn't be made to recommend to the Board of Selectmen that the Committee wants to adhere to the earliest possible schedule. The entire committee agreed. Mr. Walsh suggested that it be the committee's recommendation that it would be more cost effective and beneficial to the project as a whole if it were started as early as possible.

Motion to move this forward to the Board of Selectmen. Motion by Mr. Sponheimer, seconded by Sean Walsh.

Mr. Strumello disqualified himself from the vote since he is on two boards.

Vote: 8 – Yes 0 – No 0 – Abstain 1- disqualified, Ed Strumello

Mr. Galligan stated that the bleachers are eligible for the co-op and he can start negotiating the co-op sometime next week.

The turf and the rubberized asphalt are not eligible for the co-op. These will go out to public bid. Site work will be out as soon as the bleachers are set. Mr. Galligan stated that at the next regular meeting 90% of the site work will be done from the design standpoint.

Mr. Galligan and Mr. Aniskovich discussed the turf and rubberized asphalt materials with manufacturer selections.

Mr. Sponheimer asked about accountability between the site guys and the turf guys, and if there was any way to coordinate the two together. Mr. Galligan said there are several ways to do that. One, you could bid the turf as part of the site contract but if you do you're going to pay a significant mark up. Mr. Galligan did Oxford and bid the site work separate from the rubberized asphalt. There is a clause in the site contractor's contract

that says he has to prep the site to the turf manufacturer's satisfaction. There's a clause in the turf manufacturer's contract that says he has to be on the site and supervise the finishing surface and certify to the town that it has been done before he can put it down. It worked seamlessly in Oxford.

Mr. Galligan stated that if you put the site contractor with the turf contractor you lose control over the turf supplier because when the guy has a low bidder you either have to have the low bidder and then have alternates and how do you justify to people that you're going to use a more expensive alternate because he's different than the low bidder's primary supplier. He doesn't see the need for it. He would rather and he would recommend that you put the two bids out separate so that you don't have to pay the mark up.

Mr. Sadick and Mr. Galligan argued their points about bidding site and turf contractors separately versus together. Mr. Walsh asked if there were any specifics to any particular material. Mr. Aniskovich stated that when he worked on the Town of Clinton's project, they wanted a specific turf so he wrote the spec around the specific manufacturer and then said 'Or equal' and then he listed two other companies that made that product. And when these turf manufacturers see this they know the client wants product x. What happened in Clinton was that no one else bid because they knew that the town wanted that specific product. Mr. Sadick wants to see them bid together because if there is a timeline on the project the two will be working together and the site guy won't drag his feet and put all the pressure on the turf guy. Mr. Aniskovich stated that you won't be able to get Product X from the site guy and you will be paying a mark up of about 10-15%.

Through the chair, Mr. Strumello stated that when he was the AD he attended a workshop with someone talking about turf fields and he said that if you designate a particular product or kind you will get zapped with a higher price.

Mr. Galligan and Mr. Aniskovich recommend separating the bids but to think about it because it doesn't need to be decided right now.

Mr. Walsh asked if there are any details to the brand that the committee is interested in that is specific that would lock that in and allow no one else to do it and not be in violation. Mr. Galligan stated you can specify to a point where you only have the top three or four manufacturers.

Mr. Galligan and Mr. Aniskovich discussed the product options.

Revolution, monofilament 3/4 inch thick width, 40 oz. face weight. Vortex, hybrid mix of monofilament and what is called slit film. The difference between mono and slit filament is monofilament is a very soft textured fiber, has a tendency to lay down. Has no memory. Slit film has memory it will stand up. Slit film used to be the fiber of choice but people complained about the roughness. That's when monofilament was developed. Now they are together for the purpose of the memory. Mr. Sponheimer prefers Revolution.

Ms. Klarides-Ditria asked if the turf has to be covered if it were to be used for graduation next year to be able to walk over it with heels. Mr. Aniskovich stated that some sort of mat needs to be put down because single leg chairs and high heels. Mr. Galligan stated

the manufacturer prefers that you put mat's down. Mr. Walsh stated that Stratford has this type of field and they were told no folding chairs, high heels, free standing structures, etc. Mr. Sponheimer stated that Field Turf actually has a mat you can rent for a certain amount of days. You can also buy it from them too.

Regarding the track, one style was sandwich system where the liquid would be poured on and the pellets hand spread across the track while wet. The second was a full depth color, which is the one Mr. Aniskovich recommends for a number of reasons. With the sandwich system, it will wear to a point and you will start to see black. The full depth color, when it wears you'll never see black. Surprisingly the full depth color is cheaper than the sandwich system. Same product, same thickness. They'll both wear the same but the full depth color is cheaper. Mr. Aniskovich recommends base bid with full depth color and alternate with the sandwich system.

