

**East Haddam School Building Committee Meeting
January 11, 2006
Adopted January 25, 2006**

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Todd Moss at 7:02 p.m. at the Nathan Hale High School - Room 117.

A) Roll Call

2. Attendance

Members present:

Todd Moss	
Melissa Ziobron	David LaFemina
Denise Gable	Craig Parker
Dana Barnes	Kerri Willis Budzik
Mary Beth Mordecai	John Gibson

Others present:

Jennifer Mangiagli, KBA
Stephen Melingonis, KBA
Chuck Grabowski, Newfield Construction
Tom DiMauro, Newfield Construction
Dave King, KBA
Robert Carroll, Central Office, Board of Education Business Manager
Alan Burr
Joe Albuquerque
Shirley Judge
Whitney Talcott, KBA

Committee Members agreed to add Traffic Study and Public Relations under Old Business and Land Acquisition under Other Discussion and add timeline to future agendas.

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion by Dana Barnes to approve the minutes of December 14, 2005 meeting amended as follows:

- To adopt the minutes as amended to reflect spelling errors.
- 4th page, under Architect Report, 2nd bullet, 5th to last line, change “Intersection” to “Intersections” and insert “from the west” after traffic.

- 5th page, 2nd paragraph, 5th line, strike “electrical which was referenced in their minutes” and replace with “emergency electrical loads which were referenced in their minutes”.

A) Discussions of 1/4/06 meeting minutes.

Committee Members discussed the accuracy of information contained under 4C, Architect Report of the 1/4/06 meeting minutes. Mr. Barnes questioned if all car traffic going to the school would travel North Moodus Road. Mr. Moss responded no, that the primary access would be Andrews Road/ 149 intersection and Clark Gates Road. Mr. Barnes questioned if all bus traffic should be directed to Andrews Road through the 149 intersection, which has better sight lines. Mr. Talcott responded all traffic would go west and not exclusively Andrews Road. He stated there would be no buses going out the Clark Gates 149 Intersection. Mrs. Ziobron stated that it is the intent of the Board of Education that all bus routes enter from Route 149 and Andrews Road.

Mrs. Ziobron referenced Other Discussion (pages 9 and 10), stating that she strongly disagreed with the way in which exchanges were referenced and discussed in the minutes, stating that it is not reflective of the sentiment of the discussion. She stated as an example after “Mrs. Budzik stated that she was unclear as to what Mrs. Ziobron’s ideas were, asking that she send the Committee Member’s suggestions via email to be discussed at the next scheduled meeting”. Mrs. Ziobron stated that she did not want to be a maverick on the Committee and that she wanted to be a team player and felt it was important for the whole Committee to be working together on the process. Mrs. Ziobron stated that she was unclear without a tape recording, of exactly what transpired, but stated that she knew for sure that the entire paragraph does not correctly reflect what had happened. She stated that until it can be verified via tape recording, it can not be verified. She questioned the Secretary if there was a tape of meeting which could be referenced. Ruth Ziobron stated that there were no tape recordings of the meeting. Mrs. Ziobron stated that she would like to have future meetings recorded and filed at the Selectman’s office. Mr. Barnes stated that he felt the minutes were accurate to what was said. Mrs. Ziobron disagreed; stating that she distinctly recalls the using the word maverick and that she was urging a committee decision and didn’t want to be responsible for solely crafting public relations. She stated that she had wanted to discuss it as a committee and it was not able to happen because the discussion was shut down. Mrs. Ziobron stated she would be willing to review the paragraph and present what she believed transpired at the next meeting. Mr. Barnes stated that with all due respect, he did not want the Committee to argue and that clarification of the paragraph would be reflected on these meeting minutes.

Motion by Mr. Barnes to approve the minutes of December 14, 2005 meeting as amended. Seconded by Mary Beth Mordecai.

**FAVOR: Moss, Mordecai, Barnes, LaFemina, Parker, Budzik
OPPOSED: Ziobron**

Motion carried.

4. Audience of Citizens

There were no people to contribute to the Audience of Citizens at the time it was offered.

