Received 6/29/26
9:40 AM Jodi Moore, ATC

Regional School District 13 **Board of Education** **June 17, 2026**
Building Committee

The Regional District 13 Board of Education Building Committee met jointly with the Board of Education in regular session on Wednesday, June 17, 2026 at 5:00 p.m. in the library at Coginchaug Regional High School.

Building Committee Members Present: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Giammatteo and Mr. Dwire (attended virtually)
Building Committee Members Absent: Mr. Overton, and Mr. Putnam
Board of Education Members Present: Dr. Darcy (attended virtually), Mr. Konstantino, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Petrella, Mrs. Cowan and Mr. Roraback
Board of Education Members Absent: Mrs. Caramanello, Mr. Stone, and Mr. DelVecchio
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 and 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 5:00 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Approval of Agenda

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

All in favor of approving the agenda as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Giammatteo, Mr. Dwire, Dr. Darcy, Mr. Konstantino, and Mr. Roraback. Motion passed.

Approval of Minutes – June 3, 2026

Mr. Moore made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cross, to approve the June 3, 2026 Meeting Minutes as presented.

All in favor of approving the June 3, 2026 Meeting Minutes as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Dwire, and Mr. Giammatteo; Motion passed.

Memorial Renovation/Expansion

A. Construction Partner Update

1. QA&M

Mr. Collier reported that the team is now attending coordination meetings multiple times per week as construction activity increases. With demolition and early construction work underway, several unforeseen existing building conditions have been identified that require additional coordination with O&G. Mr. Collier noted that they are currently evaluating solutions to these issues and will bring recommendations back to the Building Committee once a clear path forward has been developed.

a. Building Committee Discussion and Vote to Approve QA&M to Provide Additional Services for: the Eversource Easement, PFA Water Treatment Services and Roofing Specification Services and to Recommend to The Board of Education.

The committee discussed QA&M’s request for additional professional services that arose after execution of their original agreement. Three specific items were presented. Mr. Malik reported that Eversource required a survey related to an easement, and QA&M engaged its consultants to perform the work at a proposed cost of $2,750.00. Additionally, the project’s existing well system was flagged during Connecticut Department of Public Health review due to PFAS contamination levels and changing regulatory requirements. Lastly, Mr. Malik discussed an item that involved roofing specification services associated with the roof rebid process. Mr. Malik explained that while the roofing specifications had already been prepared as part of the original design work, the consultant responsible for those specifications is a small business and indicated that it could not absorb the additional effort required for the rebid without compensation. QA&M therefore requested an additional $2,500.00 to cover those services.

Mr. Moore sought clarification on the treatment that is required. Mr. Collier explained that the treatment system will be installed within the existing pump house to provide additional filtration for the well water supply. The filtration equipment itself has already been incorporated into the project scope and budget; the current request is only for the associated design services, totaling $8,930.89.

Mr. Cross made a motion, seconded by Mr. Croston, to approve QA&M to provide additional services for: the Eversource Easement, PFA Water Treatment Services, and Roofing Specification Services for $14,160.00.

All in favor of approving QA&M to provide additional services for: the Eversource Easement, PFA Water Treatment Services, and Roofing Specification Services for $14,160.00 as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mr. Dwire, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Giammatteo and Mr. Simmons. Motion passed.

e. Building Committee Review and Potential Vote to Approve Pennoni's Additional Service Request #2 Dated 6/12/2026.

The committee received an update on the environmental remediation work, which is nearing completion. Mr. Twitchell reported that the vermiculite abatement has finished, a condition that was discovered after work began and required additional remediation. Remaining work includes addressing lead-containing floor cutbacks, completing remediation of several wall mastic locations, and resolving mold that has been identified on portions of the roof deck. Depending on the final remediation approach, additional mold clearance testing may be required, particularly for affected fiberglass-backed insulation panels. Mr. Twitchell also noted that contractors performing future cutting and coring work will need site-specific training regarding PCB-containing materials to ensure proper handling and worker awareness.

A proposal for additional environmental consulting services was then reviewed. Mr. Twitchell estimated an additional cost of $33,062.50 based on unit rates previously approved under the contract. The estimate reflects approximately 22 additional days of work resulting from the project schedule being extended by roughly one month, along with additional clearance testing, project management, and design coordination associated with the newly discovered conditions. Mr. Twitchell emphasized that the estimate represents a worst-case scenario and is not a lump-sum request. In preparing the estimate, assumptions were made that each affected room would require separate containment and clearance procedures; however, Mr. Twitchell indicated that larger combined containment areas may reduce the actual cost. The proposal Mr. Twitchell expects the final cost to come in below the estimate.

Mr. Cross asked if mold samples were taken. Regarding the mold discovered on the roof deck, Mr. Twitchell explained that testing indicated the material is located on fiberglass-backed insulation panels. Since the existing roof structure will ultimately be covered by the new roof system, one potential solution is to encapsulate the material rather than remove it entirely. The project team continues to evaluate options and indicated that no major concerns have emerged from the findings to date.

