



## **BCOC Meeting Minutes**

**Date: November 19th, 2020, 5:30pm**

**Location: Video Conference**

**Video of this meeting, and past BCOC sessions can be found at:**

<https://www.bsdt.org/district/budget/bhs-renovations/>

### **Present**

**Committee Members:** Doug Nedde, Peter Bahrenburg, Clare Wool, David Boehm, Kate Stein, Martine Gulick, Marty Spaulding, Nathan Lavery, Tom Peterson

**Members of the Public:** Tom Flanagan, Amy Mellencamp, Kujtim Hashani, Mike Fisher, Natty Jamison, Colin from RETN, Stef Smith

**Meeting commenced at 5:35pm**

### **Introduction:**

*Tom Peterson (TP) kicked off the meeting giving an overview of the structure and purpose.*

### **Project Updates**

#### **PCBs and Urban Soils:**

- **TP:** Air sampling was completed in early October and we have shared the results with the agencies. These tests were to establish the appropriate air sampling protocols going forward. The district has decided that they would like to pursue utilizing the unique facilities in "A" building. "A" building had very low levels, and houses the cafeteria, gym, auditorium, and other specialty facilities. Now that the district is pursuing the use of Macy's for in person learning, the rush to occupy the rest of the campus is somewhat lessened. The district will be testing in Macy's to determine if it is healthy to occupy, we expect those results after Thanksgiving. The gym is already approved for limited programming.

#### **Soils Update:**

- **TP:** ATC has submitted their site investigation work plan to the DEC and they have provided some comments. We are moving forward with soil sampling. Approximately 2 weeks of field work, and a lot of lab work. Results are expected at the end of January.
- **TP:** The next step in quantifying and locating the suspected materials is about to begin. ATC staff will be on site tomorrow to begin that process. Not sampling, just observing and documenting. That will be incorporated into a plan for bulk sampling and testing which will be submitted to the agencies for approval.
- **TP:** Ongoing questions are: is it physically possible to get the air levels below the agencies' recommendations and if it is, is it economically feasible. We won't have an answer to that for some time. The district is pursuing some outside funding to assist with mitigation. Currently the costs have been coming out of the project budget. Questions from BCOC members?

- **Kate Stein (KS):** I'm curious how much has come out of the project budget to address PCBs?
- **Nathan Lavery (NL):** The current phase, approximately since September, costs are over \$100k and that does not include services rendered but not yet billed. There are many more significant costs to come. Difficult to estimate right now. I am assuming at least \$1 million to \$1.5 million. We are optimistic that the state may be able to support us in some of those costs.
- **KS:** And if they don't, we have to adjust the project?
- **NL:** It has to get paid for. Either from the project, or we carve the PCB issue out from the project and fund it from other sources. We do have a little money from the project budget already allocated to PCB work.
- **David Boehm (DB):** Regarding the material characterization: aren't the ceiling tile and mastic going to be removed in any case?
- **TP:** They are, but the agencies still need to know if PCBs exist in them, and at what level. We all want to ensure materials go into the correct waste stream.
- **DB:** So a pilot project would be to pull all of these materials out in an area, and then test again?
- **TP:** Essentially. We originally proposed 4 rooms, but the state didn't consider that being us doing our due diligence. The bulk sampling will help determine the extent of the pilot project.
- **Martine Gulick (MG):** We won't be doing testing or pilot projects in rooms that are scheduled to be demolished, will we?
- **TP:** Yes and no. We will have to do some fairly extensive testing for the waste stream issue. We won't have to do the ensuing air testing however.
- **Marty Spaulding (MS):** To DB's question, we will be taking out the old materials, as well as putting in the new materials.
- **DB:** It seems like the problem won't even be there after demolition.
- **TP:** That was our assumption almost two years ago. We figured we'd just take out the contaminated materials. The air sampling confirmed that the levels were much higher than expected, and the agencies confirmed that the concrete and other substrates could be contaminated. We need to make sure that there isn't anything left that will contaminate the new facility.
- **DB:** It seems like you could focus your testing on just what is going to remain.
- **MS:** Again, it's the waste stream issue.
- **MG:** Is winter a factor for being able to test?
- **TP:** Not particularly.

