

Minutes  
Building and Grounds Committee  
June 23, 2006

Present: Barry Feldman, Jim Bradley, David Woods, George Kraus, Karla Fox,  
Ross MacKinnon

Absent: Lori Aronson, Tom Callahan, John Saddlemire, Janet Greger, Bill  
Stwalley

Notetaker: Melanie Savino

Meeting commenced at 9:05 a.m.

- 1) Review of Minutes - The Committee approved the minutes from the meetings of April 28<sup>th</sup> and May 12, 2006.

As the agenda for this meeting appeared lengthy, K. Fox requested items be rearranged on the agenda to allow time for the discussion of the South Garage area. The Committee agreed.

J. Bradley noted that in regard to future meetings: (a) we will begin to provide agendas with more detail; (b) we will attempt to provide the meeting agendas a week in advance to allow more time for review of attachments and materials in preparation for upcoming meetings; and (c) we will build up executive support of B&G so that each project that is brought before the Committee, will be presented with all information available so that decisions can be made on a timely basis. This should also allow for more time to be allocated to the discussion of major projects.

- 2) Review of FY06 Deferred Maintenance -

- South Garage – K. Fox inquired as to what the current issue is and whether there is structural damage. J. Bradley stated that there are two issues: (1) someone backed a piece of heavy equipment on the ramp and damaged it; and (2) there is a slope failure. K. Fox stated that the ramp could be repaired, but what should be of more concern is the structural stability and safety in location to the Burton/Shankman building. G. Kraus reported that a preliminary repair cost was \$50,000. K. Fox inquired as to whether there is danger of erosion on the slopes. G. Kraus stated that funding is needed to do a study on the repairs of the ramp by September. George Kraus stated that the estimated cost is \$150,000 to have the contractor study all three slope areas: (1) the paved slope - where the upper area is running down the garage and is exacerbated by the fact that water is coming down and making matters worse; (2) the Shenkman slope – which is something that requires investigation. It may be related to the breakout of water coming down from the parking area above; and (3) Burton slope – may be project related.

B. Feldman inquired as to whether there are ongoing erosion issues? If so, there now may be an issue of safety. He queried as to whether the issues should be resolved now or at a later date? G. Kraus stated that GZA provided a quote to fix all three areas, as they have been involved in the Burton building and have been watching the garage. R. MacKinnon inquired as to whether there was a cost estimate available. G. Kraus replied that it was approximately \$150-\$300K, two years ago. B. Feldman inquired whether this would be for all three areas. G. Kraus stated that this quote was for the slope area only. If we look at all three areas, it would be more like \$.5 million.

J. Bradley stated that the engineering area must be looked at. He stated that if it is a design problem, it must be solved once and for all. *Follow up: B. Feldman requested that J. Bradley prepare a time line and cost estimate of what is needed to repair all three areas for the next meeting.*

J. Bradley stated that funding may be available from the '06 remaining budget. At this time, \$35,000 is needed for an engineer (GZA) to look at all three areas. B. Feldman inquired as to whether the expectation would be to do the work this winter. G. Kraus replied it could be stabilized now and repaired in the spring. J. Bradley stated that the money may have to come out of the contingency or emergency funds, but as the slope by the garage and Burton is a Burton problem, they should be part of the project.

B. Feldman asked the Committee if they wanted to vote on this matter now or wait until a future meeting. The Committee decided to discuss all issues on the table first before deciding.

- Fine Arts Studio – G. Kraus informed the Committee that there is a need to install emergency exit door in the theatre. D. Woods stated that this was a matter that was discussed in September, 2005 and that fund was promised to come from end of FY06 or early FY07 DM. The estimated cost is \$100K. This cost would cover the door and the required four exhaust vents in the old portion of Dramatic Arts. These items are needed as a result of a state inspection and without these repairs, the theatre will be closed down. The agreement with the inspector was that these repairs would be completed during the summer of '06.

Barry Feldman clarified for the Committee that what is being requested at this time is \$100,000 for the door and exhaust vents for Fine Arts, \$35,000 for GZA to study the three failing slopes, and \$10,000 for the Level A Mapping. G. Kraus confirmed and explained further that the Level A Mapping is a requirement from EPA. It is a computer run model. Over time, the requirements have changed, and the model needs to be rerun. This work will be performed by Danny Meade. The question was raised as to whether it would need to be put out to bid as it is for professional services. J. Bradley stated that it did not, as the work is below the bidding threshold. G. Kraus informed the Committee that it would cost more to have to recreate and rerun the model. This is most beneficial scenario.