Mr. Cross made a motion, seconded by Mr. Croston, to approve Pennoni's additional service request #2 Dated 6/12/2026, not to exceed $33,062.50.

All in favor of approving Pennoni's additional service request #2 Dated 6/12/2026, not to exceed $33,062.50 as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Dwire, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Giammatteo and Mr. Simmons. Motion passed.

f. Board of Education Review and Potential Vote to Approve Pennoni's Additional Service Request #2 Dated 6/12/2026 not to exceed $33,062.50.

Mrs. Petrella made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Cowan, to approve Pennoni's additional service request #2 Dated 6/12/2026, not to exceed $33,062.50.

All in favor of approving Pennoni's additional service request #2 Dated 6/12/2026, not to exceed $33,062.50 as presented: Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons, Dr. Darcy, Mr. Konstantino, and Mr. Roraback. Motion passed.

The committee received a brief update on the ongoing soil sampling investigation. Mr. Twitchell reported that laboratory results for the remaining samples were expected the following day, after which final reviews and recommendations would be completed. Preliminary findings from the testing continue to support the conclusion that the material is naturally occurring rather than the result of contamination from construction or other external sources. A total of 14 soil samples were collected, including additional samples taken closer to the falls and former mining areas to establish background conditions and compare soil characteristics across the site.

2. O&G

The committee received a construction progress update from O&G. Mr. Luccarelli reported that shoring work inside the building remains ongoing, erosion and sediment control measures have been completed, and inspections by Weston & Sampson and local zoning officials were scheduled for the following days. Work on the sediment trap was set to begin that week, tree clearing had been completed, temporary electrical service from the street to the school was initiated, topsoil stripping had begun, and salvage operations were underway. Mr. Luccarelli reported that the project was progressing well overall and remained on schedule.

The committee then reviewed the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) package that had been discussed at the previous meeting Ms. Purcell identified two significant changes that had occurred since the last review. First, the climbing wall in the gymnasium, which had previously been identified as a potential value-engineering reduction, was restored to the project and removed from the list of cost-saving measures. Second, complications arose during the roofing bid process when both the apparent low bidder and second-low bidder withdrew their bids after incorrectly pricing the canopy alternates. Ms. Purcell explained that bidders had mistakenly treated the canopy work as an add alternate rather than a deduct alternate. To address the issue, the roofing specifications were revised and the roofing package would be rebid.

As part of the revised bidding strategy, the roofing package will include all canopies in the base bid, with only one canopy designated as an alternate for possible deletion. Committee members reviewed renderings showing the two entrance canopies and discussed their relative value. The canopy on the left side of the entrance was considered essential because it helps transition between different exterior materials, provides weather protection along the primary approach to the building, and contributes significantly to the building's appearance. The canopy on the right side, while still functional and providing covered seating and bus-loading area protection, was identified as the more appropriate candidate for removal should budget reductions become necessary.

Ms. Purcell explained that because the roofing package had not yet been awarded, the anticipated roofing value was shifted from the trade contract summary into an allowance within the GMP. Once the roofing bids are received, reviewed, and qualified, the team will return to the committee with a separate recommendation for award, following the same process used for other trade packages. Members were reminded that previously discussed credit values associated with canopy removal reflected deleting both canopies, so future pricing for removal of only the right-side canopy would differ from earlier estimates.

Finally, Mr. Cross requested that Ms. Purcell discuss the GMP terms and conditions. Ms. Purcell noted that most provisions were standard, although one unusually detailed section addressed utility work and clearly defined which utility-related costs and responsibilities were included in the GMP and which were excluded.

Ms. Purcell explained that the general conditions costs had been distributed evenly across the 20-month construction schedule, resulting in a fixed monthly lump-sum payment structure. Additional effort had been made to clearly define the handling of allowances, specifying whether any overruns or savings would be charged to or returned from the owner's contingency or the construction manager's contingency. The GMP also explicitly incorporates all approved value management decisions so there is a clear record of which scope reductions were accepted and which items remain in the project.

Several project-specific qualifications were highlighted. Ms. Purcell noted that no security services are included in the GMP and that no temporary fire alarm system is planned for portions of the building under construction, both of which would be typical inclusions on some projects. The GMP also excludes any masonry restoration or cleaning of existing building surfaces because that work is not currently shown in the project documents. A provision was added clarifying that while the construction management contract allows for a contingency of up to 3%, the GMP includes only a 2.45% CM contingency, with the remaining 0.55% reserved should additional contingency become necessary later in the project. Another provision specifies that if the aggressive construction schedule requires additional staffing, those costs would be funded from the CM contingency rather than becoming a direct project increase.