5. Old Business

A) BOE Report

Mrs. Ziobron informed the Committee that she had updated the Board of Education Members. She stated that she supplied them with the latest cover sheet of the budget and soft costs and they have reviewed the SBC meeting minutes including the 1 – 30 value engineering items. She stated that concern was raised by the BOE about the following:

- Hesitance to put old technology into the school
- Did not want inferior phone systems.
- Would like further clarification of all of the various types of phone systems.
- Electrical items and want further understanding of what to be determined means.
- More details as to item #1.
- They questioned the removal of the acoustical block (#7) based on experiences with the current high school.
- Roof pitch.
- Cafeteria and Media center reduction in size
- Sidewalk egress, that they do not hug the buildings and the design of the sidewalks should be usable.

Mrs. Ziobron stated that they discussed at length the cost of the project, going back out to the public via referendum and if it is the case; the members would like a separate cost for the gymnasium as a separate question. She informed the Committee that they are also interested in having other items as options for the public, such as air conditioning. She stated that they would like to have broken out in the budget a better understanding of what the additional costs above and beyond the original budget of having the gymnasium being that large in today's budget. Mrs. Budzik questioned who was against the flat roof. Mrs. Ziobron stated she did not remember and Ms. Mordecai stated that they all seemed against it and two people were outspoken. Mr. Moss stated that the design was not for all flat roofs but a combination of slope and flat. Mrs. Ziobron stated that they do not like the idea of changing the pitch of the roof to satisfy budget requests.

Ms Mordecai stated that the one thing that stood out to her, when the Board of Education Members were discussing the Media Center and the Cafeteria, is that the members of the board were concerned about the quality of the project, which was why they had many questions about the project. She stated that Dr. Durham did not want the roof to be drastically reduced in the media center. Denise Gable stated that cutting the size of the Media Center and Cafeteria could affect future expandability of the school. David LaFemina questioned why the Board wanted the costs for the gymnasium broken down. Mrs. Ziobron replied to help the public understand where the project is in the process. She stated that it is helpful to know that significant budget over runs are due to the gymnasium and that the original allocation of over \$300,000 (which was in the referendum) was not sufficient to build the gymnasium. She stated that the Board of

Education would like to see the gymnasium as a separate question to see if the public is interested in supporting it financially. Mrs. Ziobron informed the Commission that they would like to understand specifically the costs of the additional size of the gymnasium. Mr. Barnes questioned if the referendum number was the cost of the difference between a standard gymnasium and a tournament size gymnasium. Mr. Moss responded that it was the premium to build the larger gymnasium. Mrs. Ziobron stated that the Board of Education would like the public to decide, because if a significant portion of the budget over run is because of the gymnasium, they don't want the project to fail. Ms. Mordecai stated that they would like to see all of the costs of the tournament size gymnasium included (extra parking, landscaping, locker rooms etc.) besides just the building of the actual gymnasium.

Mr. LaFemina stated that the increases in costs are proportionate with the project and stated that he did not understand why it needed to be broken out. Mrs. Ziobron responded that breaking the costs associated with tournament size gymnasium will allow the town to decide based on the numbers if they want it during referendum. Mrs. Ziobron referred to the referendum question stating that 1076 people voted yes for the school and 537 people voted no. She stated that 735 people voted yes for the tournament size gymnasium and 516 voted no for the gymnasium. She stated the underlying issue is that a lot of people did not vote for the tournament size gymnasium. She informed the Committee that the Board of Education would like the public to have an opportunity to voice what they are willing to support and that the Board of Education does not want to sacrifice the project or cost over runs because of a tournament size gymnasium. She stated that they want it to be a part of the joint discussion. It was agreed to have the numbers available for the joint meeting.

Mr. Moss stated that the difference would be deducts and credits. It was stated that the base cost for the gymnasium is in Newfield's May 12, 2004 estimate included a small gymnasium. All of the components are within the divisions and are spread throughout the estimate. Mr. Moss stated that the \$330,000 (approved at referendum) was the additional cost associated with a tournament size gymnasium and not the total cost.