J. Bradley stated that the question at this time is how good is the \$369,000 balance left in DM funds? G. Kraus stated that some of the balances shown on the DM spreadsheet (see attached handout) may not be totally accurate as some of the funds may have already been committed elsewhere. The safest avenue would be to not spend every penny shown in the balance. He suggested a safe number to work with would be \$350,000. K. Fox inquired as to whether these matters should be on hold until next meeting. Other members felt they should be acted upon today.

B. Feldman made a motion to support continuing activity and act upon these items today. He informed the Committee that the issues could be acted upon separately or as a package to include the installation of the emergency door and exhaust vents for Fine Arts; the Level A Mapping and the sloping issues. B. Feldman motioned to move to approve all three issues as a package. K. Fox seconded the motion. No further issues discussed. Committee vote was unanimously in favor of acting upon all three items today and funding all three from FY'06 balance in DM funds.

#3) FY07 DM – J. Bradley informed the Committee that the Board of Trustees approved the FY'07 DM list at the June 20, 2006 meeting (see attached handout). He informed the Committee that the figures represent an increase which will impact the Committee. There is now \$24.7m available as the Health Center was able to shift some of their priorities around. As a result, this yielded available funds in the amount of \$24.7 million for Storrs and \$4.8 million for UCHC. R. MacKinnon inquired as to whether in essence UCHC is loaning Storrs the funds. J. Bradley confirmed and explained that the money will be paid back out of Phase III DM as part of the \$237 million available. J. Bradley further explained that the issue was one of timing and that the funding for Storrs was rolled up front. This was approved by the BOT. G. Kraus informed the Committee that with regard to encumbered funds, the renovation lump sum funds for Ryan Refectory are tied up as it is being designed now. Ryan renovations are tied in to the project for moving Nayden Clinic to campus. He stated further that some of the other items on the list have been there for some time.

In order to provide the Committee with additional background, J. Bradley stated that more money was requested on the Storrs' due to the impact of the landfill closure. J. Bradley worked with G. Kraus to come up with a list of projects matching the resulting funds based on several inputs. In addition a balance of 10% must be carried as emergency funds. This can also be used as a reserve to allow more flexibility. There is also \$1.5m designated for code repairs/renovations. K. Fox inquired as to whether information was available pertaining to requests that did not make the list. R. MacKinnon stated that there is a subcommittee looking into DM, but have only met once. He stated that if the subcommittee is not necessary, the items should be decided by the committee as a whole. In order to do this, everything should be looked at. J. Bradley concurred. He stated that a new process is starting and, in addition, budgets will be approached more aggressively. There is definite need to have some kind of clearing house. He suggested that perhaps the subcommittee should be reactivated. Members are: J. Bradley, R. MacKinnon, G. Kraus and J. Greger. This issue will remain on the agenda.

B. Feldman requested that J. Bradley discuss the FY '08 master list and other impacts, what the Committee should look at, and where the Committee should plan to go from here. J. Bradley explained that there needs to be a more robust planning process and it must be interfaced with departments. The procedure that is evolving includes looking at budgets between January – March. In addition the BOT was promised that they will receive a capital projects (including DM) budget document annually and it will also include a five year forecast of projects. The University needs to think of this as a capital projects process, not just DM. Trying to move this all around to do a capital projects planning and moving process. *[It was suggested to add the capital projects planning process to agenda at first meeting in September '06 in order to determine how we are doing on the '08 process. Committee concurred.]* When DM runs out, that is the end of the funding. R. MacKinnon stated that the need for continued maintenance should also be considered as some of the new buildings have more high-tech equipment that will require on-going maintenance.

#4 Merritt Roof – G. Kraus informed the Committee that it is estimated to cost \$407,000 to repair the roof. D. Woods stated that per P. Nicholls' request, the building was inspected as a potential location for the Fine Arts departments to move to. P. Nicholls suggested a portion of the Merritt Building. *[Judith and Ted will need to meet with GK to begin plans]*. G. Kraus stated that \$3,000,000 was designated from FY'07 to this project. J. Bradley inquired as to whether the building is good. G. Kraus confirmed.

