Minutes for 5/9/17 Walls Committee Meeting

Members present - John Elsessor, Ed Cofrancesco, Gene Marchand, Michael Hicks.
Also present - Mr. Thomas DiBlasi (Engineer)

-Call to order @ 1805 hrs. Minutes approved at 1806 (mot- Hicks, 2nd- Marchand, pass unanimously)

-Discussion with Mr. DiBlasi

- His goal is to bring the walls up to compliance with the building code today.
- First step may be to perform ground penetrating radar (GPR) to find out which walls can be reinforced vs. which walls would pass as is.
- Would like to make sure that the outer walls are properly reinforced as well.
- In his opinion, a full GPR scan is appropriate at this time.
- Cost of the full scan survey would be at least the $96,500 that was quoted in the past, but that number may increase a little due to change in scanning company.
- Based on his opinion, adding rebar to the current walls is not a viable solution.
- Building a “sister wall” would be one option. (ie- building a wall immediately adjacent to the current walls that have issues and combining the two for stability).
- Another option would be to spray a binding agent on the current walls. Much like a carbon fiber wrap that would add strength. This option would only be viable if the testing is done and we just come up short of code. It is not meant to correct a major structural issue.
- Exoskeleton steel bars are not acceptable in his opinion either.
- The schedule would be – Elevation maps by DiBlasi and then outside testing agency does the testing. He would NOT use Special Testing Lab out of Danbury for this project. They did some of our past work and, in his opinion, are not reputable.
- Ed Cofrancesco brought up a very good point – To look at the soil to see if we can change our soil class rating. This may lower the standards of required strength for the walls and may be our cheapest option if it works. DiBlasi suggested that we start there...and perhaps use Haley and Aldrich out of Rocky Hill for the Geotech testing. If that works we would just sure up the walls at the joints to address the wind rating issue. The earthquake rating could take care of itself. DiBlasi will look at the the ASC 7 Building Code to see if the restrictions are less.

-Steps we should take

- Look into soil issue/Geotech testing
- Research who we will use for Ground Penetrating Radar company
- Address the issues between the Board of Education and the Town Council to see who will fund DiBlasi and at what percentages. (50/50, 60/40, etc...)
• If we move fast to get approval on testing, they would get into the school in July. 15 day testing, and be done by the start of school. After that we would have discussions on corrections to be made and what we need to do as far as repairs. Then, the goal would be to go out to bid in the Spring of 18, construction during the summer of 18. That would require a special referendum in January or February of 18 because we would not make the normal town vote/referendum. That deadline (per the State) would be this September for the November vote...which is not feasible.

• Committee Chair will get the past Geotech information to DiBlasi. We may need about $3,000 for 1 boring hole to be dug by a Geotech company at that point.

• We are hopeful that our committee can go to the Town Council Meeting on June 5th to present our information.

• One final point brought up by Ed Cofrancesco was the possibility that the foundation of the school’s addition may have been done (concrete) by J. J. Mottus. This may mean that there would be a crumbling foundation issue. This is obviously a valid question but more research needs to be done to see if that is going to be another issue. Mr. Elsessor stated that we should have that information in the building records. He also noted a few points as far as that goes;
  1. It depends if Mottus actually did the foundation work.
  2. Even if they did the work, it has been said that slab foundations are not experiencing the same issues that housing foundations are (up the walls, etc...).
  3. Even if Mottus did it, it would depend on the chemical makeup of the foundation. This is because Mottus used several areas of the one bad mine. Certain parts of it were good though.
  4. Mr. Elsessor also noted that more companies used that mine, not just Mottis.

-Next meeting date to be determined.

-Motion to adjourn made by Hicks at 1927 hrs, seconded by Marchand. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted - Michael Hicks