John Gibson stated that by giving the public the option, if they choose the regular size gymnasium, the extra premium would be available to build the school with the smaller gymnasium. He stated that the tournament size gymnasium will require an increase in cost for that bigger gymnasium or the cost of the bigger gymnasium would need to come out of educational programs, which in his opinion is unacceptable. How the numbers would be presented was discussed. Mr. Moss stated that an estimate can not be shown because there are no drawings which accurately reflect a small gymnasium and that current drawings reflect a big gymnasium.

Mrs. Ziobron stated that the Board of Education is compiling a full listing of assets at the Middle School. She stated it is a lengthy process and she was not sure if it would be available for the January 18, 2006 meeting. She stated that they would like to be updated prior to the joint meeting.

B) Construction Manager Report

Tom DiMauro distributed and discussed the following documentation:

- Revised East Haddam 4 – 8 Middle School Proposed Value Engineering Items, dated January 11, 2006. The documentation reflects decisions made by the Committee as documented in previous meeting minutes. There is 1 new value engineering item #37 flat roof design with mansard façade and Committee Members determined that further evaluation was required prior to deciding on this item. The documentation states that “To provide A/C at the balance of the school area, excluding the Gym, ADD \$310,000. Systems consists of HV Units 1,2,3,5,6 to be changed to the packaged rooftop Units”.
- East Haddam 4-8 Middle School Project Budget Summary Update, dated January 11, 2005. The VE Items Accepted to Date has increased since the last update from \$992,000 to \$1,028,400.

Construction costs	DD Budget 12/14	24,214,568
VE Items Accepted to Date		<u>(1,028,400)</u>
Revised Construction Costs		23,186,168
CM as Constructor Fee@ 2.2%		510,096
CM as Constructor Contingency	3%	695,585
Estimate Contingency	3%	695,585
Escalation Factor	3%	<u>752,623</u>
Total Construction Costs		25,840,057
Project Soft Costs		<u>4,664,875</u>
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET		30,504,932

	Project Funding	Schematic Design Est. 11/22/05	Design Dev. Est. 12/14/05	Design Dev. Est. Rev. 1/11/06
Construction Costs	20,165,125	24,609,950	26,986,167	25,840,057
Soft Costs	4,664,875	4,664,875	4,664,875	4,664,875
Total Project Budget	24,830,000	29,274,825	31,651,042	30,504,932
Amount Over Funding		4,444,825	6,821,042	5,715,498

EHMS Other Project Costs Budget, 12/14/05

CM as Constructor Preconstruction Fee	40,000
Land Acquisition	900,000
Offsite costs	
Land Survey/Environmental	44,400
Architectural/Engineering Fees, Geotech Consultant, Borings	1,359,750
A/E Reimbursable	80,000
STC Traffic Study	8,325
Special Inspections	50,000
Peer Review	15,000
Program Manager	
Furniture, Fixtures, Equipment	750,000
Bonding Costs	100,000
Builders Risk Insurance	158,400
Utility Company Charges	65,000
Energy Consumption costs	40,000
Legal Costs	50,000
Plan Review Costs	10,000
DEP/DPH Costs	10,000
SFU Filing Fee	5,000
Project Contingency	<u>979,000</u>

Total Other Project Costs **4,664,875**

Proposed Budgets 1/11/06

FFE per KBA preliminary Estimate	410,000
Technology per AKF Estimate	1,472,750
Equipment Allowance	<u>TBD</u>
	1,882,750
FFE Budgeted Line Item (see above)	<u>750,000</u>
Amount Under funded	1,132,750

Mr. DiMauro informed the Committee that the items with * next to them on the Value Engineering proposal were not calculated into the Total Estimated Savings because they were still evaluating the costs associated with them. He stated that item #22 (Provide conventional sinks in lieu of Bradley sinks at gang toilet rooms came out higher than projected at \$79,000. Mr. DiMauro stated that item #33, PBX phone system in lieu of voice over IP systems, belonged below the line because it can't be done during the construction phase, due to the complexity of the system. It requires a specialty contractor and should be moved to other project costs. Mrs. Budzik questioned if consideration to provide A/C at the balance of the school areas for \$310,000 included the costs associated for KBA to redesign the school to accommodate it. Mrs. Mangiagli stated she did not know but would have the information available at the next meeting. Mr. DiMauro responded that additional design fees were not added to the estimate. Mrs. Budzik stated that caution should be made in stating that the cost for air conditioning the school would be \$310,000 until the costs associated for KBA to design it are included. Committee Members reviewed and discussed the Proposed Value Engineering Items at length.