B. Feldman queried whether, based on D. Woods' needs to move, the building is acceptable in its current condition. D. Woods responded that there are two issues: (1) the presses that would be in this location weight approximately 3,000 – 5,000 pounds. We need to make sure the floor can hold them; (2) ventilation is needed for the print making shop and photography. Ventilation must be installed. The Thompson building had ventilation, but Merritt does not. B. Feldman stated that the Committee must meet D. Woods' needs. J. Bradley suggested that a building envelope study should be performed. He inquired as to whether the proposal is to have the roof repaired immediately. G. Kraus stated that a firm needs to be selected, and the job could be done in the spring.

D. Woods stated that he has been informed from the faculty that it will take a year to plan and design the area and everything must be up and running by August '07. B. Feldman inquired as whether this is a reasonable time frame. G. Kraus concurred. J. Bradley stated that if it is started now committing all the funds in '06, the building survey and structural review could be done and then start designing in the fall. It would then take 3-4 months to design and start in the spring of '07 for completion in the fall.

J. Bradley informed the Committee that \$3 million was available in the '07 budget for the Mansfield Training School improvements.

PRLAC – G. Kraus stated that it costs approximately \$467,500 to move a modular building to a new location as long as utilities are already installed. B. Feldman inquired as to whether it was necessary to retain the modular buildings. G. Kraus stated that Psychology is currently using one. As PRLAC will be empty on June 28<sup>th</sup>, the question was raised as to whether the structure is in good condition. G. Kraus confirmed. K. Fox reminded the Committee that the Master Plan called for removal of the two modular buildings, as the Master Plan's intent was to get rid of all modular structures; however, they make good swing space. J. Bradley stated that modular buildings usually do not handle moving well. If the cost is \$400,000 to move it, it is better to look at buying a new one. B. Feldman inquired as to whether there is any interest in having a subcommittee look at the use of the structure, if they should be sold, or if there is a need for them. R. MacKinnon stated that the nursing modular will also be empty soon. In addition, the Asian American modular has already been committed to Psychology. K. Fox reminded the Committee that the Psychology move is temporary until their addition is completed at the end of 2012. B. Feldman inquired as to how this should move along. Do we move it along to the next meeting? Later in the year? Or have a subcommittee look review it further? K. Fox stated that it would be beneficial to have this item on the agenda again. B. Feldman concurred and stated it will be added as an action item with options to be provided by J. Bradley as to possible uses. [*Action: J. Bradley and G. Kraus to prepare a presentation. It was agreed to return this item to the agenda for the first meeting in September.*]

#4) Nayden Clinic - G. Kraus stated that B&G approved \$215,000 for the design of the Nayden Clinic; however, it now appears that the cost will be \$500,000. He explained that this is partly because the doors are too small and do not meet ADA compliance. They must be expanded. The cost is \$3,000 per door. In addition, all light switches will need to be moved. A waiver may be obtained, but it might affect the clinic's status and might not be worth pursuing. The building must meet the fire compliance codes.

Air conditioning - With regard to the building air conditioning, the air conditioning for the bottom floor is included in the price. It is approximately \$170,000 to provide air conditioning for the entire building, and an additional \$100,000 to tie into the central system [or a total of \$270,000]. R. MacKinnon inquired as to what the advantage is to tie it into the central system. G. Kraus replied that it would provide a long-term savings. K. Fox stated that the top floor is for the child care lab. The duct work is there, but it has never been hooked up. If air conditioning is available, it will allow the child care lab to operate all year round.

Clinic Parking – G. Kraus stated that Morgan Hill wants the University to look at new parking for the area. He has requested removing the circle and replacing it with parking. The question arose as to how many parking spaces are currently available. J. Bradley replied that there are 12. G. Kraus stated that M Hill would like more than that; however, a study would have to be done first and utilities may have to be moved to honor this request. The consensus was that if staff parked elsewhere, the 12 spaces could be reserved for the patients and this may be adequate.

Clinic Signage – D. Woods informed the Committee that M. Hills has requested combining the CRT sign with Nayden Clinic. G. Kraus stated that he would also like a sign on the building in a variation like that of “Beach Hall”, which would read “Nayden Clinic”, not “Philips Building”. Additionally, he would like a sign directing traffic up from Rt. 195. The cost is \$280,000. Of this, \$80,000 is needed to do the air conditioning and the fire alarms, and an additional \$200,000 would be needed in FY '07.

