

The Regional School District 13 Board of Education Building Committee met in regular session on Wednesday, April 1, 2026 at 5:00 p.m. in the library at Coginchaug Regional High School.

Committee Members Present: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mr. Putnam, Mr. Dwire (attending virtually), Mr. Overton, Mr. Giammatteo, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons (arrived 5:06) and Mrs. Petrella.

Committee Members Absent: Charles Dalles

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

O&G Associates present: Mr. Luccarelli, Mr. Cravanzola (attending virtually), and Ms. Purcell

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

STV present: Ms. Liska

Mr. Weissberg called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

### **Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

### **Public Comment**

Avery Viens, a junior and captain of the girls' tennis team, thanked the committee for supporting the tennis program but raised concerns about the worsening condition of the tennis courts. Avery expressed appreciation for plans to fully replace the courts but asked if the timeline could be moved up, noting that if the project takes two or more years, current freshmen may graduate without ever playing a home match.

The committee thanked Avery for her message and Mr. Weissberg commented that discussion of the tennis courts is on the agenda for the evening.

A parent of a student athlete expressed concern about the poor condition of the tennis courts and the impact on tennis players. The parent noted that about 10% of the student body participates in tennis and said it is upsetting that juniors and seniors may never have a senior night or home matches on their own courts. While acknowledging the school has excellent facilities and a strong tennis program with great students, the parent hopes improving or replacing the courts becomes a priority in future planning so tennis athletes can have the same opportunities as other sports teams.

The committee thanked the parent for sharing his concerns and discussed a motion to move the discussion of tennis courts earlier on the agenda.

**Approval of Agenda**

*Mr. Cross made a motion, seconded by Mr. Giamatteo, to approve the agenda with an amendment of moving item F. Discussion of Tennis Courts, as presented.*

*All in favor of approving the agenda with an amendment of moving item F. Discussion of Tennis Courts as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mr. Putnam, Mr. Dwire, Mr. Overton, Mr. Giamatteo, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons and Mrs. Petrella. Motion passed.*

**Approval of Minutes – March 4, 2026**

*Mr. Cross made a motion, seconded by Mr. Putnam, to approve the March 4, 2026 Meeting Minutes as presented.*

*All in favor of approving the March 4, 2026 Meeting Minutes as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mr. Putnam, Mr. Dwire, Mr. Overton, Mr. Giamatteo, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons and Mrs. Petrella. Motion passed.*

**Tennis Court Discussion**

The discussion focused on the deteriorating condition of the tennis courts and possible solutions. A Committee member noted that the tennis courts have been repaired in previous years to extend their use while acknowledging they are nearing the end of their lifespan and will eventually need replacement. The Committee member asked Mr. Proia whether the courts have now deteriorated too much to be repaired again for match play this year, or if repairs could still make them usable as in past years. Mr. Proia explained that repairs have continued each year and were completed again this spring so students can practice safely, but the courts have surface cracks affecting ball bounce. Mr. Proia iterated that the main decision is whether to replace them with asphalt or post-tension concrete.

Mr. Cross explained that replacing the tennis courts could cost between \$250,000.00 and \$500,000.00, but the project cannot move forward until the necessary funds are allocated through the budget. Currently, about \$20,000.00 per year is being set aside, though it may eventually stop making sense to continue repairing the courts. Once funding is approved, the replacement could be completed relatively quickly.

Mr. Weissberg presented the investigations that have been done on the courts, including soil borings and video inspections of the drainage pipes to determine if groundwater was causing the deterioration. Mr. Proia suggested that the underground drainage system appears to be functioning properly, and although one section could not be fully inspected due to camera limitations, there is reason to believe it is in place and working as intended. Additionally, Mr. Proia identified that the issue is not related to drainage or groundwater but rather surface cracking from aging courts, which were installed around 2010 and have been repaired regularly for about a decade. Mr. Proia presented the benefit of post-tension concrete courts, costing close to \$1 million, but lasting much longer (potentially around 30 years) and providing a more durable long-term solution. Asphalt courts, costing roughly \$350,000.00–\$400,000.00, with an estimated lifespan of about 10–12 years (possibly longer with proper maintenance).

Dr. Leggett suggested that investing in the more expensive, long-term solution might prevent repeated costs to taxpayers. Mr. Weissberg asserted, based on his experience, that asphalt courts can last longer than the commonly cited 10–12 years if routine maintenance and resurfacing are properly budgeted. From a life-cycle cost perspective, Mr. Weissberg believes asphalt could be a practical and cost-effective option, noting that choosing asphalt could help avoid a situation where the town has no available tennis courts for an extended period.