Ms. Purcell also discussed logistical and operational provisions. Upon completion of portions of the building, the district will provide two secure rooms within the facility for use as the construction manager's field office and contractor meeting space, allowing project staff to transition out of temporary facilities. Insurance-related provisions regarding builder's risk coverage were also reviewed, with Ms. Purcell noting that these clauses reflected requests from the district's insurance representatives and are not typically included in their standard GMP agreements.

A clarification requested at a prior meeting was incorporated into the GMP regarding work occurring after school occupancy. Ms. Purcell confirmed that construction activities such as punch-list work, commissioning, and final closeout tasks would not interfere with school operations once students are present. Any remaining work would be performed during off-hours, vacations, or in a manner coordinated with district operations. The GMP establishes August 12, 2027, as the substantial completion and building turnover date; however, Ms. Purcell emphasized that this is not intended to be a rigid handoff. Ms. Purcell expects portions of the building to be released earlier on a phased basis to allow furniture installation and move-in activities to begin before final completion.

The discussion also clarified occupancy requirements. Mr. Cross clarified that furniture and equipment can be moved into the building prior to issuance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) because those activities are considered part of the construction process. However, district staff cannot occupy the building until a TCO is issued and life-safety requirements are satisfied. Ms. Purcell expects that district personnel may begin moving into portions of the building while construction crews are still completing minor punch-list items, provided the Fire Marshal approves the phased occupancy plan and all required safety measures are in place.

Before a vote took place, Dr. Leggett questioned if the members should discuss the ongoing concern regarding the permit fees since they affect the contingency line in the GMP. Mrs. Cowan questioned whether the full amount of those fees were reflected in the GMP and an update on the meeting with the attorneys for the district and the Town of Middlefield. Ms. Purcell clarified the permit fees were reflected in the GMP. Additionally, Dr. Leggett replied that discussions between attorneys for the district and the Town of Middlefield had taken place earlier in the week, but no final resolution had been reached. Dr. Leggett explained that while there appears to be some agreement that the fees charged may exceed the actual costs incurred by the town, there remains disagreement over the mechanism for returning any excess funds. Dr. Leggett discussed the legal concept that permit fees must be reasonable and tied to actual costs associated with plan review, inspections, and permit administration. Dr. Leggett noted that because the district is already paying for third-party review and inspection services, the town's actual costs may be significantly lower than the permit fees assessed. One issue under discussion is whether a full town meeting would be required to authorize a refund. The district's position is that a refund would not constitute a new appropriation but rather the return of funds that were overcharged.

Ms. Purcell noted that contractors are contractually obligated to hold their pricing through July 9, providing the district with a limited window to make final decisions regarding alternates and potential project additions. While that deadline locks in the quoted prices, it does not guarantee that any alternates would ultimately be selected; rather, it preserves the district's ability to act if additional funds become available before that date.

Dr. Leggett expressed increasing concern about the lack of progress in resolving the permit fee issue, noting that the district had expected a response from Middlefield that day but had not received one. Dr. Leggett suggested that legal action might ultimately be necessary, including seeking injunctive relief from a court to compel the return of any fees determined to be excessive. Dr. Leggett emphasized that the question was no longer simply a financial dispute but involved broader legal and statutory considerations regarding the proper use of public funds and compliance with state requirements governing municipal permit fees. Concerns were also raised regarding the use of state-reimbursed construction funds, since approximately 68% of eligible project costs are reimbursed by the state. Dr. Leggett questioned whether retaining permit fees beyond actual municipal costs could create complications with state oversight agencies, alignment with reimbursable expenses, or result in public funds not being used for their intended school construction purposes. Additionally, Dr. Leggett noted that taxpayers approved funding for a school construction project and argued that any funds determined to be excessive permit charges should ultimately remain available for school-related purposes to honor the will of the voters.

Mrs. Cowan asked whether the district could obtain documentation showing how the permit fees were calculated and whether the hours and costs underlying those fees could be itemized. Dr. Leggett replied that a Freedom of Information request had been submitted to the Town of Middlefield seeking documentation of how permit fee calculations were derived and what municipal costs were incurred. At the time of this meeting, no response had yet been received.

The discussion then turned to potential uses for any funds that might be recovered. It was noted that any returned permit fee revenue would flow back into the project's owner contingency account. Mr. Weissberg then reviewed several previously deferred project elements that could potentially be funded if additional contingency became available, including the north parking lot, outdoor classrooms, playscape improvements, and other discrete site enhancements. Because these items were intentionally separated from the core project scope during value engineering, it was clarified that they could potentially be added back later without affecting the overall project reimbursement structure.

Dr. Leggett wanted to address misconceptions circulating within the community regarding the permit fee dispute and the project's bidding results. One concern raised publicly was the claim that the permit fee issue emerged because HVAC bids came in dramatically higher than expected. Dr. Leggett and Ms. Purcell pushed back on that narrative, emphasizing that concerns about the permit fees had been raised long before construction bids were received. Mr. Cross noted that discussions regarding the legality and appropriateness of the permit fees began during the design phase, with documented conversations occurring as early as August 2025. Mr. Cross and Dr. Leggett stressed that the issue is unrelated to the final bid results and has been an ongoing concern throughout the project.

