

COMMITTEE ON JOINT SCHOOL BUILDINGS

May 1, 2007

5:00 PM

Chairman Beaudry called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: School Committee Members Beaudry and Gelinas; Aldermen Roy, Long and Thibault

Absent: School Committee Member Herbert

Chairman Beaudry addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Update on the School Facilities Improvement Project (Monthly Report – April 2007).

Chairman Beaudry stated Tim and Allan, welcome.

Tim Clougherty, Facilities Engineer, stated thank you, Mr. Chairman. Allan Jefferson with DMJM will give us a report on this month's progress.

Allan Jefferson, DMJM, stated this month's progress is as follows. At Central High School they have installed some roof steel to relocate three of the rooftop units, due to sound attenuation work. At Hillside and Southside, some missing fin tube radiation in miscellaneous rooms, including the chorus rooms and cafeteria. In both locations they are proceeding on that installation. At Weston they are addressing some punchlist issues, deficiencies in duct work, and at West there's an intercom station that was inoperable that they've recently made functional.

Mr. Clougherty stated other than that, Mr. Chairman, we see some effort in resolving punchlist deficiencies that are ongoing, and we hope to see Gilbane continue to resolve those.

Alderman Long asked Tim, on any of the work that we were going to do, has that been awarded out or is that starting with some of the punchlist items?

Mr. Clougherty responded not as of yet.

Alderman Long asked do we anticipate a time when we'll start doing that?

Mr. Clougherty responded mostly when school gets out. We anticipate having some of that work executed this summer.

Chairman Beaudry stated Tim, just a couple of quick ones as far as the punchlist and that. I know I brought up about Central again. Did anyone go over and take a look at that courtyard and the concrete over there that is cracking and the stairwells on the southeast side of the Classical Building?

Mr. Clougherty stated we did have somebody go over, and we didn't note significant deficiencies. However, I would welcome the opportunity to walk that area with you so that we can see those areas first hand. You also brought up in conversation, as well as in previous meetings, the floors at Central High School. Some of the floors we have worked on, and we feel they're in pretty good shape. We don't think that our problems are one hundred percent resolved over there, especially with the thresholds, and we intend this summer to put in some new thresholds to eliminate the differential in flooring between the classrooms and the hallways.

Chairman Beaudry stated and there was some vandalism. Was that at Southside that they did vandalism to the ductwork on the roof?

Mr. Clougherty stated we've had some vandalism, probably about a month ago, and then again about two weeks ago. What the vandals are doing is they're getting onto what...it's our belief that what they're doing...is getting onto a canopy roof for one of the entrance ways, getting onto the first floor roof, scaling ductwork that travels from the first floor to the second floor, making their way all the way to what is essentially the third floor on the east side of the building. They put quite a bit of spray paint and graffiti on the ductwork, and that was about a month ago. And most recently, they took the School District's communication satellite and threw it off the building.

Chairman Beaudry asked is there anything that we're doing to try to stop that from happening in the future?

Mr. Clougherty responded we've discussed it internally but we don't have viable options to bring forward at this point in time.

Chairman Beaudry stated now I know that the units up on the roof...can we lock them? Because you can get into those units where the filters and everything are.

Mr. Clougherty stated the units we need to worry about, you really need a set of tools to open. They can be bolted shut and they have been bolted shut whenever I've been up there, so it's not just a matter of opening the door and getting in.

Chairman Beaudry stated and one last question. It actually is and isn't part of the Design Build, but an elevator at Bakersville School... Is there any more talk as far as when and if that elevator will be put in the school, and is that going to be on the agenda for any future CIP money?

Mr. Clougherty responded I've heard talk about it, but I don't know exactly where it stands relative to the CIP process at this point in time.

Chairman Beaudry stated okay, because they just had the bathroom put in. It's all handicapped accessible, but you can't get to the bathroom because there's no elevator.

Alderman Long stated just one more. Tim, has there been any retainage released since last we met?

Mr. Clougherty responded no there has not.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Committeeman Gelinias, it was voted to accept and this report and send it to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Chairman Beaudry stated we will recess the meeting at this point to go into litigation discussion.

Chairman Beaudry called the meeting back to order.

Chairman Beaudry stated Tim, if you would please, can you give us an update on the Memorial High School project and any of the concerns on the conditions of the buildings down there?