Dr. Leggett added that the current courts are still playable and not considered a safety hazard, though improvements are still needed. Mr. Overton iterated that, based on inspections and borings, the underground drainage system is functioning properly and groundwater is not causing the deterioration. While one section could not be fully inspected due to equipment limitations, Committee members believe it is in place and working. Mr. Overton noted that if the courts are truly unplayable, this is unexpected, and if ongoing repairs have not restored them to competitive standards, the district may need to consider an accelerated replacement.

Mr. Giammatteo questioned who determined that home matches could not take place, and was this decision made due to the number of tennis courts. Dr. Leggett clarified that the lack of home matches is not due to the number of courts, but because the courts, while safe for practice, are not optimal for competitive matches due to surface cracks affecting ball bounce. Mr. Putnam noted that he believes the specific determination of unplayability appears to have been made by whoever approves courts for high school varsity competition, based on minimum standards for match play. This information was not known to Dr. Leggett, so questions arose regarding who made this determination and if it is a rumor.

Mr. Weissberg asked Mr. Proia about the age of the courts. Mr. Proia responded that the courts were installed in 2010, making them 16 years old, and the tennis company noted that introducing cracks or control joints during installation is not recommended, which contributes to current issues. Additionally, the company can't provide any type of warranty on an asphalt course.

Mr. Cross iterated the current state of the tennis courts, in which the tennis courts are currently being used for practice but not for competition. He shared that the town and state do not provide reimbursement for court replacement, and past attempts at grants (e.g., through USTA) were unsuccessful. Mr. Overton questioned if even a minimal asphalt replacement is possible immediately. Dr. Leggett replied that the \$400,000.00 is not immediately fundable because existing capital accounts are already allocated to other projects like chillers and other updates that are ADA compliant.

Mr. Weissberg expressed concern that the decision to make the courts unplayable for competition may have been made without informing key personnel, including facilities staff and the superintendent. The issue seems to be ball bounce and playability, not safety. Members asked what requirements are needed to make them suitable for matches. Because competition usability is a new concern, Mr. Overton believes it could make replacing or repairing the courts more urgent, and may warrant more aggressive funding allocation in the budget.

Mr. Weissberg discussed the need for more information on current condition, liability, and who made the competitive play decision. Dr. Leggett clarified that she was aware the matches would be played away, mainly due to coaches' concerns about court playability, and this decision was not surprising. Dr. Leggett

emphasized that the bigger issue is when and how to fully repair or replace the courts. While the Board could decide to host home matches despite the courts being suboptimal, doing so would mean the athletes would play on courts that are not ideal for competition, even though they remain safe for practice. This approach was seen as a reasonable compromise for now.

Mr. Weissberg emphasized the need to clarify liability and safety, including how long the courts are safe for play and ensuring there are no tripping hazards or displaced surfaces. Mr. Weissberg stressed that decisions between asphalt and post-tension concrete should consider life-cycle costs to determine the best long-term solution.

Mr. Weissberg added that timing is also a challenge because quality work is best done after the season and winter damage, while the team needs courts in March. Mr. Overton identified that annual repairs are substantial and labor-intensive, not minor patchwork, and are intended to maintain usability until a full replacement can be completed. Mr. Overton and Mr. Weissberg agreed it would be beneficial to coordinate with coaches and the athletic director to discuss both short-term playability and long-term solutions.

### **Memorial Renovation/Expansion**

#### **A. Update from Construction Partners**

Ms. Liska covered progress on Phase Two abatement work and broader construction activities. Ms. Liska reported that Phase Two abatement is ongoing, with the first owner-architect-contractor meeting completed. A site walk showed good progress, with the abatement demolition contractor working efficiently and keeping the site organized. Phase Three bids are currently out, with results expected by April 9. A meeting with the town attorney addressed concerns about the GMP (Guaranteed Maximum Price), and a proposal from O&G for Phases One and Two is being considered to formalize agreements.

Mr. Weissberg questioned if there were any complaints. Ms. Liska stated there are no concerns. Communication with neighbors is being maintained via town website updates, and a temporary fence has been installed for safety. Work is being documented for the first request for reimbursement, which includes about 370 pages of invoices totaling approximately \$5 million.

Ms. Purcell introduced Mr. Lucarelli as project manager who is actively overseeing phase two and will continue through phase three, bringing prior experience from school projects in Salisbury and Simsbury. Ms. Purcell reported that addenda have been issued weekly since March 4, with addendum #4 released last Thursday and #5 scheduled for tomorrow. Phase three bids are due April 9, while roofing bids have been slightly delayed due to technical specification revisions, though this will not affect the overall schedule. Pre-construction planning includes scoping critical contractors with long-lead items, such as door frames, windows, and mechanical systems, with scope reviews for these critical trades planned for the week of April 13th.