Mr. Cross clarified that the district intentionally pursued a higher-performance HVAC design focused on indoor air quality, energy efficiency, and long-term building performance rather than a minimum-standard system. The design was intended to meet both high-performance school standards and the district's goal of providing a healthier learning environment. Mr. Cross further noted that the limited number of mechanical contractors submitting bids likely contributed to higher pricing and reduced competitive pressure during bidding. Mr. Cross emphasized that despite the higher-than-anticipated mechanical costs, the district is receiving a high-quality system that is expected to provide long-term benefits. Dr. Leggett noted that the project still received enough qualified bids to proceed and that the bidding results reflected market conditions rather than flaws in the project's planning or budgeting. Dr. Leggett argued that whether bids come in above or below estimates is ultimately separate from the question of how permit fees should be handled. Dr. Leggett stated that if all project costs had come in under budget and surplus funds remained available, those funds would either be returned to taxpayers via bond reduction or used for approved project-related improvements in accordance with project rules and state requirements. Likewise, Dr. Leggett argued that any excessive permit fees should remain available for school project purposes rather than being retained by a municipality without justification.

Mr. Cross also noted that significant value engineering had already been performed before bidding to align the project with the approved budget. Several desirable project elements, including site enhancements and other upgrades, were removed or deferred during that process. Dr. Leggett iterated that the narrative linking the permit fee dispute to higher bid costs was inaccurate and did not reflect the history of the issue or the project's financial planning process.

Mrs. Cowan emphasized that the concern is not with paying reasonable permit fees, but rather with the possibility that the district was charged more than $600,000.00 in fees that may exceed actual municipal costs. Mrs. Cowan argued that if excess fees were collected, those funds should either be reinvested in the school project or ultimately benefit taxpayers rather than remain with the municipality. Mrs. Cowan stated that not reimbursing the district for excessive fees is illegal and an injunction is necessary. Mr. Cross also noted that many school construction projects receive full permit fee waivers because state-reimbursed construction dollars are intended to maximize educational benefits rather than generate municipal revenue.

Despite the ongoing disagreement, Mr. Weissberg expressed optimism that a resolution could be reached. The discussion then shifted from the legal dispute itself to the practical question of how any recovered funds might be used if they are ultimately returned to the district. Mr. Weissberg acknowledged that because the permit fee issue remains unresolved, any potential refund cannot be included in the current GMP calculations or relied upon to fund immediate project upgrades.

Mrs. Neubig reviewed a strategy discussed at a previous meeting for managing any future refund. Under that approach, if the committee wishes to restore previously eliminated project elements, such as the outdoor classroom or other deferred enhancements, the cost would initially come from the owner's contingency account through a formal change order. If permit fee funds are later returned by the Town of Middlefield, those proceeds would be deposited back into the owner's contingency, effectively replenishing the funds that had been used to restore the project scope.

Mr. Weissberg also emphasized that the committee members do not want to commit to additional project spending until there is greater certainty regarding the amount and timing of any refund. While there was cautious optimism that some funds could eventually be recovered, the committee agreed that it would be prudent to secure those funds first before making commitments to add back project features. Mrs. Neubig acknowledged that while there was still uncertainty regarding the amount of any potential refund and the process for obtaining it, discussions with Middlefield had progressed to the point where there appeared to be some agreement that a refund of some form may be warranted. The remaining questions involved determining the amount, the legal mechanism for returning the funds, and the timeline for resolution.

Mr. Cross asked whether contractors, particularly the MEP trades, had already paid permit fees and obtained permits. Ms. Liska confirmed that the contractors would proceed with paying permit fees and pulling permits as required, and that the GMP would remain unchanged regardless of the outcome of the permit fee dispute. Any refund received from the Town of Middlefield would simply be deposited into the owner's contingency account rather than requiring revisions to the existing GMP. Ms. Liska explained that no change orders would be needed related to the permit fees themselves because those costs are already embedded in the project budget. However, Ms. Purcell noted that if the district later chooses to restore previously removed project elements using owner contingency funds, those additions would be processed through formal change orders that increase the GMP. Any associated contractor markups would be included as part of those change orders.

Several members expressed a desire to use any recovered funds to restore project features that directly benefit students or improve the long-term quality of the facility. They noted that many of the removed items were eliminated solely to maintain budget discipline and not because they lacked value. Mr. Roraback noted that delaying those improvements until after construction would likely result in higher costs and reduced state reimbursement opportunities. Ms. Purcell reminded members that the pricing for alternates and deferred scope items remains contractually valid only through July 9. After that date, contractors are no longer obligated to honor the quoted pricing, and future additions would be subject to market conditions, material costs, and scheduling impacts. Some items, particularly those involving electrical infrastructure or work embedded within the construction sequence, become increasingly difficult or impossible to add once construction progresses.

