

DERBY MUNICIPAL PARKING AUTHORITY

Minutes

(meeting taped)

Workshop: Wednesday January 23, 2013 in the Derby Municipal Parking Garage Office.

Workshop was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

By roll call, members present: Joseph Moore, Delphine Krezel and Anthony Szewczyk. Richard Bartholomew arrived at 6:02 p.m. Jack Moran was excused.

Also present: Treasurer Keith McLiverty, Building Official David Kopjanski and Parking Authority Director Leo Moscato.

Anita Dugatto of Sunflower Dental at 69 Elizabeth Street and member of the Board of Apportionment and Taxation noted that it was her understanding that the referendum bonding will be paid by the users of the garage being that the payment of the bonding would be coming from the Parking Authority revenue. She suggested considering renting out a portion of the garage for possible use by small business owner shops that could then offset the cost of the bond. Members noted that changing the garage to a mixed use could have zoning code implications.

Mr. Moore thanked Mr. Kopjanski for attending the meeting to answer any code issues that may arise with the renovation. First, the elevator, it is five foot by five foot (5'x5'). Mr. Kopjanski stated that the unit must be large enough for a wheel chair to enter and turn around; the size seems capable of that function. Further, the door must open at least 32 inches and the height of the controls must be reachable in a wheel chair. In regards to any other code issues, if necessary a waiver or modification could be sought through the State due to cost limitations and constraints of the existing structure. Portions of the structure may be grandfathered. Members asked about whether the bathrooms have to be accessible to the public and ADA compliant. Currently, they are not accessible and the use of the garage does not seem to warrant the need for public facilities. Mr. Kopjanski indicated that the bathrooms would be primarily regulated by the health department. Customarily, the directive is to consider spending approximately 20% of the overall cost of the project to make the building more accessible.

In regards to the electrical and the sprinkler systems, members weighed whether to reuse parts. Consensus was that it would be equally or more costly to reinstall used parts. Many of the light fixtures have been recently replaced so they could be reusable. The sprinkler system is more than 30 years old and the system would all have to be recertified after installation making it likely more expensive to reuse. The conduit for the electrical has had sections replaced due to inside corrosion indicating that replacement would be the more likely solution.

Mr. Kopjanski stated that the priority is the decking replacement. Many garage structures built at the same time as the Derby garage are experiencing the same problem. The rebar in the concrete decking is corroding impacting the integrity of the decking structure as noted by the deterioration observed in the garage. It will be critical to verify that the new decking structure will have corrosion-free rebar and that it has been certified to carry the pre-determined load on the structure. The designer should be knowledgeable to the specifics of environmental impacts on the deck and the methods that provide for the most efficient product. Mr. Szewczyk noted the possibility of going with a prefabricated decking system as a viable way to speed the project and be cost effective. Mr. Kopjanski indicated that he is aware of projects in town that did utilize prefabricated product and the result can be both cost effective and the overall product shows excellent quality control. Again, the right designer moves the project

forward in a positive way. It was suggested that Mr. Moscato contact other authorities who may be undertaking or have undertaken renovations to their garages and seek information from their experiences.

Mr. McLiverty restated the parameters given by the Corporation Counsel at the January 9th meeting. He indicated that the desire is to have the referendum by the end of March. He stated that once the date of the referendum is set by the Board of Alderman, then the Authority can not advocate for the vote. Members had considered mailings or some means of explaining the purpose of the bonding to the voters and Mr. McLiverty indicated that it had to be done before the Board of Alderman acted.

At 6:35 pm Mr. McLiverty and Mr. Kopjanski left the meeting. Members thanked them for their assistance and expertise.

Mr. Moscato stated that he had received a call from Herman Zecker and he will be getting back to the Authority with estimates for the decking replacements and fascia panel replacements. Schindler is coming to assess the elevator. Connecticut Fire was contacted about the sprinkler system and their recommendation is to replace the entire system. McDermott Company has submitted an estimate for the cost of electrical removal and replacement. To completely restore the steel beams will cost between \$250,000 to \$275,000. The guard rails will likely have to be removed during the deck replacement and as such, their replacement should be estimated.

Members reviewed the list and defined them by priority.

Priority 1:

- The decking on all levels – replacement including rebar
- Guardrails – sand, prime and paint and replace two sections that are severely corroded
- Painting – steel beams must be sanded, primed and epoxy.
- Painting – On the decks, the parking spaces must be relined and the directional arrows, etc. will have to be redone
- Bathrooms – The ceiling could be lowered to conserve heat.
- Temporary storage – During reconstruction there will be reusable materials that will have to be placed in storage (i.e. booth, gate, security equipment, signs, etc.)
- Sprinkler system – assess whether there are any reusable components, otherwise replacement
- Electrical system – Conduit and wiring will have to be replaced once deck work is complete

Priority 2:

- Elevator –original to the building – will be assessed by the contractor
- Heat coils in drainage pipes – Currently the water freezes at the drain openings resulting in an overflow. Coils would allow for the system to function as designed
- Office – Repairs to the ceiling must be done due to water leakage
- Fascia panels – The mounting brackets must be addressed
- Stairwells –Repairs needed do not appear to be structural and the determination on the elevator would determine the level of work needed.

Mr. Szewczyk indicated that he has a colleague who is willing to come and assess the conditions and scope of the needed work. Members welcomed his assistance.

Members discussed the possibility of a brochure to explain the purpose and need for the funding. It was felt that the material should be informative stating the level of usage, the expectations of the Authority to repay the loan through revenue generated by the Authority, not the taxpayer and other pertinent information that can clarify any questions that a voter may have when going to the polls. The members will accumulate information and discuss this further at the next workshop.

Mr. Moore has spoken with the director of Valley Transit and he feels that arrangements were possible. He will need to speak with the State of Connecticut to verify there is no conflict with his contract and then he will prepare a proposal for the service. This may take some time to determine the expense. Members will explore whether this service will be needed either by contract or necessity and wait for the proposal to make a final decision on whether this is mandated.

Next meeting set for January 30, 2013 at 6:00 pm. Without objection the workshop closed at 7:05 p.m..

Respectfully prepared,

Karen Kemmesies, recording secretary

"These minutes are subject to the Authority's approval at their next scheduled meeting."