Mr. Lucarelli noted that mobilization began on March 16, with abatement and demolition progressing efficiently; flooring abatement is nearly complete, with work moving next to PCBs and tunnels. Necessary permits from OSTA, DEEP, and P&Z are in process, most already secured, and weekly

inspections, including stormwater and turbidity monitoring, are being handled by a third-party independent service to ensure compliance.

#### B. Review and Possible Vote on Guaranteed Maximum Price – O&G (GMP)

Ms. Purcell reviewed the cost summary for Phase One and Phase Two. The cost summary includes \$70,000.00 in CM allowances for potential lead-based paint abatement, shoring, and demo of a discovered block wall, to be spent only with owner approval. The total for phase two is \$3,866,238.00, rolled into a combined phase one and two total of \$5,700,324.00, which includes all costs, CM reimbursables, general conditions, staffing, permits, and advertising. The phase three GMP will follow a similar document structure, and future board discussions will focus on phase three assumptions, clarifications, and selection of alternates, ensuring a clear roadmap for project scheduling, financial management, and pre-construction activities.

*Mr. Cross made a motion, seconded by Mr. Giamatteo, to approve the guaranteed maximum price proposal for phases one and two, in the amount of \$5,700,324.00.*

*All in favor of approving the guaranteed maximum price proposal for phases one and two, in the amount of \$5,700,324.00 as proposed. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mr. Putnam, Mr. Dwire, Mr. Overton, Mr. Giamatteo, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons and Mrs. Petrella. Motion passed.*

#### C. Phase 4 Furniture and Fixtures

Mrs. Neubig reported she met with three furniture vendors along with Mr. Collier and Mrs. Smith, and all three were excellent. Each belongs to a consortium and prices are the same and all have access to the same furniture, so the differentiator was really customer service. The district has decided to move forward with Creative Office Resources. While all vendors were strong, Mrs. Neubig proposed Creative Office Resources is the best fit.

#### D. Approval of Invoices

Mrs. Neubig presented the following invoices for approval:

STV	1570	\$9,400.00	Owners Rep Services
Michael Horton Associates	25-246.b1	\$9,800.00	Engineering Code Consultant 3rd party
Shipman & Goodwin	679530	\$95.00	Legal Fees
US Bank	7931477	\$850.00	Bond Closing fees
QAM	17824	\$23,763.00	Bidding, Traffic Study and Well and Septic Design
Eversource	5189-758-0163	\$913.67	Portables 5/6 February
Mobile Modular	2870447	\$3,239.00	March

Acrisure	29429	\$105,489.00	Builder's Risk Insurance effective 3/17/26
O&G	2	\$124,637.25	Precon svcs, steel predetailing cm fee

*Mr. Cross made a motion, seconded by Mr. Giammatteo, to approve the invoices as presented.*

*All in favor of approving the invoices as presented. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mr. Putnam, Mr. Dwire, Mr. Overton, Mr. Giammatteo, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons and Mrs. Petrella. Motion passed.*

### **ADA Report (Strong and CRHS)**

Dr. Leggett provided the Building Committee with the initial ADA study report for review. Dr. Leggett noted the report is thorough, assessing both Strong and the high school for ADA needs, and it identifies several areas that require attention. While there is some funding available at both schools for ADA improvements, it may not cover everything immediately, so Dr. Leggett identified priority updates. The initial action is to issue an RFQ/P for design services for the front entryway at Strong, which is a high-priority item to ensure a secure and ADA-compliant entrance. Following that, the high school auditorium will be the next focus, as it likely requires the most significant ADA-related updates. Concurrently, Dr. Leggett established that these ADA considerations will be developed into a more comprehensive capital plan, keeping in mind that reimbursement requirements for state projects will necessitate bundling improvements into two projects: one for the middle school and one for the high school. Additionally, there are some more immediate, lower-cost improvements that could be addressed independently, such as sidewalks, curbs, exterior accessibility, and ramp upgrades. At Strong, aside from the entrance, the elevator also needs to be prioritized for replacement.

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **Adjournment**

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

*All in favor of adjourning the meeting. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mr. Putnam, Mr. Dwire, Mr. Overton, Mr. Giammatteo, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons and Mrs. Petrella. Motion passed and the meeting adjourned.*

Respectfully submitted by Meghan Shortell-Fratantonio