Meeting Summary

Project Title: City of Hudson DRI
Chazen Project Number: 31908

Meeting Date, Time: Wednesday, April 15 at 2:30PM
Meeting Location: Conference Call
Prepared by: Caren LoBrutto, Chazen Project Manager

Attending:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee by phone:</th>
<th>Representing:</th>
<th>Email:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Chameides</td>
<td>City of Hudson, Mayor’s Aide</td>
<td>mayoral <a href="mailto:aide@cityofhudson.org">aide@cityofhudson.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Perry</td>
<td>City of Hudson, DPW Superintendent</td>
<td>dpw <a href="mailto:superintendent@cityofhudson.org">superintendent@cityofhudson.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Roberts</td>
<td>City of Hudson, Attorney</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cheryl.roberts@cityofhudson.org">cheryl.roberts@cityofhudson.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Bujanow</td>
<td>City of Hudson, DPW Commissioner</td>
<td>p <a href="mailto:bujanow@cityofhudson.org">bujanow@cityofhudson.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Round</td>
<td>Chazen Companies</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cround@chazencompanies.com">cround@chazencompanies.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caren LoBrutto</td>
<td>Chazen Companies</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clobrutto@chazencompanies.com">clobrutto@chazencompanies.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom DePietro</td>
<td>City of Hudson, Council President</td>
<td>council <a href="mailto:pres@cityofhudson.org">pres@cityofhudson.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Campbell</td>
<td>City of Hudson, Treasurer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:citytreasurer@cityofhudson.org">citytreasurer@cityofhudson.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamal Johnson-Absent</td>
<td>City of Hudson, Mayor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mayor@cityofhudson.org">mayor@cityofhudson.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
Note: This meeting is taking place during the NYS, Columbia County, and City of Hudson State of Emergency where social distancing procedures are in place. This committee, which does not have a defined quorum, is not subject to open meetings law. Meeting notes will continue to be distributed and public comment sought.

Discussion/Agenda Items

1. Project Status
   a. Project #1 Promenade Hill Park:
      - Starr Whitehouse provided a summary of 3/27 call with Michael and Chris during which it was discussed that there is no public engagement scheduled currently due to COVID-19 crisis; other platforms are being considered, but no decisions have been made.
      - As decided previously, site survey (as in engineering survey, not a public feedback survey) should start as soon as possible. Survey will need to conform to essential services directive. The first step is the utility mark out and it was determined that Rob Perry/Public Works has relevant records, including the National Grid Utility Plan.
      - Starr Whitehouse provided a revised contract (based on City comments) for City review and signature by Mayor.
b. Project #2 BRIDGE District Connectivity:
- Arterial has revised the contract, including DOS required language regarding ownership of work product. The revised contract is anticipated to be received this week of 4/13.
- Arterial is currently working on a public engagement schedule, which may include use of online platforms.
- If public engagement begins by June there should be no substantive change to the overall schedule.