Mrs. Mangiagli reviewed the change to the canopies. She stated the ones which were eliminated were not ones which people would walk under but were added as a design feature. Building overhangs were changed to awnings. Gutters which were originally fancier to enhance the overhangs have been reduced to have a simpler gutter system which has reduced the price as reflected in the Value Engineering items. The front two main entrance canopies will be 19 feet wide. It was stated that the Land Acquisition costs needed to be changed.

Mr. Grabowski stated he had determined that there is an error on the Value Engineering items; item # 25 (Electrical, Deduct Phone System (Move to FFE) should indicate yes. He informed the Committee that the change would be made prior to the joint meeting. Item #33 (PBX phone system in lieu of voice over IP system) should indicate pending. This would increase savings to \$20,000. Responsive to Mrs. Ziobron's question, Mr. Grabowski replied that the soft costs used in the estimate were numbers supplied by the Committee.

Mrs. Mangiagli distributed and discussed the following documentation:

- KBA Architect's Report for the East Haddam 4-8 School, dated January 11, 2006. A Preliminary Furniture Estimate is broken down into all of the furniture which would be included for a total cost of \$410,000.000. Mrs. Mangiagli stated that the cost includes a "worst case scenario", assuming there is no furniture which can be transferred from the current Middle School and all new furniture is needed. Equipment which is currently not included in the project budget is listed as well as a list of items which is included in the construction costs.
- Telephone Systems-Centrex, Private Branch Exchange (PBX) and Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP). This document compares the 3 systems.
- Technology Equipment Cost Estimate. The total FF & E is \$1,472,750. The estimates do not include any discounts potentially available from the Universal Service Administrative Company Schools and Libraries Division or other sources.
- Schematic drawings of various roof pitches and designs.

Mrs. Mangiagli briefly described how an inventory of furniture is performed. She stated that technology equipment is currently included on the estimate. She stated that when Newfield put on their sheet, equipment allowance," to be determined", and is currently not included in project budget list of items.

Mr. Moss questioned if the technology equipment cost estimate was per the educational specifications. Mrs. Mangiagli responded no, the VoIP system is not included. She stated that the educational specifications include 4 - 6 computer drops per classroom not saying desk or laptops. She stated that further discussions concluded that 1 desk top per room for the students would be fine as well as a computer for each teacher. She stated there will be 1 mobile computer lab per grade which would contain 24 laptops and a printer on it. She stated that the 1 student desk top wouldn't do much good in the classroom on its own, but works well in conjunction with the mobile computer lab when projects require all of the students in the class to use computers at the same time. There will be 6 lap tops on wheels, 1 per grade and 1 for the media center (for a total of 7 units).

Mr. Moss questioned the \$100,000 gym/multipurpose AP System and if it was defined in the educational specifications. Mrs. Mangiagli responded she didn't know but that performances and tournaments should have a separate AP System. Denise stated that clarification should be made to if the Board of Education plans on paying for some of the extra costs. She stated that snow blowers, lawnmowers and pianos should not be a part of the budget. Mrs. Mangiagli stated that many of the items were not set in stone and could be changed if necessary. Mr. Moss stated that these are the types of things which need to be discussed during the joint discussion. Specifications of the computer system on a cart were discussed at length. Ms. Mordecai questioned if grants for technology was available. Mrs. Mangiagli stated that there are grants available and Mr. Carroll responded that the Superintendent would need to apply for the applications as a joint effort with the SBC. Mrs. Ziobron stated that even if the BOE would consider taking on the cost that she would hope that the amount is brought to referendum because it does not save any money it just goes from one line item to another. Mr. Moss stated by including it in referendum, it is eligible for close to 50% reimbursement. Mr. Moss stated that off site road improvements are not reimbursable by the State. Mr. Barnes stated of the importance of discussing where the purchase of the land's funds come from. He stated that the SBC should not foot the whole bill. Mr. Moss stated that the full cost of the land was included in the original referendum.

Mrs. Mangiagli stated that the school was slightly over the square footage on the grant and the additional square footage will not be reimbursable. She stated that if enrollment figures change, the additional square footage may be reimbursable. It was stated that the size of the tournament size gymnasium always put the project over full reimbursement for the project. Mrs. Ziobron questioned Mr. Grabowski if he had a chance to put together a cost comparison as requested at the last meeting. He responded no. She stated that when she had tried to compare budget cost documents for comparison, the latest was not broken into divisions and asked that all future line items of budget have the same formulas for comparison purposes. She cited various examples for further clarifications. She stated that it is very important that the Committee is able to be accountable, because the Committee knows why all the additions are valid and believe that the project is bare bones, but when the community sees the changes, the Committee should be able to answer questions. Mr. Grabowski explained the changes in costs. Mr. Moss stated that the schedule can be updated after the January 18, 2006 meeting to include construction and pre-construction. He stated that the project is still on track to start in the summer. Mr. Barnes stated that he would not start with January 2006 and work backwards, but that it would be prudent to start as soon as the project is ready to start.

John Gibson questioned if the project were to go back from a tournament size gymnasium to a regular size gymnasium, does it save enough square footage to put the total square footage back into a 100% reimbursable category. Mr. Moss responded yes. Mr. Gibson stated that when the offset is calculated it needs to state that it does not reflect reimbursable square footage and that it should be a part of the referendum question.

C) Architect Report

Mrs. Mangiagli referred to the telephone systems handout. It is a 2 page document, the first page briefly describes the 3 systems and the second page gives comparisons in graph form. Advantages and disadvantages of the systems as discussed are as follows:

PBX

- Onsite phone system which has initial costs
- Maintained by school
- Easy to use
- Very reliable, may have 5 minutes per year down time
- Is 99.99% reliable
- Current system used in Elementary, Middle and high school
- Moderate on premise space requirements

Centrex

- Similar to PBX but no initial cost because the equipment is contained with the phone company.
- Monthly fee with the phone company for use.
- Highest reliability

VoIP

- New and more mainstream
- Not as reliable
- Not recommended by the documentation.
- \$20,000 more initial cost than the PBX system
- Requires more maintenance.
- More downtime which will affect the whole phone system.
- Requires a technician to run it.
- Requires the most on-premise space.

Mrs. Mangiagli stated that the current plans provided enough space for the VoIP system. Mrs. Mangiagli reviewed the sketches which Newfield is using to give cost estimates if the roof lines are to change. There are also sketches showing Mansard roof scheme to lower the gable roof. It would apply to both academic wings. Mrs. Mangiagli stated that with mansard roof schemes, the roof top equipment may be visible from certain angles. Currently the full pitch roofs hide them. Responsive to a question, Mr. Grabowski responded that the cost difference between the Mansard and pitched roof system will be available for the next meeting. Various roof types were discussed as well as materials and up front costs. Mr. Gibson stated that flat roofs have a history of leaking and require maintenance which is often lacking. Mr. Moss stated regulations have changed and roofs are not really flat as they have a slight slope. Mrs. Ziobron stated that the BOE Members are against flat or semi-flat roofs with the exception of what is currently in the plans. Mr. Barnes stated the reason for suggesting the Mansard roof was for cost savings. The Mansard scheme diagrams only contain the heating and ventilation systems and not the proposed air conditioning systems.

The stoop drop off areas and entry ways will be concrete and not bituminous. The acoustical block in the gymnasium is pending KBA review. Mr. Moss stated that item #1

on the value engineering items should be changed from “all” to “selected” and should be better defined. Mr. Grabowski clarified that the location of potential rock is located below the 4th and 5th grade wings and that he had given misinformation at the last meeting. Borings tests indicate that the rock location may be below the footings.

