

April 19, 2007

BOARD (Present)

John D'Angelo	President	Steven Cullen	Member
David Chichilitti	Vice-President	Joseph Fusco	Member
Pete Williams, Esq.*	Solicitor	John Hill	Member
Mary Antonelli	Secretary	Mary Jane Paglione	Member
Joseph Ciambrello		Denise Riccio	Member

*Substituting for Mr. Mandio

BOARD (Absent)

James Petrino	Treasurer
Anthony Mandio, Esq.	Solicitor

OTHERS (Present)

Dr. Broadus Davis	Superintendent of Schools
Joseph Roe	Business Manager
Thomas Shaffer	Secondary Principal
Kelli Rosado	Elementary Assistant Principal
Angelo Rago	Owner Representative – New Construction
Dick Koelle	Vitetta
Thomas Beach	Vernick, Remington & Beach
Doug Hoffer	“ “ “

Representative from Kleinfelder, Inc. (environmental engineer firm)

Reporters (1)
Teachers (2)
Residents (5)

OTHERS (Absent)

Rosemary Parmigiani	Elementary Principal
James Esposito	Acting Assistant Secondary Principal

The Bristol Borough School Directors held a public meeting on **Thursday, April 19, 2007**, at **7:00 p.m.** in the Board Room of the District Administrative Offices and Educational Complex, 1776 Farragut Avenue, Bristol, PA.

CALL TO ORDER.

President D'Angelo apologized for the delay. He called the meeting to order and led everyone in the Salute to the Flag.

April 19, 2007

AGENDA APPROVAL: Approved (8-0)

Motion: Mr. Chichilitti
Second: Mr. Cullen
Result: Approved: (9-0)

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Agenda items only: None

PRESENTATION:

Loretta Vasso of the Bristol Borough Community Partnership shared a summary of the Risk Assessment findings. Bristol Borough Community Partnership is an organization dedicated to reducing problem behavior in youth. The goal of the Community Partnership effort is to identify which Risk Factors, Protective Factors and Program Behaviors are prevalent in our community and implement evidence-based programs that address our community's unique profile.

- Data was obtained through the Pennsylvania Youth Survey. The survey was administered to students in the 8th and 10th grades in the Bristol Borough School District in 2000, 2003 & 2005. The survey identified risk factors

She asked that the Bristol Borough School Directors grant permission for the Partnership to disclose and use the results of the data (in particular the abuse and substance use data) when the Community Partnership sponsors an Addiction and Recovery Night for the community. Mr. Chichilitti asked who owns the document that contains the data and results, and Ms. Vasso answered that the Bristol Borough School District and the State of Pennsylvania own the document.

ADDENDUM ITEM:

- a) Allow the Bristol Borough Community Partnership to disseminate the information at the Addiction and Recover Night and throughout the community

Motion: Mr. Ciambrello
Second: Mr. Chichilitti
Result: Approved: (8-0)

REPORTS: There would be no reports tonight. The board will devote the entire time to the district's new elementary school. The student delegates were excused.

April 19, 2007

K-8 NEW CONSTRUCTION

Thomas Beach of Remington, Vernick and Beach introduced himself and Doug Hoffer and explained that he was present tonight to answer any questions that the board may have with regard to the recent change orders.

Mr. D'Angelo began by asking about the 12" storm drain. **Mr. Chichilitti** interrupted and read from a letter from CBM Consultants: "Bock Construction Inc., a general contractor for the School District has started relocating the existing 30" storm sewer pipe located under the proposed building. An excavation around the existing pipe was done to install Manhole No. 6. Upon excavation it is found that the existing 30" clay pipe has numerous cracks, dislocated joints and is structurally in very poor condition. Further the pipe has sediment deposited up to 1/3 to 1/2 the depth of the pipe and has considerably reduced its hydraulic capacity to convey storm water." Thus, the question: How was the pipe inspected? **Doug Hoffer** responded that the drawings indicated that the pipe should have been replaced. The only additional work that was recommended by the borough engineer was additional pieces on the parking lot side of the school. When the pipe was exposed, Mr. Hoffer stated that he went to the site and confirmed that at the next section of pipe the joint was offset about 6". And, that would not have been discovered until the pipe was exposed. Therefore, the borough engineer recommended the replacement of another 50 to 60 ft of 30" pipe and a portion of the 24" line. The original 30" line under the school was shown to be replaced on the initial drawings.