Mr. Clougherty stated yes, Mr. Chairman. As we've discussed in the past, Gilbane built our athletic complex at Memorial High School, including the athletic fields, along with three buildings, three supporting structures: the concession building, the team room building, and the storage building. This was done as an amendment to the Design Build contract and was done under a construction management project delivery method. The buildings are constructed of a single wythe concrete masonry unit or what's also known as concrete blocks or cinder blocks. It's basically one layer of concrete blocks thick going up. The buildings started showing signs of water infiltration some time ago, after the project was completed,

probably plus or minus a year ago. The City questioned why we saw water infiltration on the interior of the buildings. We did some investigation, and the block and mortar was specified in the contract to contain an integral waterproofing add mixture. Gilbane claimed the block and the mortar contained the add mixture, but couldn't produce any documentation supporting this. We then followed our contractual obligations and requested that an independent testing agency be engaged to test for the presence or absence of this waterproofing add mixture. Gale Associates was contracted at Gilbane's recommendation to verify whether this product was in the block and the mortar or not. Gilbane also offered to waterproof the buildings at no cost with a certain product. We also asked the testing company to evaluate the effectiveness of such product, whether the City should move forward with this waterproofing method after the fact. The City declined the waterproofing at first, and we also continued to press that the testing agency provide a recommendation for it. The results of this test found that the add mixture was in fact not in the block and is the source of the water infiltration. I have a report for you that I'll hand out that will speak to the problem in much greater detail. Under the recommendation section, there are several recommendations considered. However, the recommendation section starts off with "As the wall system was not constructed in accordance with the Contract Documents, the City of Manchester should consider demolition and disposal of the CMU walls followed by the reconstruction of the buildings utilizing the specified and approved materials as listed in the original construction documents." As you can tell, we've got a pretty major problem that we're dealing with here. Just as Gilbane has made claims against the City, the City has filed counterclaims against Gilbane in the ongoing litigation, and this is included in that.

Chairman Beaudry stated now that section that you just read, that was from the engineer or the company that came in to inspect the blocks that was requested by Gilbane. That's the company that Gilbane wanted?

Mr. Clougherty stated that's correct. They suggested the company that was chosen.

Chairman Beaudry asked can you give us a brief synopsis of what is stated in that document? I know you gave us that one line. Is there anything else that you can enlighten us in? I know we're going to have the document to begin with. Maybe the public would like to be aware of what...

Mr. Clougherty stated bear with me one second; there's one section that talks about potential problems. "We noticed water infiltration on the interior of the building. These blocks have hollow cores, and a lot of areas are supposed to be filled with a certain type of insulation. At the time the tests were conducted, the insulation was observed to contain moisture." It talks about the fact that

continually wet insulation can cause problems in a structure such as moisture staining, reduced insulating properties, mold growth, paint damage and freeze-thaw damage. It's Gale's opinion that the wet insulation may not effectively dry and retain its thermal properties while inside the wall. Gale understands that the City has been requested to give consideration to a surface applied waterproofing manufactured by Conproco Corporation. "Regardless of the product, penetrating sealers should be used with caution and may not be considered appropriate for this project. Liquid applied breathable coatings are not fully waterproof and are classified to be "water-repellent" since they reduce the rate, not eliminate completely, moisture absorption into a wall system. Masonry coatings have also been known to stain the masonry and/or mortar and typically require re-application every five (5) to seven (7) years. Reapplication must be of the same material to insure compatibility, which can be difficult when product lines are discontinued." And then it goes into the Recommendations section. So those are some of the highlights of the potential problems that we're faced with in the long term with the building.

Chairman Beaudry asked and their recommendation to resolve this situation was what?

Mr. Clougherty replied their first recommendation states that "...the City of Manchester should consider demolition and disposal of the CMU walls, followed by the reconstruction of the buildings, utilizing the specified and approved materials, as listed in the original construction documents." Gale is unable to comment on the performance of the dry block system, which is the add mixture that I referred to earlier, as their experience with this product is limited. However, it would be recommended that the dry block add mixtures be included in the CMU and mortar for construction, as it was originally specified.

Committeeman Gelinas stated Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion at this time that we ask Mr. Clougherty to send a letter to the School District, along with a copy to be sent to the Athletic Director, Mr. Gosselin, indicating the problems that we're having with this building and any suggestions that they feel that the coaches should take in regard to health concerns.

The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Roy. The motion carried.

Alderman Long stated just to be clear, we contracted with Gilbane to put this building up. There was an additive that they didn't put in and that was confirmed with their tester that they wanted. Gale is the name of the company. They advised us that the remedy would be to spray this sealer on it. Gale is saying that the sealer, although it may be a repellent, it could still absorb wet, and every five to seven years you'd have to re-spray it. So, from what you read on there, the first

line, is that in order for us to get what we paid for, the building should be demolished and rebuilt according to the specs that we originally had.

Mr. Clougherty responded that sounds like an accurate representation.

Chairman Beaudry stated I just want to go on record that I support what that document just stated and that building should be brought to the specs that the District requested. And hopefully that will be remedied in the very near future.

There being no further business, on motion of Committeeman Gelinas, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee