

CITIZENS UNITED

RE: Cl&P's Interstate Reliability Project

March 26, 2012

Senator Fasano stated "Nearly everyone who spoke to me about this legislation expressed concern over the health consequences of the electromagnetic fields" "That's why we included language requiring lines ..be placed underground.... "

Gov. says yes to power lines bill, Brian McCreedy , Journal Register News Service 05/07/2004

Victor Civie

To: Mansfield Town Council Members, Matt Hart, Town Manger, Cherie Trahan,
Director, Department of Finance
From: Alison Hilding *Alison Hilding*
Date: March 26, 2012
RE: Mansfield's effort to achieve the "renovate like new" status along with the higher reimbursement rate for renovation of the three elementary schools.

**Notes for comments to be delivered orally at the Mansfield Town Council meeting
March 26, 2012.**

Concerning the March 22, 2012 memo from Cherie Trahan to Matt Hart (attached) would you please answer the following questions:

When Ms. Trahan and Mr. Baruzzi met with the staff of the Bureau of School Facilities in the CT Department of Administrative Services (formerly of the Department of Education) in December 2011, did they address the option of renovating the three elementary schools with the bureau staff, or did they only address the two-new elementary schools option?

At what date, and to whom, of the Bureau of School Facilities have Trahan and Baruzzi, or any other official representative of the Town of Mansfield, presented an itemized and quantified list which details the components of the Rick Lawrence Associates \$95 million budget projection for renovation of the three Mansfield elementary schools? If this estimate and its specific components has been provided for review to the Bureau of School Facilities, what was their response? Who responded for the Bureau, at what date, and was this response delivered in writing or orally at a meeting or by phone?

Has any Town of Mansfield representative, including but not limited to Ms. Trahan and Mr. Baruzzi, had a discussion with any representative from the Bureau of School Facilities concerning whether or not any, or all, of the three Mansfield elementary schools might qualify for the "renovate like new" status and the higher reimbursement rate? Has anyone from the Town of Mansfield, at any point in this school building review process, told representatives from the Bureau of School Facilities that they would like to renovate the schools rather than build new? Has any official representative of the Town of Mansfield asked for the state's help in figuring out how the elementary schools might qualify for the higher "renovate like new" reimbursement rate? If so, when, who, and with what staff member of the Bureau of School Facilities did this communication occur?

Has Lawrence Associates ever presented to the Mansfield Board of Education, the Mansfield Town Council, or the Mansfield Department of Finance a clearly and fully detailed list of expenses which adds up to the \$95 million Lawrence Associates has projected for renovating the three elementary schools? If so, when, and to which of the town's councils, boards, or departments was this detailed list provided? Was the

document dated? If a detailed itemization of the Lawrence Associates \$95 million renovation projection exists, may I please have a copy of it?

When the calculations were done by Lawrence Associates to determine if the three Mansfield elementary schools qualified for the State of CT higher "renovate like new" reimbursement rate, how was the square footage of each school computed? Were the portables included or not? Has the Mansfield Board of Education, Town Council, or Department of Finance ever been presented by Lawrence Associates with a list which categorizes as alteration, repair, code improvement, etc, all of the work to the physical plant of the three elementary schools that has been completed over the past thirty years?

It is my understanding that how the historical construction work completed over the past thirty years is categorized or classified, such as "alteration", "repair", or "improvement" is key to determining whether 75% of each building has been "renovated" or not. I believe that there may be some discretion concerning the way completed work may be classified. Depending on what outcome a school system, or a consultant, wants to achieve, improvements to the physical plant may be assigned to one category or another, albeit with limitations. Likewise, how you compute the square footage of each building (such as including the portable classrooms or not) necessarily affects the percentage of the previously "renovated" space .

Nothing I have seen to date has convinced me that either Lawrence Associates or the Town of Mansfield has made a serious effort to qualify for the State's "renovate like new" status and the higher reimbursement rate.

Lastly, could you please tell me when, and by whom, a thorough study was made of the suitability of the land around Southeast School for a new and larger septic system? Was appropriate soil excavation done at that time to determine the soil drainage type? Are records available that document this investigation? Could you please provide me with a copy of this document, or alternately, tell me how I might access these records?

Thank you.



Town of Mansfield

Department of Finance

To: Matt Hart, Town Manager
From: Cherie Trahan, Director
CC: Fred Baruzzi, Superintendent of Mansfield Public Schools
Date: March 22, 2012
Re: School Building Project - Option A Concerns

Following the Public Hearing for the School Building Project on March 5, 2012, Rick Lawrence spoke to me regarding the Option A discussions and comments. He was very concerned that there was a misunderstanding as to what Option A was going to do for us and more importantly, how long Option A would take to complete. After listening to the numerous points he made, I suggested he prepare a list of his concerns so that we could discuss them at the Special Council meeting on March 7th. The primary concern was that all citizens understood not only what the end result would be, but what the process would be to get there, not to cast blame. Regretfully, that seems to have been the interpretation.

From my perspective, the sheer number of projects that are still under consideration, along with the time delay between our reviews has made it extremely difficult to keep clear the fine differences between them. Over the past 6 years we have analyzed and reviewed approximately 10-12 different versions. As was pointed out, we ourselves continue to fall back on the term "renovation" even though Rick has repeatedly explained the difference at the workshops. However, understanding the importance and impact of this project on the entire community, going forward I believe the factual points regarding Option A are important to remember:

1. Option A is basic repairs/maintenance/alterations to maintain the buildings to be completed over a 20 year period.
2. The cost estimates were based on completing the project over 20 years to mitigate the impact on the students. Work would need to be done over vacations and summer break because there is insufficient swing space to move the students to while work is being done. To shorten the implementation of this option would increase the cost of the option.
3. Based on our conversations with the School Facilities Unit, we do not believe we will receive the higher reimbursement rate for the alterations in Option A because we do not qualify for "renovate to new" status. However, we will continue to monitor any further clarifying information from the State.

I hope this information is helpful and that we can assist the Council in moving forward with their deliberations.