

First Selectman's Building Committee Process Review Committee
Wednesday, August 22, 2012
First Floor Conference Room – Independence Hall
725 Old Post Rd.
Fairfield, CT 06824

Final Minutes

Members present: Michael Tetreau, David Title, Philip Dwyer, David Becker at 5:37 pm
Jim Brown joined at 5:45 pm

Members absent: Al Kelly, Hal Schwartz

Public: Judy Ewing, Ken Lee, Charlotte Leslie, and Susan Bellissimo

I. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 5:37 pm by Chairman Michael Tetreau, First Selectman.

II. Approve Minutes

After review, the minutes of June 14, 2012 were approved as presented. Phil Dwyer reported that the March 6, 2012 minutes were revised per the comments on June 14th.

III. CIP Process for Board of Education

David Becker asked if the respective town bodies have accepted the recommendations on the schedule for reviewing and approving CIP projects. Mike Tetreau indicated that the Board of Selectman accepted the process as presented and indicated the Board of Finance did likewise. Phil Dwyer reported that the Board of education also approved of the recommended process.

IV. Discuss Building Committee Process

a. School Construction and Reimbursement Process

Dr. Title distributed a four page description of the School Construction and Reimbursement process dated August 20, 2012. It outlined the review and approval steps required by the CT Department of Education for school projects requesting state reimbursement. Dr. Title highlighted:

- This document does not include the local steps and procedures, only those required by the state
- ED 049 and the required resolutions, for most projects, should be done by June 30th to facilitate timely funding requests.

- School projects only require a professional estimate (generally by an architect) and bids cannot be solicited until after the state gives approval on final plans and specifications.
- Dr. Title indicated the opening sentence of the document needs to be updated to reflect the funding authorization has to be for the total amount of the project costs, not just the district share.

The committee discussed aspects of the process including:

- The Warde roof project was different in many respects because it was done under legislative special waivers, including waiving the ½ inch pitch requirement, taking the old roof down to the roof deck (both waivers were recommended and approved by the Hoffman architects) and a waiver to the bid timetable, among several others. Also, roof projects do not have to meet the June 30th deadline.
- The committee suggested that this document be used as a basis for a longer version which includes the steps required and taken by the Board of Education, Board of Selectman, Board of Finance and Representative Town Meeting in reviewing and approving projects. This would also include describing the three resolutions required to begin the state review process. Phil Dwyer suggested that a definitions section be included, especially as to what a “professional cost estimate” accomplishes.
- The second deliverable of this committee may be a fully developed School Construction Process document that includes a. Process description, inclusive of the state reimbursement process, b. Desired (typical) timetable, c. rationalization for the various steps, d. checklist of key decisions and documents, power point presentation, and e. a definitions section.

V. **Public Comment**

Susan Bellissimo felt a definition of terms was important and suggested statements like “local funding authorization” which may be known to local officials is not generally understood by citizens. She also asked the group to consider how emergency (public health issues) may impact the process schedule.

Judy Ewing agreed that the Board of Education process steps should be included on the document. She also indicated that the Town has frequently named the building committee and its members at the same time, although the state may not require it. She reminded the group that the Board of Finance had begun to develop a quarterly report on the status of various bond issues as a means of keeping track of what funds have been spent against authorizations and receipts of state grants.

Mike Tetreau indicated the Board of Finance is reviewing the “waterfall chart” and is looking to improve upon its presentation. This may further improve the reporting and tracking process.

VI. Adjourn

The Committee adjourned at 6:44 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Phil Dwyer