Before moving toward approval of the GMP, Mr. Dwire raised a scheduling question regarding occupancy dates. He noted that Exhibit H of the GMP still listed an owner move-in date of September 14 and asked whether that language was consistent with the committee's discussion about substantial completion and phased occupancy beginning much earlier. Ms. Purcell clarified that the contractual milestone is the August 12, 2027 substantial completion date, which appears in the AIA contract documents. That date represents the point at which the building is turned over to the district for beneficial occupancy. The September 14 date shown elsewhere in the schedule is a planning milestone intended to provide time for furniture installation, staff preparation, classroom setup, and other move-in activities before students occupy the building. It is not a contractual completion date and does not alter O&G's obligation to achieve substantial completion by August 12.

Mr. Collier further explained that substantial completion does not necessarily require a final Certificate of Occupancy. Depending on the status of remaining punch-list items and approvals, the district could receive a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO) or potentially a full Certificate of Occupancy. The goal is to have the building safe and functional for district use by August 12, allowing occupancy-related activities to begin while minor closeout work continues as needed.

a. **Building Committee vote to Approve Guaranteed Maximum Price for the Regional School District 13 School State Project #213-0051 RNV/EA as Computed and Presented by O&G Industries, the Construction Manager for the Project and Recommend to the Board of Education.**

Mr. Cross made a motion, seconded by Mr. Croston, to approve the Guaranteed Maximum Price of $66,117,093.00 for the Regional School District 13 School State Project #213-0051 RNV/EA as Computed and Presented by O&G Industries, the Construction Manager for the Project.

All in favor of approving the Guaranteed Maximum Price of $66,117,093.00 for the Regional School District 13 School State Project #213-0051 RNV/EA as Computed and Presented by O&G Industries, the Construction Manager for the Project as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Dwire, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Giammatteo and Mr. Simmons. Motion passed.

b. **Board of Education vote to Approve Guaranteed Maximum Price for the Regional School District 13 School State Project #213-0051 RNV/EA as Computed and Presented by O&G Industries, the Construction Manager for the Project**

Mrs. Cowan made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Petrella, to approve the Guaranteed Maximum Price of $66,117,093.00 for the Regional School District 13 School State Project #213-0051 RNV/EA as Computed and Presented by O&G Industries, the Construction Manager for the Project.

All in favor of approving the Guaranteed Maximum Price of $66,117,093.00 for the Regional School District 13 School State Project #213-0051 RNV/EA as Computed and Presented by O&G Industries, the

Construction Manager for the Project as presented: Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons, Dr. Darcy, Mr. Konstantino, and Mr. Roraback. Motion passed.

3. STV

Ms. Liska reviewed the overall project budget and contingency forecasts. The first pages of the budget package separated project costs into two major categories: construction costs and owner soft costs. Ms Liska explained that the total construction budget shown on the summary page, approximately $66.4 million, does not exactly match the GMP because it also includes previously approved pre-construction services performed by O&G. Those pre-construction expenses, including early planning and management work, have already been funded and are included in the overall construction cost accounting.

The committee was directed to the detailed construction cost page, where members reviewed the breakdown of trade costs and project expenditures. Ms. Liska highlighted the approved value management line item, which reflected approximately $689,821.00 in cost reductions that had been accepted by the committee through the value-engineering process. This line item serves as the accounting mechanism that captures the various scope reductions and substitutions approved to keep the project within budget.

Attention then shifted to the owner's soft cost budget, which includes all non-construction project expenses. These costs encompass architectural and engineering fees, commissioning services, moving and storage expenses, environmental consulting, project management services, and other owner-related expenditures. The budget also includes the owner's contingency account. Ms. Liska explained that the previously separate $200,000.00 soft-cost contingency and $1.3 million owner contingency had been consolidated into a single owner contingency totaling approximately $1.5 million. Because the project is now actively under construction, maintaining separate contingency categories was no longer considered necessary.

The committee then reviewed a forecasting spreadsheet used to monitor anticipated draws against the owner's contingency. The purpose of the forecast is to identify known and expected costs before they occur so the committee can better understand how much contingency funding may remain available throughout construction. Ms. Liska explained that the first several projected expenses are associated with the portable classroom program, including costs incurred during installation, occupancy preparation, utility work, rental fees, and other ongoing expenses related to maintaining the temporary facilities.

At the time of the presentation, approximately $963,935.00 in projected costs had been identified as likely future draws against the owner's contingency. Ms. Purcell asked how much of those anticipated expenses were attributable to construction-related changes and unforeseen conditions, which are typically the primary purpose of an owner's contingency fund. In response, Ms. Liska pointed to a line item covering Requests for Information (RFIs) numbered 1 through 57. While not every RFI results in additional cost, some involve clarifications, field conditions, or design modifications that may generate change orders and therefore require contingency funding. Ms. Liska explained that they maintain a separate tracking process for RFIs and associated cost impacts so that contingency forecasting can be updated as more information becomes available throughout construction.