J. Bradley stated that this project should likely be estimated at \$500,000, as there is \$90,000 needed for code compliance, \$170,000 to provide air conditioning to the entire building; plus an additional \$100,000 required as a contingency fee. This will cause it to grow to a significant project. If it exceeds \$500,000, it must go to the BOT for approval. B. Feldman reminded the Committee that they must also state where the funding will come from for this project. J. Bradley stated that \$13,000 has been spent to date. G. Kraus stated that this was for mechanical engineering support for the air condition design. J. Bradley informed the Committee they should agree to design the space. G. Kraus stated that it will be done in-house by Joe Leoni. He stated further that the air conditioning has not been designed to date. In addition, the electrical will also be done in-house.

B. Feldman inquired as to whether there something that requires action from the Committee at this time. G. Kraus replied that the Committee asked him to provide information on the air conditioning and its cost of \$170,000. The additional cost includes electrical work for the second floor, as it is not satisfactory and needs to be upgraded to accommodate the air conditioning. B. Feldman inquired as to whether the \$290,000 for the project would be wasted in the future if the air conditioning was provided to the second floor at a later date. G. Kraus replied that it would not. J. Bradley inquired as to whether the \$290,000 includes the required contingency fee. G. Kraus confirmed. J. Bradley stated that this would allow for the move for Nayden Clinic.

B. Feldman inquired as to whether the Committee would prefer to move on this item today or wait until absent members could be present. G. Kraus stated that no funding is needed at this time as work cannot begin until Ryan Refectory is empty. At that time, funds will be needed for the engineering side of the project. He stated that what is required from the Committee today is a decision as to whether to provide air conditioning to the second floor. R. MacKinnon stated that the group should not decide not to provide air conditioning to the second floor, as he felt it should be installed. J. Bradley stated that there may be money left in FY '06 and as the area seems to be used for active programs, it should be clean, air conditioned and code compliant.

B. Feldman reiterated that in order to air condition the entire building it would cost an additional \$170,000 and to tie it into the central system it would be an additional \$100,000 for a total required of \$270,000. J. Bradley asked G. Kraus to review this again. B. Feldman inquired as to whether the Committee would like to discuss this

further at the next meeting. He inquired as to whether \$234,000 is available from other projects to provide air conditioning for the entire building and the requested signage. J. Bradley stated that it might be possible to find \$100,000 from FY '06 and \$150,000 from FY '07. *Action: B. Feldman stated that this topic will be addressed again in July, at which time J. Bradley will bring the budget with a breakdown of line items and provide options for further discussion. [G. Kraus will prepare this information.]*

Chemistry/Snow guards – G. Kraus explained that a bid was done to provide snow guards on the Chemistry building. The cost came in at \$350,000. As they felt this figure was too high, the project was re-bid. The second cost came in at \$450,000. G. Kraus stated that there has been an on-going problem with the contractor [MCC Construction] and the University will no longer be using their services. However, this project will have to go out to bid again. The thought at this time is not to do the entire building, but merely repair the west side and the entranceway. The issue, however, is 40° and falling is the barrier to gluing onto the roof. This is key. Peter Brandolini will prepare the bid. Originally, \$250,000 was allocated for this project. More funding may be required. If it is done in two phases, we can do the west side and entranceway first. B. Feldman requested that G. Kraus keep the Committee up-to-date.

#7 Tennis Building – J. Bradley stated that the Committee needs to discuss future policies surrounding erecting small buildings on campus and established where do requests go?

G. Kraus stated that with regard to the tennis building, a building was proposed in the past, but there was no funding. J. Bradley inquired as to whether there is available funding now. G. Kraus replied that Athletics has the money. It was queried as to a timeline for this project. GKraus replied it would be this fall, as they play fall tennis. It will be used for protection purposes.

J. Bradley stated that the Committee needs to decide is: (1) Who has the right to put what, where? (2) What should it look like? (3) Do we have architectural oversight? (4) Does this Committee make the decisions? B. Feldman stated that this could definitely become a safety issue and should not be decided upon today. J. Bradley stated that Athletics would like to move forward and want to hire an architect. R. MacKinnon suggested they provide additional information. J. Bradley suggested they be given the signal to move forward, but that the design and project must be reviewed by B&G. B. Feldman stated that a requirement is that it cannot be a temporary structure or one made of metal. Design guidelines should be established.

#### Old Business

J. Bradley stated that G. Kraus presented information on the plans for the Torrey building. The momentum for this project needs to continue along with comprehensive discussions. The Committee concurred.

New Business

K. Fox requested that crosswalks be discussed at a future meeting, especially those at Hillside and Stadium Road. *Action: The Committee agreed to discuss this at a future meeting.*

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.