Mr. Chichilitti, again, asked how the pipe was inspected, and **Mr. Hoffer** responded that he did not inspect the pipe. **Mr. Chichilitti** asked who inspected the pipe, and **Mr. Beach** responded that it is standard engineering practice to locate any and all utilities. It is not common practice to actually go out and make an inspection of the pipe. If you are tying into an existing system, you look in the inlet and inspect manholes that would be between the reaches... **Mr. Beach** added that there is not any way of inspecting the line underground from point A to point B, unless you "TV" it. When the original line to be replaced was to be connected, it was discovered that the connecting line was in very poor condition and the borough engineer recommended the line to be replaced.

Mr. Chichilitti asked for further clarification and said. "If we assume that there is 100 feet of pipe and 50 feet of that pipe is going to be replaced since it is under the proposed building, would you not be concerned with the other 50 feet where the connection is." **Mr. Beach** answered that they would not be concerned since those areas are not under the building and it was not part of the design phase. Normally, such a replacement would not be the responsibility of the district since it is a Borough storm line. Only, if the Borough engineer recommended that the area be TV, would the project engineer proceed. **Mr. Chichilitti** then asked Angelo Rago if there was another (piping) issue.

April 19, 2007

Mr. Rago indicated that the drawings showed that there was an abandoned line and it was brought to the engineers' attention in November by the borough engineer who reported that the line was not abandoned but active. That 12" line is still not resolved and recently caused damage at the Borough's Municipal Building. He asked the engineers, who were present tonight, if they were aware of that 12" line. **Mr. Rago** stated that the concern of the district is that work was started and the above issues were known and needed to be addressed. In fact, they were never addressed. **Mr. Hoffer** explained that Remington, Vernick & Beach recently located them, but did not do the initial surveying of the area. **Mr. Hoffer** stated that requests were made to the borough engineer who stated that there are no records of this particular line and the plans were approved as they were.

Mr. Rago explained that there were numerous correspondences, and once the project was underway, the borough manager contacted him (Mr. Rago) because the contractor started replacing the 30" line. The borough manager asked if the district was aware that there was correspondence regarding an abandoned line. **Mr. Rago** further stated that the letter was directed to Remington & Vernick & Beach. **Mr. Hoffer** responded that as soon as the engineers observed that the line was active the engineers came to the site to locate where it was coming from and proposed a solution. **Dick Koelle** of Vitetta stated that the line is addressed by change orders 1 & 2. **Mr. Chichilitti** repeated: "that line is addressed by change orders 1 & 2." Mr. Chichilitti continued and reaffirmed that the line was identified, and **Mr. Koelle** answered that the line was identified by Borough Engineer Kanti Patel as indicated in his letter of October 26, 2006, and the contents of that letter was referred to the engineers. After a series of discussions, the engineers issued what is called an architect supplemental instruction. It was then forwarded to the contractor for him to replace that particular line. **Mr. Koelle** further explained that the engineers met with Mr. Patel in January who made another recommendation and that recommendation turned out to be change order #2.

Mr. Rago offered the following timeline:

- October 26, 2006 – The borough engineer advised Vitetta of the above issues and there were no revised drawings issued until January 25 and February 2. Mr. Rago indicated that he had numerous correspondences to both the engineers and Vitetta urging each to take action. And "that" is the concern. The length of time it took to resolve the issues.

Referring to a meeting held at the Borough Hall, **Mr. D'Angelo** stated that at that meeting Mr. Patel had questions about the 12" line and you (Mr. Hoffer) said that it was an abandoned line. **Mr. Hoffer** responded that he did not know where the line was coming from. **Mr. D'Angelo** further stated that all the board wanted to know was what the board would be dealing with. The board was initially told that the line was abandoned when it wasn't abandoned at all. Due to the above issue, the contractor has been held up. We recently got an easement from the Housing Authority that will allow us to move forward, and, hopefully, make everything better than planned. **Mr. D'Angelo** concluded by stating that when the board hired you (Vitetta), the board did such in good faith. However, you did not complete the job as you should have.