Ms. Liska then reviewed a detailed Potential Change Order (PCO) log that tracks Requests for Information (RFIs) and other known issues that could affect project costs. Ms. Liska emphasized that the figures presented were highly preliminary and intended only to provide an order-of-magnitude estimate of potential future contingency usage. Many RFIs had been answered that same day, while others had only recently been identified by O&G, making the estimates subject to significant change. The purpose of the log was to give the committee a realistic picture of where contingency funds might be needed as construction progresses.

The PCO log included all RFIs that the project team believed could have a cost impact, along with rough estimates for each item. In addition to the RFIs, two known future cost items were identified. The first involved the handling of soil containing elevated levels of naturally occurring materials. Earlier discussions had contemplated the possibility that contaminated soil might require off-site disposal at a cost approaching $125,000.00. However, recent testing results were increasingly supporting the conclusion that the material is naturally occurring, which would allow it to remain on site. As a result, the current forecast assumes approximately $40,000.00 in costs associated with excavation, relocation, and management of the soil within the project site rather than costly off-site disposal. One possible approach discussed was relocating the material to areas designated for future parking lot construction.

The second anticipated cost relates to exterior masonry restoration and repair. Because the existing building is showing signs of age, Ms. Liska expects that some level of brick repair, repointing, cleaning, and general masonry maintenance will be required. The exact scope has not yet been determined. Once demolition activities are complete, the architect will conduct a comprehensive exterior review and identify all locations requiring restoration work. A preliminary allowance of $30,000.00 was included in the forecast for this effort, although the actual cost could ultimately be higher or lower depending on the condition of the building and the extent of repairs identified.

Taken together, the RFIs and known future issues resulted in a preliminary forecast of approximately $250,000.00 in potential contingency expenditures. Ms. Liska stressed that these figures represent current expectations based on information available at the time and will continue to evolve as RFIs are resolved, field conditions are better understood, and construction progresses.

The committee then reviewed how the projected change-order and contingency forecasts affect the overall financial position of the project. Referring back to the owner contingency worksheet, Ms. Liska pointed out that the estimated $250,000.00 associated with RFIs and known future issues had been incorporated into the contingency forecast, along with a separate line item reflecting the remaining budget gap after all approved value-management decisions were applied.

Ms. Liska reminded the committee that when bids were initially received, the project exceeded the available budget and required a substantial value-engineering effort. Through a series of committee decisions and accepted value-management items, costs were reduced to bring the project into alignment with available funding. However, even after those reductions and the GMP approved that evening, the project still reflected an approximately $55,000.00 budget shortfall. That amount was therefore being carried as a projected draw against the owner's contingency.

Using all currently known information, Ms. Liska explained that the original owner contingency of approximately $1.5 million is expected to absorb roughly $963,000.00 in identified and forecasted costs. These include portable classroom expenses, known project obligations, anticipated change orders, RFIs, soil handling costs, masonry repairs, and the remaining budget shortfall. Based on those projections, Ms. Liska stated that the realistic working contingency available today is closer to $500,000.00 than the full $1.5 million originally budgeted.

The committee was reminded that this forecast is dynamic and will continue to evolve as RFIs are resolved and projected costs become actual change orders. As estimates are refined, some items may increase, some may decrease, and others may be eliminated entirely.

Ms. Liska explained that if permit fee funds are ultimately returned to the district, those funds would replenish the owner's contingency. In practical terms, a successful recovery could increase the effective contingency from roughly $500,000.00 back toward $1 million or more, depending on the amount returned. At that point, the committee would receive an updated financial analysis and be in a position to evaluate whether previously removed project elements could be restored.

Mr. Cross emphasized an important clarification regarding public perceptions of the project's finances. He noted that when bids were first received, the project was not millions of dollars over budget in the manner sometimes portrayed publicly. Rather, the project team identified cost pressures, developed value-management options, and worked through a structured process with the committee to align the project with available funding. The remaining shortfall after those efforts was approximately $55,000.00, a figure that was being managed through contingency planning rather than representing a major budget crisis. This clarification was offered in response to community narratives suggesting that the project had been dramatically over budget or poorly planned, which Mr. Cross argued does not accurately reflect the project's actual financial position. Mr. Cross also iterated that concerns about permit fees long predated the receipt of construction bids. Mr. Cross noted that he raised this issue during design and planning because contingency funds were expected to be tight on a renovation project involving an older building. His position remained that any excessive permit fees should be returned to the project to strengthen the owner's contingency and help ensure the district can fully address unforeseen conditions as construction progresses.

Mr. Cross noted that the current contingency forecast is not unexpected for a renovation project of this type. Renovations involving existing buildings typically experience many of their largest unknowns during demolition, environmental remediation, and early investigative work. Once those phases are completed and existing conditions become better understood, project costs generally stabilize and become easier to manage.