c. Dunn Warehouse Short Term Repairs:
- Peter reported the roofing material was delivered, and roof repair began on 4/13 with completion originally anticipated for 4/14.
- During the repair, an additional 10x10-foot hole was identified in the roof. How should additional holes be handled? Some ideas included use of a rubber roof membrane and whether a shorter vs. longer term solution was desired.
- Michael opined that with the contractor mobilized on site it may be less expensive overall to undertake the additional repair now as opposed to remobilizing on a different date.
- Peter stated that the roofing membrane being used for the 9x22-foot hole may be suitable for this 10x10-foot hole.
- Michael opined that a small cost as opposed to a massive reinvestment seemed reasonable to stabilize the building in advance of the future long-term investment being considered as part of the REI.
- Peter requested that a Chazen engineer visit the site on 4/16 to assess whether the work has been done to scope and to assess the newly found hole and make a recommendation for a short-term repair. Peter will provide the contractor’s contact information.
- The conversation shifted to which authorization should be used to approve the expense, including applicability of various sources/powers:
  - Pre-authorized discretionary expense account(s) which can be used for emergency repair provisions (blanket authorization with limit for capital projects);
  - Restoration activity eligible under the Restore Grant (ESDC funds, City incurs expenses to a capital account and gets reimbursed);
  - Capital account for DRI; and
  - Current roof repair approved BID
- Cheryl summarized eligible options: 1) Apply existing resolution authorizing discretionary expense accounts(s); or (2) Apply City Charter authority to spend under emergency conditions; or (3) Approach Mayor and Council with new resolution to authorize additional roof repair.
- Peter will request a quote for additional repair from Tecta America WeatherGuard if determined to be necessary after site visit by Chazen Companies engineer.
- [Note after the 4/15 meeting, a Chazen engineer visited site on 4/16. The engineer noted that the project, including the repair of the 9x22-foot hole, was completed to specification and that no additional work be performed.]
2. Dunn Warehouse Request for Expression of Interest (REI)
   - Peter noted that Bonacio had responded to the HDC Kaz project and the Dunn Warehouse project may be a better fit.
   - Discussion moved to how to proceed with only one response: should it be reviewed? If so, does it meet requirements set in REI?
   - Michael noted it would be ideal to have more than one response, but that the REI response could be advanced through further consideration without a binding commitment.
   - Peter suggested re-issuing the REI with greater emphasis on potential uses within the responses to a targeted group of developers, brokers, architects.
   - Discussion about REI and RFPs in general took place, acknowledging different strategies (e.g. REI leading to more focused RFP) and recognizing the public/private partnership aspect of this project and the reluctance to be too prescriptive in the approach.
   - The Committee decided to take a week to review the single REI response and consider if the REI should be reissued. An email response of yes/no to reissuing the REI on 4/22 is required. This email should also capture the strengths and weaknesses of the REI received. The purpose of the email response is to better shape the discussion on 4/29.
   - The Bonacio REI response will remain confidential until the Committee decides whether a new REI will be issued or not.

3. Fugary Fishing Village:
   - Michael shared that he had received emails from Tim O’Conner about O’Connor’s correspondence with SHPO. Those emails show SHPO recommending: “In an ideal world we would do our best to identify not a scattered collection of shacks, but instead a number of contiguous ones, in order to properly convey a sense of density that properly reflects historic conditions.”
     [Note: after the 4/15 meeting, Michael shared an updated map/plan from O’Connor that prioritized contiguous shacks”]
   - Caren provided summary of Shack Preservation Methodology as was discussed during prior meeting with report on coordination with SHPO. SHPO has no official opinion on preservation of shacks (notwithstanding the information provided by Tim O’Conner) outside of a more formal regulatory review.
   - The overall vision of the Park was briefly discussed with Michael articulating: nice, safe place with historical value provided by retained/preserved shacks.
   - Cheryl has asked Jeff Baker to look at permitting requirements (e.g. floodplains, wetlands). Jeff Baker should contact Chris Round and Caren LoBrutto with comments/questions.
   - Shack preservation methodology was discussed and whether an engineer should be consulted on structural issues related to preserving various buildings. Other various criteria were discussed: flooding potential, environmental contamination issues.
   - Chris indicated the park could be realized through a general contractor (GC) under the City’s direction. The GC would do the site work and the City DPW would oversee, with legal undertaking the permitting requirements.
The 2016/2017 idea to connect the proposed park to the land conservancy’s boardwalk and trailhead was briefly discussed.

Chazen to prepare a matrix showing each shack and identifying the various issues/criteria that apply.

4. DOS Funding
   - The potential for funding difficulties during the COVID-19 Crisis was discussed. DOS has indicated the projects should move forward, where possible, with no disruption to funding anticipated.
   - Heather raised the potential for issues associated with cash flow and timing of repayment as a result of the COVID-19 Crisis.

5. Chazen Invoicing
   - Chris provided the invoice summaries to the City and these have been submitted to the Council for formal review on 4/21, with approval anticipated by 4/24.
   - Chris will prepare reimbursement requirements.