April 19, 2007

Mr. Beach responded that there is no way to know every underground utility. The firm does its best to try and locate anything that is on the surface that would indicate that there is a utility underground. In addition, the engineers reviewed all existing records, checked with the borough and the borough engineer. Unfortunately, years ago things were done and were not marked accordingly.

Mr. Fusco stated that, if he was hired to do something and was not the engineer, but had access to a camera, he would scope the entire area. First it was an inactive pipe and now it is an active pipe. Indicating that he did not say that the pipe was inactive and that he did not the survey site. **Mr. Hoffer** responded that Jeffrey Skinner met numerous times with Mr. Patel and it took quite sometime to complete the survey. **Mr. Fusco** clarified what Mr. Hoffer said and repeated that Mr. Skinner did the surveying and not Mr. Hoffer. **Mr. Hoffer** explained that he (Mr. Hoffer) did not do the surveying since he is not a surveyor. **Mr. Beach** interrupted and stated that at the time Jeffrey Skinner was working for us (Remington, Vernick & Beach) through the architect.

Discussion continued between the active and inactive line between the school directors and representatives from Vitetta, Kleinfelder, Inc. and Remington, Vernick & Beach. The attached pictures were reviewed and several comments were made:

- Jeffrey Skinner did the initial surveying and the borough engineer was present during some of it. The line was considered inactive at that time. **Mr. Chichilitti** asked about the report and Mr. Hoffer responded that there was no report, but it is part of the drawings. Mr. Koelle added that he, too, did not believe there was any correspondence regarding the issue. Mr. Chichilitti disagreed.
- Borough engineer was on site to survey some related work and used a video camera and found the line in question to be active.
- The manhole is on Borough property. **Ms. Riccio** asked when the issue was brought to the district's attention. Mr. Rago stated the information regarding the active pipe was addressed in a letter of 10/26 from Mr. Patel who used a video camera to further survey the line.
- Plans were submitted to the borough and approved.

In spite of the above, **Mr. D'Angelo** indicated that the problem will be addressed and will improve the site. However, he stated that the board negotiated in good faith and is disappointed that those involved did not "go the extra mile" to assure the right thing was being done. **Ms Riccio** stated that the issue and how to proceed was merely a "guess" by everyone involved: Skinner, Patel and Hoffner.

When subcontracting with Mr. Skinner, **Mr. Hill** asked how long Mr. Skinner was on site and, Mr. Beach indicated that there was a contract but no specific time. And, at the time, most of the surveying was completed by Remington, Vernick & Beach.

April 19, 2007

Mr. Fusco asked (1) if the firm ever used Skinner Engineering before, and (2) being such a large firm with subcontractors of its own, how was Skinner Engineering picked. Mr. Beach indicated that when the architects brought Remington, Vernick & Beach on board it was the busy season and it was decided to look for a local engineer to do the surveying to eliminate any additional delay.

Ms. Riccio shared the following history (previous to Mr. Fusco being on the board) with regard to Mr. Fusco's questions. Skinner was one of the 3 engineering firms that bid originally on the job and lost the bid. Again, **Mr. Chichilitti** asked for clarification on who hired Skinner Engineering. First, it was stated that the architects hired Mr. Skinner and now you said it was you (Remington, Vernick & Beach) who hired Mr. Skinner. Indicating that it was almost two years ago, Mr. Beach stated that it is his recollection that both parties sat down and decided in order to proceed in a timely manner it would be good to bring in a local surveyor. Discussion continued and Mr. Skinner's name was mentioned at that meeting, but the actual contract was with the architect.

Mr. Rago asked several questions regarding his concerns. (see attached)

- He referred to a letter he received from Vitetta on 4/13 regarding some of Mr. Patel's requests for additional information that go back to as far as 3/15. His concern is that there is construction underway and timely responses to these questions are imperative. Mr. Rago asked that Vitetta or Remington, Vernick & Beach address those requests and respond in a timely manner. Mr. Beach indicated that all those responses will be addressed by next week.
- Additional items that the contractor is awaiting responses are:
 - Sanitary Line Installation – submerged sanitary line installation & concern for anti-flotation measures.
 - Storm Line Backfill & Inverts – backfill materials and storm line invert elevations
 - 30" Storm Line at Beaver Street – additional storm line replacement
 - Plan Review Comments
- In regard to the surveying, Mr. Beach indicated that his firm will be doing the necessary surveying.

