

The Regional District 13 Board of Education Building Committee met in regular session on Wednesday, May 6, 2026 at 5:00 p.m. in the library at Cuginchaug Regional High School.

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

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

STV present: Ms. Liska and Ms. Cahill

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

### **Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **Approval of Agenda**

*Mr. Cross made a motion, seconded by Mr. Putnam, to approve the agenda as presented.*

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

### **Approval of Minutes – April 9, 2026 and April 22, 2026**

*Mr. Cross made a motion, seconded by Mr. Giammatteo, to approve the April 9, 2026 and April 22, 2026 Meeting minutes as presented.*

*All in favor of approving the April 9, 2026 and April 22, 2026 Meeting minutes as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mr. Putnam, Mr. Overton, Mr. Moore, Mr. Giammatteo, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Dwire, Mrs. Petrella, and Mrs. Cowan. Motion passed.*

## Memorial Renovation/Expansion

### A. Construction Partner Updates

Mr. Collier reported that the project demolition work is progressing well overall, though a few unforeseen conditions were discovered during the demo. These include limited hazardous material remediation needs and missing structural steel that was not shown on the original drawings. The building is currently safe and properly supported, but replacement structural supports and related costs will need to be reviewed by the committee in the coming weeks. Mr. Collier emphasized that these findings are not unusual for demolition work in an existing building and are not considered major concerns. Furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FF&E) meetings with departments, faculty, and administration are continuing and are expected to complete their first or second rounds by the end of May.

Mr. Collier also revisited discussion about the school entrance canopies. Updated visuals were shared to provide more clarity. Keeping the canopies, particularly near the existing gymnasium, may help conceal repair and brick patching work that would otherwise be visible if the canopies were removed. Mr. Collier recommended retaining them if financially feasible, though the committee does not need to make a decision immediately.

Mr. Luccarelli reported that notices to proceed for the critical contracts approved at the previous meeting were sent out immediately, and contractor agreements are now being finalized. Over the next two weeks, O&G will continue reviewing scopes for the remaining contracts, primarily focused on finish trades. Work on value management is also ongoing, with contractors helping identify potential cost-saving ideas that will be reviewed during upcoming trade discussions.

Mr. Luccarelli also reported that construction and demolition activities continue to make strong progress. Demolition is complete in most building areas, with only limited work remaining in one section. Chimney demolition is about 75% complete, canopy demolition is nearly finished, and abatement work has been completed in several areas while continuing in others. Roof removal and some interior saw-cutting work are being delayed until steel detailing and coordination are finalized to avoid exposing the building unnecessarily to weather conditions.

Mr. Luccarelli noted that additional coordination and survey work is underway. Weekly coordination meetings with the steel team have begun, building scans using BIM technology started this week, and surveyors are documenting existing structural steel conditions. Shoring work is scheduled to begin next week to allow demolition to continue safely in areas affected by load-bearing walls. Site work is ready to begin as soon as building and site permits are approved.

Mr. Luccarelli also identified another potential issue involving spray foam insulation throughout parts of the building. Because of its condition and related concerns, the material will likely need to be encapsulated. The design team is currently working with consultants and contractors to develop pricing and determine the best approach for addressing it.

Mr. Cross asked for clarification regarding the newly discovered load-bearing wall and structural issues. Mr. Luccarelli explained that they are continuing to investigate conditions as demolition progresses but believe the problem areas are fairly limited in scope. Since most of the affected areas are now exposed, the team has been able to better assess the situation. Mr. Luccarelli and Mr. Collier identified a few structural columns made of concrete masonry units (CMU) that had deteriorated and needed repair, along with one area where expected structural steel was missing. However, they noted that these issues are minimal and confined primarily to portions of the building dating back to the original 1950s construction. Existing drawings from that era were incomplete, which contributed to the unexpected findings.

Ms. Liska reported that the committee received an update on bids for required stormwater monitoring services. Three companies submitted proposals: Solli Engineering at \$52,900, Tectonic at about \$42,121, and Weston & Sampson at \$27,600. The quoted amounts are based on estimated inspection visits and could change slightly because the consultants must conduct weekly inspections as well as additional visits following rain events exceeding one inch. The estimates assumed around 47 visits, though the total may increase depending on weather conditions. Despite the uncertainty in the number of inspections, Ms. Cahill noted that the budget includes a \$75,000.00 line item for these services, leaving substantial room even if the number of required visits increases significantly. Based on the pricing received, STV recommends awarding the contract to Weston & Sampson because their proposal was the lowest and still comfortably within budget.

Ms. Liska also reported that a request for proposals (RFP) for materials testing services has already been prepared and posted for bidding. Responses are expected within the next couple of weeks. The project budget currently includes approximately \$100,000.00 for materials testing services, which STV believes will be more than sufficient.

Mr. Overton requested clarity on the estimated duration of the project. Mr. Collier clarified the anticipated duration of the construction project, confirming that the current schedule estimates approximately 16 months. Mr. Collier explained that if stormwater monitoring services begin around the end of the current month, monitoring activities would likely continue through July or August of the following year, aligning with the overall construction timeline.

Mr. Overton commented that based on the 16-month schedule, weekly stormwater inspections alone would total approximately 64 site visits over the life of the project, not including additional required inspections such as initial setup visits or inspections triggered by significant rain events. Mr. Overton also questioned whether the stormwater monitoring proposals included all required regulatory responsibilities, specifically the filing of the Notice of Termination at the end of the project. The project team confirmed that the proposals do include that filing, along with several additional required inspections beyond the estimated routine weekly visits. Mr. Cross also noted that the base proposal already covered inspections throughout the duration of the project, while the estimated 47 routine visits were an added calculation for budgeting purposes.