Whitney Talcott reviewed comparative entrance road ways from Clark gates Road. Option B is 80 feet from Mr. Burr’s property line and option C is 130 feet from Mr. Burr’s property line. Option C has an estimated increase in cost of \$14,500. Option C will be built straight into the hill and has more ledge potential resulting in more earthwork. Option A, the original proposal and option B are relatively close in costs. It was stated that it is unknown if there is ledge but that part of the 14,500 additional cost does contribute to some potential for ledge, but not all of it. Mr. Talcott stated of the importance to decide on an option so that the project could go through the wetlands process.

Alan Burr questioned if option C would relax some of the impact on the wetlands. Mr. Talcott responded that the road still does not go through any wetlands but that option C would go through less of the regulated area. Going through the regulated area would require that no erosion goes to the wetlands and that there is adequate cover on the soil, so that there is no potential erosion onto the wetlands. Mr. Gibson stated that there is no longer a regulated area that it is now called upland review area.

Mr. Barnes questioned if the \$14,500 was the minimum cost involved with choosing option C. Mr. Talcott responded that it is an estimate and if ledge is hit, it could cost more. He stated that the estimate does include hitting some ledge. How much ledge will be hit is an unknown. Hitting ledge on option B is less likely based on boring tests and elevations of the road. Responsive to Mr. LaFemina’s question, Mr. Talcott responded that the roads are designed for mandated speeds. Landscaping costs comparative to option B and C were discussed. Mr. Talcott stated that trees could be planted to screen the road from Mr. Burr’s property line. Responsive to Mrs. Ziobron’s question, Mr. Talcott responded yes, a decision should be made during this meeting so that he could go to the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission and Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Gibson agreed that a decision needed to be made so that the property could be split up into school, municipal and open space.

Mrs. Budzik questioned Mr. Burr as to his views on the options. He stated the further away from his house the better. He stated that he would still prefer to see the road on the other side of the tree line. Committee Members responded to various questions by Guy Mazzotta about the project referencing acreage, referendum wording and the access road. Considerable discussion ensued comparing all of the options and costs associated with them.

Mr. Moss stated that to move the access road to the emergency road would add an additional 100,000 not including ancillary costs around the building. Both road options are reimbursable. Changing the road access would require further design by KBA requiring additional time and fees. Mr. Talcott stated that his time line started on

February 7, 2006. Considerable discussion ensued about how changing the access road would have an adverse effect on the project with respect to the timeline and additional architectural fees. The building would need to be shifted and the fields moved.

Ms. Mordecai reflected upon a past meeting in which Mr. Burr had responded affirmatively that he would be willing to pay the extra costs involved to move the road further away from his property. Mr. Burr stated that he had agreed to pay the additional costs involved in moving the road to the other side of the trees and that this plan was not in accordance with the agreement. He stated that he would be willing to agree to pay approximately \$3,700 which constitutes half of half of the reimbursable rate of \$14,500, since the property only comes half way to where he would like to see the road located. Mr. Barnes stated that he felt the Committee had done in good conscious everything possible to move the road over and that now it is time to vote so that the project can stay on the timeline. He stated option b does not adversely affect the budget.

Motion by Mr. Barnes to go with driveway B. Seconded by Ms. Mordecai.

Mr. Barnes stated that he understood that option B was not a popular option, but that it was the most cost efficient option. He stated that the Committee had spent over a month working on the best option and that with all due respect, Mr. Burr had purchased his property with the knowledge that the school's access road was going there. The road has been moved over as much as possible with option B without additional cost to the project and additional borings were performed. Mr. Gibson stated that he supported what Mr. Barnes had said and additionally that it is important to keep non-wetland space intact for its usefulness in the future. Mrs. Ziobron stated that the vote should have waited until the end of the meeting after the audience of citizens in order to give Mr. Burr a chance to speak. Mrs. Budzik agreed with Mrs. Ziobron. Mr. LaFemina questioned the cost of the additional borings and if more boring tests would give a better rock profile for using option C. It was responded that the cost was \$1,800 and performing additional borings would affect the time line with respect to permits. Mrs. Ziobron questioned Mr. Talcott's experience with the permitting schedule and if he was being optimistic with the time line. He responded that he has extensive experience, performing over 200 and that he is being realistic with the time line. He stated the time schedule is not aggressive. Craig Parker stated that the road with the curve makes sense because it will slow down traffic.

Mr. Barnes stated that if the option to move the road to Sillimanville Road costs less money and makes sense that he would support it, but that it is important to make a decision as to option B or C at this time.

Motion pending until after other discussion by Mr. Barnes.

C) Traffic Study

Mrs. Ziobron referred to a Planning and Zoning Commission meeting in which the traffic study was discussed. She referred to a letter from Mr. Thumm to Selectman Parker stating that he was not happy with the traffic report as not being technical enough. She

questioned if an additional traffic study needed to be performed. Mr. Talcott stated that he was at the December 21, 2005 meeting and Mr. Thumm had voiced reservations with general comments (no technical) about the writing of the report. He stated that their last communication was that he would send his comments, but that he had not received them yet. Referencing the letter, Mrs. Ziobron stated that Mr. Thumm referred that the RFQ and RFP specifically required 2 hour study time and the study only contained 15 minutes. She stated that she would prefer that the Committee discuss the report before the joint meeting. Mr. Talcott responded that he had spoken with BL and Company about the concerns and that he was still awaiting an answer.

Mr. Moss stated that the traffic study was under the SBC prevue as it was directly hired by the SBC. The SBC wrote the traffic study, reviewed it. He stated that there is a discrepancy to what the traffic study asked for and what Mr. Thumm thinks it should contain. Mr. Moss stated that Mr. Thumm was looking for concrete decisions which were not the purpose of the traffic report. The intent of the traffic study is to get the counts so that some one else(another traffic engineer) can take the information to make more specific recommendations, so that the Department of Public Works can go out and build the roads to those specifications. Mr. Moss stated specific design criteria and information will not be received from BL and Company nor should it be expected. Mr. Moss stated that he had heard about the memo, had not seen it, but would get to the bottom of it before the next meeting. Craig Parker stated that the Committee has a tight schedule and that the people who work for the Committee can not go in 10 different directions with information; they should come directly to the Committee. He stated it is not in the best interest of the town, Committee or the project. Mrs. Ziobron stated that she was bringing forth the information to protect the best interest of the Committee and chairman. She referenced 1/4/06 meeting minutes.

Mrs. Budzik stated that in the future it would be helpful to send concerns, knowledge of memos or public concern via email so that Committee Members are made aware of them. Mrs. Ziobron stated that she will not use email any more as a means of communications and that she would prefer to have discussions face to face at the meetings. She referenced past email experiences (letter to the editor) as not being valuable. Mrs. Budzik stated that she was under the impression that emails were made apart of public record. The secretary responded affirmatively.

D) Public Relations Discussion

Denise Gable stated that she would like to wait to have a public relations discussion until after the joint meeting. It was agreed to keep it on the agenda for future meetings.

8. New Business

A) Prep for Joint Meeting

Committee Members reviewed the contents of the 1/18/06 joint meeting including but not limited to:

- Revised Estimate.
- Comparison between May 12, 2004 and recent cost estimate.

- Consideration of construction cost escalation.
- Potential money allocated for additional road construction.
- Revised land costs.
- Information with regards to costs associated with a regular and tournament size gymnasium.
- Architect report with FF & E and Technology budget.

Mr. Moss stated he cautioned that the difference in costs is not Newfield's fault but a combination of the Committee and the Board of Finance's requirements to shave costs. Committee Members revisited how the final costs were originally derived with negotiations with the Board of Finance which can be referenced in May 26, 2004 meeting minutes. It was stated that the Board of Finance has received no estimates since the referendum. Responsive to Mrs. Budzik's question, Mr. Moss responded that he would ask Selectman Brad Parker if Attorney Bennet would be attending the meeting. Owner and design contingency were discussed.