OLD BUSINESS:

- a) Approve minutes of March 1 & 15, 2007
- b) Approve list of bills for April 2007
- c) Approve Treasurer's Report for March 2007 (Mr. Chichilitti read the report.)

Motion: Mr. Chichilitti
Second: Mr. Cullen
Result: Approved: (9-0)

April 19, 2007

NEW BUSINESS

a) Approve change orders as per the attached.

General Construction:

- Ernest Bock & Sons C.O. No. 1-01 \$24,483.00
- Ernest Bock & Sons C.O. No. 1-02 \$52,259.00
- Ernest Bock & Sons C.O. No. 1-03 \$21,752.00

Comment: Mr. Ciambrello asked if the district was going to ask for any payment from the Borough for the off-site work that was done. Mr. D’Angelo answered that Mr. Mandio will look into the matter.

Motion: Mr. Chichilitti
 Second: Mr. Cullen
 Result: Approved: (9-0)

b) Approve the following change in the cost for the concrete testing as per the attached and award the bid to the lowest bidder and not to exceed \$44,910.00.

Concrete Testing Services: (previously estimated maximum costs of \$17,960/\$16,550)

- BVNA \$44,910.00 (lowest bid)
- VFL \$47,375.00

Motion: Mr. Chichilitti
 Second: Ms. Riccio
 Result: Approved: (9-0)

c) Approve administrative recommendation for uniforms for the Snyder-Girotti Elementary School, effective September 5, 2007. Please note the following dress code.

- K-4 through 5 grade – black pants – red shirts
- 6th grade* - kaki pants – red shirts

*This dress code will include 7th & 8th grades when the new school is completed.

Motion: Mr. Chichilitti
 Second: Ms. Riccio
 Result: Approved: (9-0)

April 19, 2007

PERSONNEL:

a) Appointments/Resignations - Professional

- a) Counselors – Summer Work – as per their per diem rate
Erica Corbezzolo – a maximum of 20 days
Debbie Conard – a maximum of 10 days

b) Daily Substitutes - \$70.00

<u>Certified Teachers</u>	<u>Nurse</u>
Nicholas Calvarese	Carol Raykovitz, RN

c) Resignation – Retirement

- Lola Lawrence – Home Economics – effective the end of the 2006-2007 school year
- Paul McAndrew – Special Education – effective the end of the 2006-2007 school Year

d) Appointments – Athletic

- Michael McCready – Softball
- Terry Dougherty – Baseball
- Jason Grisolia – Baseball
- Mike Poploskie – Baseball
- Joanne Mazzocchi - Track

Motion:	Mr. Chichilitti
Second:	Ms. Riccio
Result:	Approved: (9-0)

I.U. Representative - Excused

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION:

- The Varsity Hockey Team will be attending a Fall Classic Tournament in Florida from August 29, 2007 through September 2, 2007. The players and students will take the full responsibility of the cost of the trip. (see attached letter for further information)

April 19, 2007

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Mr. Ciambrello asked for clarification regarding the moving of dirt to behind the high school. Indicating that the decision to proceed and the cost (applications to the Bucks County Conservation) have not been presented to the board, Mr. Ciambrello asked for clarification. Mr. D'Angelo responded that Mr. Major was hired by the board previously. Mr. Ciambrello stated that Mr. Major was hired by the board to look at the site behind the high school and come up with a recommendation to the board. No approval was granted. Mr. D'Angelo stated that the amount of money was not significant and Dr. Davis indicated that nothing has been decided and Mr. Major has not submitted a bill for his services. He further stated that the contractor agreed to move the dirt at no cost. Mr. D'Angelo further stated that there is good topsoil at the site that is needed behind the high school.

Mr. Marchese, parent, asked about the change orders and the cost for delays. He asked if the plan was to occupy the building in 2009, and Mr. D'Angelo indicated that the plan was to occupy the building in September of 2008 and that date was the goal. However, delays do happen and it might be January of 2009 before the building is occupied. Mr. Marchese asked what the contingency was for the project was and Mr. D'Angelo responded that it is \$1.5 million.

The next scheduled meeting will be on May 3, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. Note: Executive sessions are routinely held 15 minutes prior to scheduled time.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned – 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Mary M. Antonelli
Board Secretary