

The Regional District 13 Board of Education Building Committee met in special session on Friday, June 12, 2026 at 12:00 p.m. remotely via Zoom.

Committee Members Present: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Overton, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mr. Giammatteo, and Mr. Dwire

Committee Members Absent: Mr. Putnam, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mr. Simmons and Mrs. Cowan

Administration Present: Dr. Leggett, Superintendent of Schools, Mr. Proia, Supervisor of Facilities and Grounds, and Mrs. Neubig, Director of Finance

O&G Associates present: Ms. Purcell

QA+M Associates present: Mr. Collier and Mr. Malik

STV present: Ms. Liska

Pennoni present: Mr. Twitchell

Mr. Weissberg called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

### **Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **Approval of Agenda**

*Mr. Giammatteo made a motion, seconded by Mr. Overton, to approve the agenda as presented.*

*All in favor of approving the agenda as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Overton, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mr. Giammatteo, and Mr. Dwire. Motion passed.*

### **Memorial Renovation/Expansion**

#### **A. Vote to Reject all roofing bids received for the Memorial School Project STATE PROJECT NO. 213-0051 RNV/EA, ITB #RSD13MPH3-001 BID PACKAGE 3.07r (Roofing)**

Ms. Purcell reviewed the roofing bid results received on May 20. Four bids were submitted, ranging from approximately \$1.46 million to \$4.31 million. The lowest bidder withdrew its bid before scope review. During review of the second-lowest bid, the project team determined that significant scope had been omitted. After pausing discussions to allow the bidder's estimator to participate, the company

acknowledged the omission and also withdrew its bid. This left the third-lowest bid, approximately \$2.65 million, as the next viable proposal.

Given the large gap between the withdrawn bids and the remaining qualified bid, Ms. Purcell recommended rejecting all roofing bids and rebidding the package rather than awarding to the third bidder. The expectation is that a rebid will produce pricing higher than the original low bid but significantly lower than the \$2.65 million remaining bid. The rebid is planned with a due date of June 29.

Mr. Weissberg asked if substantial changes must be shown in scope of work to rebid. Ms. Purcell clarified that although substantial scope changes are not required to rebid, the project team will issue a clarification to ensure all bidders include roofing work for the entrance canopies in their base bids. During the discussion, Mr. Weissberg noted broad committee member agreement that the left/front canopy must remain in the project. He questioned whether the rebid should include an alternate allowing removal of the right-side canopy, which could potentially generate additional savings while preserving the canopy considered essential. Ms. Purcell confirmed that this is the appropriate stage in the process to evaluate such an alternate because it would maximize potential savings.

Mr. Collier clarified that any canopy alternate would primarily affect the roofing trade package at this point. Pricing impacts to other trades, such as masonry and previously bid work, would need to be negotiated separately because those contracts have already been bid. Nevertheless, roofing represents a significant portion of the canopy cost, making it worthwhile to explore potential savings through the rebid process.

Ms. Purcell noted that previous estimates for eliminating the canopy ranged from approximately \$112,000.00 to \$141,000.00, making it important to accurately identify the correct canopy and ensure the alternate description matched the design documents. Mr. Giamatteo requested clarification if removing Canopy No. 4 would not increase costs elsewhere in the project. Ms. Purcell responded that because no savings from its removal had been incorporated into the GMP calculations, eliminating it would simply create a potential credit if budget pressures required it.

After reviewing the plans, the design team confirmed that the proposed deduct alternate would apply only to Canopy No. 4. Mr. Overton described the canopy as covering the sidewalk along the one-story portion of the building extending toward the gym entrance. The larger canopy over the two-story entrance area was unanimously viewed as essential and would remain in the project. Mr. Weissberg emphasized that the entrance canopy provides important aesthetic value, pedestrian protection, and circulation benefits and should not be considered for removal. Mr. Weissberg acknowledged that Canopy No. 4 still provides meaningful benefits, including weather protection, seating areas, and architectural enhancement, but committee members generally agreed it is a lower-priority feature than the main entrance canopy.

The committee agreed that Canopy No. 4 should remain in the project unless additional savings become necessary to keep the project within budget or to preserve a higher-priority programmatic element. To maintain consistency with previous trade pricing, the rebid documents will list the canopy removal as a deduct alternate, requiring bidders to submit pricing both with and without that portion of the canopy. Ms. Purcell indicated that the revised alternate language could be incorporated into the specifications immediately so the roofing package could be reissued without delay.