Mr. Sponheimer asked that when the solid color wears down, what does it mean for the people that are performing on it. Mr. Aniskovich stated that most of the wear will take place on the first two lanes, but you should get 8-12 years on the track. He stated that a lot of communities are putting gates on the first couple of lanes to force causal joggers to run the outside lanes to preserve the first two lanes.

Mr. Sadick asked that at the end of the lifespan, does the full depth color need to be completely removed before resurfaced. Mr. Aniskovich stated that what he does is go in and cut out the first two lanes and repave the first two lanes. The sandwich system could be resurfaced to an extent. Either one can be repaired in sections. Mr. Walsh noted that the sandwich system particles were flaking off as he was handling the sample.

Mr. Aniskovich presented his slide show. He changed the paw print logo to the block letter "S" and "Wildcats" spelled out facing the home stand and paw prints on either side of the "Wildcats". The committee liked the 4th option with the paw prints from option 2. There will be an extra cost for the "S" and there will be an extra cost for the "Wildcats". The blue border around the soccer field is not extra. The center logo runs between \$7,500-\$10,000.

Bleachers were discussed. There is a platform that transitions from the bleachers out to level ground. There is a leaning rail that goes the full length of the bleachers. The bleachers have 1,486 seats. Preferred seating costs \$50-\$60 per seat above what the other price would be. The seats do not have backs. Individual seats would be around \$100. Mr. Sponheimer mentioned that if somebody donated \$10,000 they could get 100 seats.

One of the bid alternates is going to be putting a sidewalk section to keep the mud level down.

Mr. Strumello asked about adding a press box and does it need to be ADA compliant to get up to it. Mr. Galligan sated that the only way to get to the existing press box is a lift. If you do a new one, you would only need to ramp to it. If you're going to be up in the press box area, it is an authorized area only and you'll have to come in off of Ross Drive. The Ross Drive entrance will be closed off to handicapped spectators. Mr. Strumello asked to get a price for a press box. The roof will be the filming area.

Mr. Aniskovich stated that Dave Stiger has no problem amending the paperwork to include the track and potentially a press box.

Ms. Klarides-Ditria asked about the tennis court ramp. Mr. Galligan will have a layout for the next meeting.

Mr. Strumello asked about the large shed up to the left of the field. Mr. Galligan said the entire area will be paved. The only thing he might not do is that sometime down the road, at the far end of the shed he can see installing bathrooms because the water and sewers are already there. So, he may leave an edge until somebody comes in and puts it in.

Mr. Sponheimer mentioned that the town garage has enough parts to do the wall. He also suggested that whoever goes to the April 6th meeting, to bring the image of the proposed project so they can see what graduation could be holding up. To show what the committee is looking to do. Ms. Conroy agreed and suggested that Mr. Galligan also attend the meeting. If they could see what is being planned and the special seating that could be a fundraiser, to keep an open line of communication. Ms. Conroy suggested the committee ask to get on the agenda. Ms. Conroy asked if the committee needed to meet earlier before the Board of Ed meeting. That will be decided at the next regular meeting. Mr. Strumello also suggested letting the Board of Ed know about the handicapped access.

Mr. Sponheimer suggested that when talking about the project, to refer to it as "the stadium" because he hears too often "football field". Stadium, complex or athletic field.

Item number six was closed.

#### **ITEM#7: Committee Comments.**

Paul Roy: Thank you for the additional information. There are some good ideas and he will be at the Board of Ed meeting.

Paul Sponheimer: Sean made it perfectly clear that as long as he is on the committee he's in both feet going forward and will help out.

Jack Liedke: No comment

Jay Hatfield: No comment

Bill Paecht: No comment

Ed Strumello: Informed Jay Hatfield that he disqualified himself on voting for the Motion because he is on both boards.

Tim Sadick: No comment

Sean Walsh: His comments were not made to the board. The insinuation was made some people in the audience that we were putting sports ahead of all others and that is not his concern. It is the project. It was not to insinuate town funds were being wasted.

Theresa Conroy: No Comment

Nicole Klarides-Ditria: No comment.

No other comments.

**ITEM #10: Adjournment**

**A Motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 8:56 p.m.** Motion: Bill Paecht Second: Theresa Conroy Vote: 9–Yes 0 No 0–Abstain

Respectfully Submitted, Angela Chernesky