Next Steps

1. Contracts to City for Starr Whitehouse and Arterial for Mayor signature
2. Chazen to inspect Dunn Warehouse temporary roof repairs (completed 4/16)
3. Cheryl Roberts to advise City on procurement policy as it relates to emergency repair (i.e. Dunn Warehouse)
4. Chazen to prepare Fishing Village matrix identifying shacks, issues, and photo.
5. Committee members to email Chris Round opinion on Dunn Warehouse REI Response and opinion on reissuance of REI by 4/22.

Next Meeting Scheduled

Wednesday, April 29, 2020, 2:30pm – via conference call
Caren LoBrutto

From: P BUJANOW <pbujanow@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 11:39 AM
To: Caren LoBrutto; Chris Round
Cc: mayoralaide@cityofhudson.org; dpwsuperintendent@cityofhudson.org;
cheryl.roberts@cityofhudson.org; councilpres@cityofhudson.org; citytreasurer@cityofhudson.org;
Mayor
Subject: Hudson DRI Committee Meeting Summaries 4/15/20
Attachments: 202004016_site_visit_observation.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caren - Chris:
Good Morning-

Respectfully request the following clarifications to the 4/15/20 Meeting Summary:

1. C Dunn Warehouse Short Term Repairs:

=> Bottom of page-
“Peter will get a quote for additional repair from Rupert.” Should read: “Peter will request a quote for additional repair from Tecta America WeatherGuard if determined to be necessary after site visit by Chazen Companies engineer.”

=> Bottom of Page, last entry-
Clarify second sentence: “The engineer noted that the project, including the repair of the 10’ x 10’ foot hole, . . .”. Size of repair not accurate to Chazen construction drawings / specs - drawings indicate 9’ x 22’.

=> Also suggest including in the minutes the email with attachment immediately below for further clarification.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Bujanow

From: Chris Round <cround@chazencompanies.com>
Date: April 17, 2020 at 2:53:24 PM EDT
To: Peter Bujanow <pbujanow@cityofhudson.org>
Subject: FW: 31992.00 Dunn Warehouse

Hi Chris,

We do not recommend additional work beyond the original scope of the temporary roof repairs. I will get you the memo shortly.

Thanks,
Becca
Peter Bujanow

On Apr 22, 2020, at 4:46 PM, Caren LoBrutto <clobrutto@chazencompanies.com> wrote:

All –

Please find attached the meeting summary for the 4/15 DRI Committee Meeting.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Caren

Caren LoBrutto
Senior Planner, Planning Services
The Chazen Companies
21 Fox Street
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601
Phone: (845) 486-1458
clobrutto@chazencompanies.com

<20200415DRICmteMtgFINAL.pdf>
Rebecca Sheely E.I.T. of the Chazen companies visited the above referenced project site on Thursday, April 16, 2020 at 1:00pm to observe the current state of construction for the temporary roof stabilization associated with repair documents titled "Temporary Roof Stabilization Winter 2019" dated 12/13/19. While on site we observed the following conditions:

1. The metal roof panel has been installed and is visibly anchored to the east masonry wall and knee wall and generally conforms to the contract documents.
   a. Closure plates per section 2/Sketch 3 still need to be installed.
   b. The west side of the metal deck still needs to be sealed and fastened down per plan view 1/Sketch 2
2. The unstable portion of the parapet has been removed.
3. A hole in the high roof at the east side of the north portion of the structure was observed. In our opinion the cost of the repair will likely outweigh the damages due to water infiltration that would occur prior to the full renovation at this location. This portion of the roof is not in worse condition than the rest of the building envelope.

Structural Observations are performed by the design Engineer of Record or qualified Design Professional and are limited to visual observations of the structural systems only. Structural Observations are completed at significant construction stages to determine if the completed work is in general conformance with the construction documents. It is the responsibility of the Contractor to review these Structural Observations and address them as a part of the inspection requirements of the project and the Contractor’s quality control programs. This Structural Observation report does not waive the Contractor’s responsibility to construct the work as specified in the contract documents, waive the required inspections by building officials and special inspections programs or be construed to imply acceptance of non-conforming work.

Respectfully submitted by:

Rebecca Sheely

______________________________
Engineer’s Name (Printed)

______________________________
Engineer’s Signature

______________________________
Reviewed by: Lanson Cosh

______________________________
Date 04/17/2020