*Mr. Overton made a motion, seconded by Mr. Giammatteo, to reject all roofing bids received for the Memorial School Project STATE PROJECT NO. 213-0051 RNV/EA, ITB #RSD13MPH3-001 BID PACKAGE 3.07r (Roofing)*

*All in favor of rejecting all roofing bids received for the Memorial School Project STATE PROJECT NO. 213-0051 RNV/EA, ITB #RSD13MPH3-001 BID PACKAGE 3.07r (Roofing) as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Overton, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mr. Giammatteo, and Mr. Dwire. Motion passed.*

**B. Vote to authorize O&G to re-bid Memorial School Project STATE PROJECT NO. 213-0051 RNV/EA, ITB #RSD13MPH3-001 BID PACKAGE 3.07r (Roofing)**

*Mr. Giammatteo made a motion, seconded by Mr. Dwire, to authorize O&G to re-bid Memorial School Project STATE PROJECT NO. 213-0051 RNV/EA, ITB #RSD13MPH3-001 BID PACKAGE 3.07r (Roofing).*

*All in favor of authorizing O&G to re-bid Memorial School Project STATE PROJECT NO. 213-0051 RNV/EA, ITB #RSD13MPH3-001 BID PACKAGE 3.07r (Roofing) as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Overton, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mr. Giammatteo, and Mr. Dwire. Motion passed.*

**C. Vote to approve the add service proposal from Pennoni for additional testing, evaluation, and reporting.**

The committee reviewed a proposal for additional environmental testing related to elevated levels of beryllium discovered during construction-related soil investigations. Mr. Collier explained that the material was identified in a limited area of the site and, importantly, was not accompanied by other contaminants that would typically indicate illegal dumping or industrial pollution. Based on the location of the material, historical conditions in the area, and the absence of other contaminants, the environmental team believes the beryllium is likely naturally occurring rather than the result of human activity.

To confirm that conclusion, Mr. Twitchell proposed conducting additional sampling, research, and reporting. If the testing verifies that the beryllium occurs naturally, the affected soil can be treated as native site material and reused on-site. This would avoid the substantial costs associated with classifying the soil as contaminated and transporting it to an approved disposal facility.

Mr. Moore questioned where beryllium was found. Mr. Collier explained that the beryllium was found in the northwest portion of the property, near the tree line adjacent to the state park and close to the area where the new addition and pre-kindergarten entrance are planned. The location, along with historical mining activity in the Middlefield area and the lack of other contamination indicators, supports the hypothesis that the material originated naturally within the site's geology.

Mr. Overton sought clarification regarding the environmental review process. Mr. Twitchell explained that the previously completed Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was a historical records review that examined past property uses, underground storage tanks, spills, and other potential sources of contamination. Because a Phase I does not include soil sampling, it would not have identified naturally occurring metals in subsurface soils.

Mr. Overton questioned whether beryllium is a specifically targeted contaminant. Mr. Twitchell replied that the beryllium was discovered during subsequent soil testing required for areas where construction activities would disturb soil and potentially require excavation, relocation, or export of material. Mr. Twitchell noted that testing for metals such as beryllium, along with volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), and other regulated substances, is part of the standard environmental sampling protocol for major earthwork projects.

Mr. Overton further questioned why the district was incurring additional testing costs when there had been no evidence of spills, releases, or contamination identified during the Phase I environmental review or other prior investigations. Mr. Twitchell explained that the process is largely driven by regulatory requirements. Under the state's environmental review process, a Phase I assessment is typically followed by limited soil sampling in areas where major construction and earth disturbance will occur. The original sampling was conducted as part of that standard procedure and was not triggered by any known contamination concerns.

Mr. Overton identified that beryllium has historically been mined in the area. The consultant acknowledged the committee's observation that beryllium has historically been mined in the region and could reasonably be expected to occur naturally in local soils. However, the testing protocols do not automatically distinguish between naturally occurring materials and contamination. When laboratory results identify beryllium above regulatory thresholds, additional documentation and evidence are required before regulators will allow the material to be treated as naturally occurring soil. As a result, the current testing effort is focused specifically on demonstrating that the detected beryllium is part of the site's natural geology rather than the result of a release or other human activity. Mr. Twitchell explained that regulatory agencies require supporting data, historical research, and additional sampling before they will make that determination. The fact that beryllium was mined somewhere within the region is not, by itself, sufficient evidence. Regulators must evaluate the specific site conditions, surrounding land uses, historical property records, and the absence of other contaminants before concluding that the material is naturally occurring.