### **Project Plan:**

-

*TP proceeded to give an overview of how the Project Plan is structured.*

- **TP:** We are still proceeding with the current renovation design. We are hoping and assuming that we will successfully conclude the PCB issue. DD set is due December 18th. WT will then perform another estimate. That is expected to take about a month, perhaps stretching into the 3rd week of January. The district still has the choice of

whether to do this estimate or not. Building F had been taken out of the project in April for value management, which was valued at \$5.4 million. We now know that it would take very significant remediation to re-occupy, so we need to decide how that will happen.

- **MG:** Is F included in the testing and pilot projects?
- **TP:** Earlier tests did include F, but the current testing plan does not.
- **MS:** It's not that it is out, it's just that we need more time to plan for what to do there. On a different timeline. There may be some equipment that is contributing to the airs there.
- **NL:** I just want to clarify a few things. There are two goals of the testing. 1: figuring out how to mitigate to proceed with the renovation project, 2: air testing in A to re-occupy in the short term. Again, we are currently able to use the cafeteria, entrance and restrooms, and gymnasium.
- **MG:** I saw NPA meetings on the schedule?
- **TP:** Yes, that is a typical zoning requirement for projects this size. Technically, we only need to present to ward 4, but the district thought it appropriate to present at all the wards since the school serves the entire city.
- **Mike Fisher (MF):** So we are making assumptions about the outcome of the PCB issue, and you are continuing with design as before.
- **TP:** As long as the studies confirm we can have a safe building, yes we will continue with design as planned.
- **MF:** I'm concerned that we are spending effort on this when we have no idea what the outcome of the PCB work will be. Is there a plan B? I'd also love to see F building being planned for as well. All of this needs to be addressed.
- **Tom Flanagan (TF):** In April, what was the rationale for taking F out?
- **TP:** It was that even after the second round of design and estimating, we were still \$11 million over budget. We had to figure out how to deliver as much of the Owner's Project Requirements as possible, within the \$70 million figure. We still planned to do the ADA work that was needed in F, as well as some other minor upgrades.
- **TF:** What are the implications of bringing it back in?
- **TP:** The contamination profile in F building is much worse than any of the others. That is a factor. F building may be a candidate for demolition.
- **KS:** When we made that decision, F was also the most recently renovated.
- **TF:** Can we bring it back in?
- **TP:** It certainly would make sense. The PCBs have to be dealt with one way or another. To make that work in the budget is a difficult task. \$5.4 million in cuts to other areas would be extremely difficult. That number can't be relied on anymore either, it will be much higher.
- **MF:** We won't have money later on either. We can't be stuck with a blighted F building.
- **Clare Wool (CW):** When we made this decision, we had no idea F was so contaminated. We spoke with our Representatives. When we got the bond vote, we promised the voters an upgraded facility. We thought we might find other funding for the tech center to bring it up to the same finish level. Perhaps we continue with alternative sites. We need to re-envision the future of the Tech Center.

- **TP:** This PCB investigation is to determine if the whole campus is salvageable, to put it bluntly.
- **CW:** When might we have that full answer?
- **TP:** We will have the bulk sample results in late January, which will inform the pilot project plan. We won't have a pilot project plan until at least 4-6 weeks later, which will then require approval. That work will then have to be bid out, another 4-6 week process, and then executed. This brings us well into the summer of 2021.
- **CW:** Can you remind the group how often you meet with the agency representatives?
- **TP:** We have two weekly meetings with representatives from the DoH, DEC, EPA. Our consultants from ATC and F&O are there as well. We have a technical meeting Mondays, and another more general meeting on Thursday. We also have other meetings as needed.
- **CW:** As a reminder, we are paving the way for everyone else who might go through a process like this. 12 years ago there was the moratorium on construction aid, which has put a hold on almost all capital improvements. We are in uncharted territory. As much as we want immediate answers, the state is also in uncharted territory.

*TP opened the floor to public comments and questions:*

- **Kujtim Hashani (KH):** I went to BHS and now am at UVM, and I just want to say I am really impressed with how organized everyone is.

**Meeting concluded at 6:45pm**