The committee was also informed that future budget reports would be presented differently. Rather than showing recurring surplus or shortfall calculations, the overall project budget would remain fixed at approximately $76.13 million, while contingency balances and individual line items would be adjusted as costs are incurred. This approach provides a clearer picture of how project funds are being reallocated over time without creating confusion about the overall project budget.

Ms. Liska further explained that several layers of financial protection remain available if contingency pressures increase. In addition to the owner's contingency, O&G maintains a separate construction manager contingency. While O&G currently needs to retain its full contingency because the project is still early in construction and many unknowns remain, portions of that contingency could potentially be released later if risks diminish. The project also contains numerous contractor allowances that provide additional flexibility. Although allowances often end up being fully utilized, they serve as another buffer and help keep the project moving without delays when schedule-sensitive decisions arise.

The conversation continued with a discussion about public communication. Mrs. Cowan suggested that the district consider publishing additional information through newsletters, project updates, or the project website to address recurring misconceptions about the project's finances. Specifically, Mrs. Cowan noted that public discussions frequently characterize the project as being "over budget," when in reality the issue involved bids exceeding preliminary estimates before value engineering and budget reconciliation occurred. The committee felt that providing clear explanations of the distinction between estimates, bids, and the final approved budget could help improve public understanding of the project's financial status and reduce misinformation circulating within the community. Mr. Weissberg asked if the improvement in the state's reimbursement could also be included in publications. Mr. Weissberg noted that when the bond referendum was presented to voters, the projected local share for Durham and Middlefield was based on a lower anticipated state reimbursement percentage. Since that time, the district's reimbursement rate has increased, resulting in a significantly larger state contribution toward the project. As a result, even though the overall project budget remains substantially the same, the amount ultimately borne by local taxpayers is expected to be lower than originally projected. Mr. Roraback referenced an estimated increase in state reimbursement of approximately $11 million, reducing the financial burden on both towns compared to what residents were told at the time of the referendum

Ms. Liska confirmed that roofing bids were scheduled to be received on June 29. Ms. Liska explained that once the roofing package is rebid and awarded, all major project cost components will be finalized, allowing the district to complete the financial information required for submission to the state's school construction reimbursement system. Receipt of the roofing bids represents one of the final pieces needed before the district can begin submitting reimbursement requests to the state.

Ms. Liska also outlined a strategy for maximizing eligible reimbursement associated with the swing space and portable classroom program. Because the legislation authorizing reimbursement for the project specifically referenced costs associated with the swing space, the district intends to submit all related expenses for reimbursement consideration, not just traditional construction costs. This could include items such as portable classroom expenses, transportation-related costs, and other operational expenditures directly connected to the temporary relocation of students and staff during construction. The committee was informed that the district will take an inclusive approach when preparing reimbursement submissions, allowing the state to determine which costs qualify.

B. Approval of Invoices

Mrs. Neubig presented the following invoices for approval:

Zayo (CEN)	Invoice 2154701 – Fiber work related to internet service and project connectivity	$3,570.00
STV	Invoice 2416 – Owner's Representative services, including OAC meetings, scope meetings, Building Committee meetings, and project coordination	$10,576.02
Pennoni	Invoice 1329304 – Asbestos monitoring and remediation oversight	$12,920.00
Weston & Sampson	Invoice 260-6891 – Phase A document review for stormwater monitoring services	$845.79
DATTCO	Invoice 33851 – Swing Space bus transportation services for May	$20,424.00
Robert H. Lord	Invoice 36200 – Strong School Swing Space locker room partitions	$10,424.23
Robert H. Lord	Invoice 36207 – Strong School Swing Space locker room partitions	$11,401.60
O&G Industries	Invoice #7 – Construction Manager Services	$632,398.83
CubeSmart	Invoice 1707212 – June storage rental	$272.00
Eversource	Account 5189-758-0163 – Electrical service for Portable Classrooms 5 & 6 (May)	$576.80
QA&M Architecture	Invoice 18011 – Bidding Services and Construction Administrative Services	$30,842.89

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

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

Tennis Court Grant Discussion

Mr. Weissberg discussed potential grant opportunities for the district's tennis courts, particularly through the United States Tennis Association (USTA). Mr. Weissberg noted that USTA offers programs that can assist with both court resurfacing and full court reconstruction. While a complete replacement of the courts remains a long-term objective, Mr. Weissberg agreed that the immediate focus should be on identifying cost-effective methods to extend the life of the existing courts while pursuing available grant funding.

Mr. Weissberg explained that USTA reconstruction grants typically require local matching funds and, while helpful, would not cover the full cost of replacement. Resurfacing grants are generally smaller but could potentially support interim improvements. Because the district currently lacks sufficient information on available repair and rehabilitation methods, Mr. Weissberg discussed issuing a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to gather input from industry experts and manufacturers.