Mr. Overton questioned the scope of the additional testing required. Mr. Twitchell indicated that approximately a dozen additional soil samples would be collected and analyzed specifically for beryllium. These results, combined with historical research and technical reporting, are intended to establish that the concentrations found are consistent with naturally occurring background conditions. If successful, the district would be able to reuse the soil on-site and avoid the significant costs associated with treating and disposing of it as contaminated material.

Mr. Moore questioned if the soil would remain outside of construction. Mr. Collier explained that because the material will be excavated during construction, the district must determine whether it can be reused on-site or must be treated as contaminated soil and disposed of elsewhere. Establishing that the beryllium is naturally occurring would allow the material to remain on-site and avoid significant disposal costs.

Mr. Overton asked for clarification on how many tests exceeded the regulatory limit for beryllium. Mr. Twitchell reported that of the original 25 soil samples collected, only one sample exceeded the regulatory threshold for beryllium. Three other samples elsewhere on the site identified different contaminants, but those materials can be managed and left in place under standard soil management procedures. The

beryllium sample was the only location requiring further investigation. Mr. Twitchell noted that if the material is ultimately classified as naturally occurring, the regulatory soil-handling requirements would no longer apply because it would be considered part of the site's native geology.

Mr. Overton questioned whether the additional testing was necessary, given the area's well-documented history of beryllium mining and the lack of any evidence suggesting spills, releases, or contamination from prior site activities.

Ms. Purcell also discussed the schedule implications. Ms. Liska emphasized that the issue is time-sensitive because the affected soil lies directly within the foundation area of the new addition. Delaying the investigation could result in construction delays or require the soil to be moved multiple times, increasing both costs and risks. Dr. Leggett voiced strong support for completing the additional testing, noting that if the district had any knowledge of a potential environmental concern and failed to investigate it fully, the district could face significant liability in the future.

Ms. Purcell also questioned who ultimately determines whether the material can remain on-site. Mr. Twitchell explained that a Licensed Environmental Professional (LEP) would evaluate the additional testing data, historical records, and geological evidence before issuing a determination letter. Because LEPs are licensed and recognized by the state environmental regulatory framework, their conclusions generally stand unless challenged by another qualified professional or regulatory agency. Mr. Twitchell noted that relatively few LEPs remain in practice, making the credential both specialized and highly regulated.

The committee also examined the cost of the proposal, which was approximately \$17,000.00. Mr. Overton asked whether the urgency of the situation was causing the district to pay a premium for accelerated environmental testing. Mr. Twitchell explained that the proposal includes a five-day laboratory turnaround, which is somewhat faster than the typical seven- to ten-day standard processing time. However, he noted that the expedited schedule did not result in a significant increase in cost. Mr. Overton questioned whether the work could have been performed earlier, since the initial soil results were known months before construction reached this stage. Mr. Twitchell responded that contaminated soil disposal costs had only been estimated during bidding and that no actual remediation work had been included in construction pricing. The proposed fee covers approximately a dozen additional samples, field work, laboratory analysis, historical research, geological review, report preparation, and the LEP determination process. While Mr. Twitchell offered to review the scope for possible savings, he maintained that the work was clearly defined and necessary to support a defensible conclusion.

*Mrs. Petrella made a motion, seconded by Mr. Giammatteo, to approve the add service proposal from Pennoni for additional testing, evaluation, and reporting.*

Before voting, the committee discussed how specifically the motion should describe the environmental testing work. Mr. Moore noted that the action involved more than simply authorizing "additional testing" and wanted the motion tied directly to the consultant's written proposal to ensure clarity regarding the approved scope of work. Therefore, the motion was amended.

*Mrs. Petrella made an amended motion, seconded by Mr. Dwire, to approve the add service proposal referring to the additional scope dated June 4, 2026 from Pennoni for additional testing, evaluation, and reporting.*

*All in favor approving the add service proposal referring to the additional scope dated June 4, 2026 from Pennoni for additional testing, evaluation, and reporting as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Overton, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mr. Giammatteo, and Mr. Dwire. Motion passed.*

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Adjournment**

*Mr. Giammatteo made a motion, seconded by Mr. Moore, to adjourn the meeting.*

*All in favor of adjourning the meeting: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Overton, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mr. Giammatteo, and Mr. Dwire. Motion passed and the meeting adjourned.*

Respectfully submitted by Meghan Shortell-Fratantonio