Mr. Overton also inquired about the requirement for a final Notice of Termination inspection to occur approximately one year after substantial project completion or site stabilization. The team indicated that the consultants is aware of this requirement and had included the necessary scope of services.

Mr. Overton mentioned not having reviewed the proposals prior to the meeting, but the members agreed that delaying the award would unnecessarily slow progress. Ms. Liska reassured the committee that the scope had been thoroughly reviewed, including assistance with drafting the RFP and review by project consultants. Weston & Sampson did not raise any objections to the scope, though they noted that the actual number of site visits may exceed the initial estimate. However, their proposal includes unit pricing for additional visits, giving the project flexibility while remaining within budget expectations.

#### B. Review and Possible Approval of Award of RFQ/P 2026-002 Stormwater Monitoring

*Mr. Giammatteo made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cross, to approve the award of RFQP 2026-002 Stormwater Monitoring for Regional School District 13 School State Project 213-0051 VA/ EA to Weston and Sampson for the base bid not to exceed \$27,600.*

*All in favor of the acceptance of the motion to approve the award of RFQP 2026-002 Stormwater Monitoring for Regional School District 13 School State Project 213-0051 VA/ EA to Weston and Sampson for the base bid not to exceed \$27,600: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mr. Putnam, Mr. Overton, Mr. Moore, Mr. Giammatteo, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Dwire, Mrs. Petrella, and Mrs. Cowan. Motion passed.*

#### C. Approval of Invoices

Mrs. Neubig presented the following invoices for approval:

	Invoice	Amount
QA&M	Invoice 17937: Bidding services and well & septic design	\$84,618.36
Eversource	Account 5189-758-0163: Portable electricity – March	\$676.42
Eversource	Account 5189-758-0163: Portable electricity – April	\$529.81
Salas O’Brien	Invoice 612-506871: Commissioning services for design phase	\$3,611.40
CubeSmart	Invoice 155424: April storage fees	\$272.00
CubeSmart	Invoice 162492: May storage fees	\$272.00
Mobile Modular	Invoice 2900815: March portable modular rental	\$3,554.00
Mobile Modular	Invoice 2886053 April portable modular rental	\$3,554.00
Dattco	Invoice 31382 March services	\$21,445.20
Dattco	Invoice 32000 April services	\$16,339.20
STV	Invoice 1891 March services	\$11,005.00
Pannone	Invoice 132-1928: Abatement monitoring	\$9,520.00

Town of Middlefield	Parcel #12058: Building permit	\$362,168.00
Shipman & Goodwin	Invoice 681188: Legal services	\$2,660.00
DBS Financial	RSD 13-180 Solar PV removal and storage agreement	\$1,955.00

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

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

Mr. Moore discussed ongoing concerns regarding additional building permit fees being charged by the Town of Middlefield. Mr. Moore noted that a letter to the town was sent requesting that the remaining permit fees, primarily associated with mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (MEP) work, be waived. The additional fees are estimated at approximately \$275,000.00. At the time of the meeting, the town had not yet responded following a recent meeting on the issue. It was clarified that these additional permit costs are already included within the contractors' bids, meaning that if the town ultimately waives or reduces the fees, corresponding credits or deductions would be returned from the contractors. To support their request, staff researched equivalent Town of Durham historical permit charges in the district dating back to 1976. Staff reviewed records stored at Durham Town Hall and found that nearly all prior school additions, renovations, HVAC work, and other construction projects had either not been charged permit fees or had only minimal fees assessed. Over roughly 50 years, total permit fees for district projects reportedly amounted to only about \$33,000.00, making the current fee request appear unusually high by comparison.

Mr. Cross acknowledged that some fees for plan review or additional staffing may be understandable, but expressed hope that much of the remaining amount could be refunded or waived. Mrs. Neubig also noted that despite already paying \$362,000.00 for the initial permit fee, the actual building permit still had not been issued after two weeks, requiring repeated follow-up efforts.

Mr. Simmons questioned the difference between Dattco's March and April invoices, noting that the reduced April amount was likely due to fewer school days during spring break. Mrs. Neubig confirmed this was the reason for April's reduced invoice.

Mr. Moore stated that the agenda item Review and possible approval of award of RFQ/P 2026-001 Architectural Services for Concept Design for ADA Improvements at Strong and CRHS was tabled because committee members had not yet had sufficient time to review the submitted bids. Mrs. Neubig states that although there had been hopes of completing some work during the summer, the state grant application timeline and review process made that unlikely. The proposals remain available in the shared drive for committee review, and Mrs. Neubig noted that the committee could either discuss them later in executive session or proceed once members felt comfortable selecting a vendor.

Mrs. Petrella also discussed improving community communication about the construction project, noting that the "Good Neighbor" flyer posted online had not been updated since March despite substantial

visible progress at the site. In response, Mrs. Neubig explained that while the flyer itself only contains static contact information, future field reports will include updated construction photos that can be posted to the website regularly. Additional photos taken by Mr. Giammatteo and staff will also be shared online.

Dr. Leggett expressed excitement about the upcoming groundbreaking ceremony scheduled for May 20 at 4:00 p.m., immediately before a building committee meeting. Dr. Leggett described plans for student involvement, including participation from the district's youngest student, an older graduating student, and a student from the transition (MTA) program. The event will feature food prepared by students from the Blue Devil Café and music performed by students. Mrs. Neubig also discussed upcoming walkthroughs for school administrators so they can better answer questions from parents and see project progress firsthand.

### **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: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mr. Putnam, Mr. Overton, Mr. Moore, Mr. Giammatteo, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Dwire, Mrs. Petrella, and Mrs. Cowan. Motion passed and the meeting adjourned.*

Respectfully submitted by Meghan Shortell-Fratantonio