

DERBY MUNICIPAL PARKING AUTHORITY

Minutes

(meeting taped)

SPECIAL Monthly meeting: Wednesday March 20, 2013 in the Derby Parking Garage office. The regular meeting was postponed so as to invite the engineers present this evening.

Meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

By roll call, members present: Joseph Moore, Jack Moran, Delphine Krezel and Anthony Szewczyk. Richard Bartholomew was excused.

Also present: Treasurer Keith McLiverty. Parking Authority Director Leo Moscato and Bookkeeper Angela Borrelli were excused.

OLD BUSINESS:

a.) Workshop update: Richard Marnicki, P.E. of Marnicki Associates & Inc., 359 Main St., Old Saybrook, CT and Joseph D'Amico, Jr. of JP Engineering, Inc., Windsor, CT were invited to tour the parking garage and present to the Authority their opinion of probable cost for renovation or rebuilding of the parking garage. They have recently completed work on the Police garage in Waterbury. They advised the Authority of their years of experience in design and construction of parking garages as well as many other projects. They have had the opportunity to review the previous studies on the Derby Parking Garage as well as physically observing the existing conditions. They observed that the steel structure of the garage is in good shape and could be restored with treatment of the current rusting visual condition. The issue remains in the decking structure. The concrete is spalling in many areas. The rebar is exposed and rusting. The deck itself was constructed of 4 ½ inch concrete with limited to no expansion capability. The decking has been exposed to years of use as well as winter exposure to the salts and chemicals tracked in by vehicular traffic. The decking was rated to support typical vehicular traffic and possibly that rating was surpassed during winter conditions with snow weight or through snow removal procedures, actions in itself not detrimental but accumulative over time. The garage was built in 1975 and has received patchwork repairs over the years. The deterioration exists deeply into the decking structure due to natural environmental conditions and their impacts on the structure. The infrastructure of electrical conduit has degraded over time through water penetration. Vehicular barriers and guard rails on the perimeter of the structure are deteriorated. There are cracks noted in the facade.

Mr. Marnicki presented two possible scenarios to be considered. First would be to partially fix the structure. That would entail selective demolition of the structure. All of the decking would be removed. The steel framing would remain. Selective demolition is more expensive than a complete demolition as it is time and labor intensive. As the frame would remain, there would be limited ability to make any changes to the design or structure of the garage. The second would be to totally demolish the existing structure and rebuild. The cost to demolish would be less than the first scenario and would also allow for modifications to the design although the changes would still be restrained by the limitations of the footprint and grade of the lot. Cost ranges for the two scenarios, based upon extrapolating from previous projects, would be in the range of 5.2 to 6.5 million.

Members discussed the scenarios. Zoning, building and ADA requirements were discussed. As the building would be seeing a significant change in the first scenario, it was questioned whether the elevator and stairwells would have to be redone to satisfy the more current codes. That cost is not projected in the presented scenario. Mr. D'Amico indicated that codes involving safety requirements would likely have to be addressed. Their projects do include funds for such changes. Seeking a waiver or modification to

the requirements could be pursued through the State that could contain the budgetary exposure. A new structure would be designed taking into account all current code requirements. Members discussed the timeframe for the scenarios. Under scenario 1 the project could move forward almost immediately whereas scenario 2 would require ordering and fabrication of the structural components. They anticipated that the garage would likely be closed for 18 months.

Mr. McLiverty was cautious on the accuracy of the numbers as they were not project specific to Derby's garage. He stressed that the referendum questions are written seeking funding for a project cost as detailed in the language attached to the referendum. Underestimating would result in a failure to move forward on the project. He was concerned that the project could escalate with the demolition revealing undetermined problems. Mr. Marnicki indicated that the current design of the garage is such that little is hidden. With his years of experience he was confident with his numbers. He noted that the economy is such that increases in cost pricing are to be expected in the upcoming years. Mr. McLiverty suggested that it would behoove the Authority to consider stepping back and looking at a more comprehensive assessment. Mr. D'Amico indicated that a schematic design would be more accurate and the work involved in preparing that document could be applied to the construction documents that would have to be prepared for the actual project. Members discussed the cost and time needed to prepare the design documents. The engineers indicated that it was doable in a short period of time. Mr. McLiverty indicated that to have an affirmative vote from the voters necessitates showing how the project benefits the community. A clear picture needs to be presented that shows the reconstruction requirements of building, accurate costs for the project, the positive impacts it will have on the community and the future usefulness as well as projected maintenance schedule. He was uncertain if this could be accomplished by the May referendum. Members were encouraged that the engineers could produce adequate information to move forward with inclusion in the referendum.

At this time, Mr. Moran was excused.

PUBLIC PORTION:

No one came forward and the public portion was closed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion was made Anthony Szewczyk and second by Delphine Krezel. Move to approve the minutes of February 13, 2013 and February 27, 2013, as written. Motion carried unanimously.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT: Motion made by Delphine Krezel and second by Anthony Szewczyk. Move to table acceptance of the financial reports due to the absence of staff to answer questions. Motion carried unanimously.

DIRECTORS REPORT: Motion made by Delphine Krezel and second by Anthony Szewczyk. Move to table acceptance of the director's report due to the absence of staff to answer questions. Motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

Nothing was presented.

Motion was made by Delphine Krezel by and second by Anthony Szewczyk. Move that the meeting be adjourned at 7:35 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully prepared,

Karen Kemmesies, recording secretary

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