Mr. Barnes stated that the Committee had performed due diligence with respect to accurately estimating property costs with the 3 appraisals. Mr. Moss stated that all numbers are estimates until bids are acquired. Responsive to Mr. Barnes question, Ms. Mordecai stated that Dr. Durham did not support lowering the ceiling in the cafeteria and media center.

9. Determination of Next Meeting

The next special meeting is January 18, 2006 at 7:00p.m.at the Hale Ray High School cafeteria. The next regular scheduled meeting is January 25, 2006 at 7:00p.m.at the Hale Ray High School, room 117.

10. Audience of Citizens

Mr. Burr thanked the Committee for listening to his concerns. He requested the Committee to consider moving the road on the other side of the tree line. Joe Albuquerque requested that the Committee not agree to a motion until after the special meeting. He stated that moving the access road was a better option. It was stated that waiting would affect the time line and the access road location could not be changed without referendum.

11. Other Discussion

Committee Members discussed recent Hartford Courant articles which are filed at the Selectman's office as email correspondence. Mr. Moss stated that the Committee needs to be prepared to discuss the eminent domain issue and road access through Clark Gates Road. He stated that the consensus from past SBC and community meetings is that people didn't want to drive through East Hampton to go to a school in East Haddam. He stated that Sillimanville Road is in very bad shape, needing to be entirely repaved from the corner of North Moodus Road to the driveway and the sight line up top of the hill do not work for the main access. Mr. Moss stated that the list is quite lengthy as to why Sillimanville Rd was not used. Ms. Mordecai stated that she would like to have the architect be prepared to present what would be entailed in changing the access road to

Sillimanville Road, including changing the soccer fields, position of the school, drawings and time involved including their additional costs.

A) Land Acquisition

Mr. LaFemina stated that the Committee had not received a report for a few meetings and questioned what had transpired with negotiations up to that point. Mr. Barnes responded that in his opinion, negotiations went above and beyond what was required to get the people to the table over a period of 18 months. He stated that they got to the point where they got up against the timeline and needed to force a decision. Mr. LaFemina stated that several meetings ago, he had asked where they were with negotiations and it did not seem at that point that all options had been exhausted. He stated that he would like assurances that all options had been exhausted. Mr. Barnes responded yes, that all options had been exhausted and that ultimately it was the timeline that forced them into the eminent domain proceedings. He stated that the original deadline had been extended by 3 months in an effort to negotiate. Mr. Gould had been given 60 days for an appraisal and never got one. Tax consequences of eminent domain were discussed. Mr. Barnes stated that there was a deadline with a reasonable offer provided. Mr. Barnes stated that the Donnelons were provided with several tax relief options. Mrs. Budzik stated that the decision has been made and that now the Committee must move forward.

Motion by Mr. Barnes that the Committee decide to go with driveway option B (80 feet from the property line) to stay on the timeline. Seconded by Ms. Mordecai.

Mr. LaFemina stated that he felt that he did not have enough information to vote yes. Mrs. Ziobron stated that the additional cost is a small price to pay to be good neighbors. Mr. Moss stated that he would prefer option C.

**Favor: Mordecai, Parker, Barnes
Oppose: Budzik, Moss, Ziobron, LaFemina
Motion Fails**

Motion by Mrs. Budzik to go with Option C contingent on control speed. Seconded by Mrs. Ziobron.

**Favor: Budzik, Moss, Ziobron, Parker
Oppose: Mordecai, Barnes
Abstained: LaFemina
Motion passes**

10. Adjournment

Motion by Mrs. Ziobron at 10:550 to adjourn. Seconded by Ms. Mordecai and unanimously passed.

Filed at Selectman's office

Attendance

Revised East Haddam 4 – 8 Middle School Proposed Value Engineering Items, dated January 11, 2006.

East Haddam 4-8 Middle School Project Budget Summary Update, dated January 11, 2005.

KBA Architect's Report for the East Haddam 4-8 School, dated January 11, 2006.

Telephone Systems-Centrex, Private Branch Exchange (PBX) and Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP).

Technology Equipment Cost Estimate.

Schematic drawings of various roof pitches and designs.