Mr. Weissberg emphasized that the goal is to understand what options are available before pursuing grants or issuing construction bids. By gathering information from manufacturers, suppliers, and specialty firms, the district would be better positioned to determine whether a relatively modest investment could extend the useful life of the courts, potentially delaying the need for full reconstruction.

Mr. Giammatteo questioned how vendors would participate without compensation. Mr. Weissberg responded that companies routinely provide this type of information as part of their business development efforts. Mr. Cross explained that the proposed RFI would primarily seek product information, available technologies, performance data, approximate pricing, and examples of similar projects rather than detailed engineering or design services.

The discussion also referenced the district's recently completed capital planning process. Tennis court replacement has already been identified in the long-term capital plan, with funding assumptions based on a future replacement cost estimated at approximately $800,000.00 and a target replacement timeframe around 2030–2031. Mr. Weissberg noted that even with a long-term replacement strategy, the district will still need to invest in maintenance and repairs to keep the courts usable until replacement occurs. Understanding available rehabilitation options could help bridge that gap and potentially leverage grant funding to maximize the value of future investments.

The committee generally agreed that the next step would be to develop an RFI or RFQ that would allow industry experts to present available technologies, expected life-cycle costs, warranty information, and realistic service-life extensions. That information could then be used to support future grant applications, evaluate interim repair strategies, and inform long-term planning for the tennis court facilities.

Draft Survey on Field House

The committee reviewed a draft community survey regarding the future of the field house. The survey was developed by Todd and graduating student representative Charlie Dallas, who had served on the Building Committee. Dr. Leggett took a moment to recognize Charlie's contributions to the committee and congratulated him on his graduation.

The survey was created in response to a request made several months earlier to better understand community priorities for the field house and its future use. Committee members were asked to review the draft, provide feedback, and refine the questions before the survey is distributed. The current expectation is that the survey would be released during the fall to gather input from residents and stakeholders regarding potential future improvements or uses of the facility.

During the discussion, Mr. Weissberg asked whether any immediate or long-term maintenance needs had been identified for the field house structure itself. Mr. Proia reported that there are no significant maintenance concerns at this time. Several doors were replaced during the previous year, and routine upkeep is expected to continue as needed.

Mr. Weissberg also asked whether recent severe weather events had affected the structure. Mr. Proia reported that the field house performed well during the storms and that the building is securely anchored. No damage or structural concerns were identified, and confidence was expressed in the facility's ability to withstand future weather events.

Mrs. Cowan questioned if the committee should discuss the auditorium; however, Dr. Leggett noted it was on the agenda for review.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Anticipated Executive Session

Mrs. Cowan made a motion, seconded by Mr. Giammatteo, for the Building Committee and Board of Education members to enter into Executive Session and invite Dr. Leggett, Mrs. Neubig, and Mr. Proia for the purpose of reviewing bid submittals for RFQ/P 2026-001 Architectural Services for ADA concept design at CRHS and Strong.

All in favor of the Building Committee and Board of Education members to enter into Executive Session and invite Dr. Leggett, Mrs. Neubig, and Mr. Proia for the purpose of reviewing bid submittals for RFQ/P 2026-001 Architectural Services for ADA concept design at CRHS and Strong as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Giammatteo, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Dwire, Dr. Darcy, Mr. Konstantino, and Mr. Roraback. Motion passed.

The meeting resumed at timestamp 1:28 after Executive Session

Building Committee Vote to Accept and Recommend the Award of the Contract to the Successful Bidder for RFQ/P 2026-001 Architectural Services for ADA Concept Design at CRHS and Strong to the Board of Education.

Mr. Giammatteo made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cross, to accept the award of the contract to QA+M for RFQ/P 2026-001 Architectural Services for ADA concept design at CRHS and Strong.

All in favor of accepting the award of the contract to QA+M for RFQ/P 2026-001 Architectural Services for ADA concept design at CRHS and Strong as presented: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Giammatteo and Mr. Simmons. Motion passed.

Board of Education Vote to Award of the Contract to the Successful Bidder for RFQ/P 2026 001 Architectural Services for ADA Concept Design at CRHS and Strong.

Mrs. Cowan made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Petrella, to accept the award of the contract to QA+M for RFQ/P 2026-001 Architectural Services for ADA concept design at CRHS and Strong.

All in favor of accepting the award of the contract to QA+M for RFQ/P 2026-001 Architectural Services for ADA concept design at CRHS and Strong as presented: Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons, Dr. Darcy, Mr. Konstantino, and Mr. Roraback. Motion passed.

Adjournment

Dr. Darcy made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cross, to adjourn the meeting.

All in favor of adjourning the meeting: Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Cross, Mr. Croston, Mrs. Petrella, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Cowan, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Giammatteo, Dr. Darcy, Mr. Konstantino, and Mr. Roraback. Motion passed and the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Meghan Shortell-Fratantonio