

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 32	PA 48	1984
House 1033-1058		(26)
Senate 553-562		(10)
Finance 1-56		(56)

LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE  
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

total 92 p.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate  
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2015

H-370

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1984

VOL. 27  
PART 3  
774-1063

kok

173

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

CLERK:

Senate Bill 18.

Total number voting 146

Necessary for passage 74

Those voting yea 144

Those voting nay 2

Those absent and not voting 5

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Calendar page 18, Calendar No. 219, File No. 160,

Substitute for Senate Bill No. 32, AN ACT AUTHORIZING

BONDS OF THE STATE FOR A LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING.

Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Approaching his desk now is the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding, Representative Ronald Smoko.

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Rep. Smoko.

1034

kok

174

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of this bill in concurrence with the Senate.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark?

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, because I know this bill has been caucused at great length by both our caucus and Republican caucus. Essentially it calls for the allocation of \$51 million in bond authorization for the construction of a new office building for the legislature as well as parking facilities to be constructed over the Armory parking lot. Mr. Speaker, I think a number of people have played an instrumental role in bringing us to this point.

Majority Leader Groppo and Rep. Abercrombie have spent literally hundreds of hours in going over the technical aspects of this bill. I can present that the Finance Committee has listened to the construction techniques detailed to us at considerable length. We're comfortable that the procedures that will be followed are appropriate. I think if there are any technical questions to be addressed on the substance of this

kok

175

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

proposal, they can be addressed to Reps. Groppo and Abercrombie, but with that introduction, Mr. Speaker, since I think this has been discussed fully in the media and by the members of this Chamber, I will sit down at this juncture, and allow the debate to center on any questions of this proposal. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further? If not, will members please be seated.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Rep. Jaekle.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

In accordance with Rep. Smoko's suggestion, I would like to direct a question to either Rep. Groppo or Abercrombie. And my question is, did the Legislative Management Committee ever issue a Joint Favorable Report on this proposal? Through you, Mr. Speaker, to either Rep. Groppo or Abercrombie.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Rep. Groppo, do you care to respond?

REP. GROPPPO: (63rd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, if I remember, this bill

kok

176

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

was referred to the Committee on Finance and Bonding from Legislative Management through change of reference.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, was that a Joint Favorable change of reference?

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Rep. Groppo, do you care to respond?

REP. GROPPPO: (63rd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes. Otherwise it wouldn't have gone if it wasn't a joint favorable.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Thank you, Rep. Groppo. I'm not going to debate the substance of the legislative office building. It has been fully discussed in the respective caucuses. I just want to point out that my recollection of what happened in Legislative Management was that the Legislative Management Committee did nothing more than raise this bill for a public hearing, and then referred the bill to the Finance Committee for a public hearing, which public hearing, by the way, was supposed to be a joint public hearing with Finance and Legislative Management, and to my knowledge the Legislative Management Committee has never issued a Joint Favorable Report on the legislative office building.

But I did want to know whether my recollection was

kok

177

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

wrong or not, but that is my recollection. Thank you.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the bill?

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Rep. Christopher Shays.

REP. SHAYS: (147th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to voice concern on this bill on a number of levels. On the first level, it costs \$50 million, and I'd like to ask you if you think we need an office building more than we need more prisons for the individuals who are supposed to be sent there and stay there and are being let out early because we haven't done our job there.

Does it make sense for us to say once again, that we're special and different, that we can have a fast track, that everyone else has to follow procedures but somehow we know the problems and we need an office building and so we're going to give it a higher priority.

This bill never went to the Bonding Subcommittee. It was never part of a Bonding Subcommittee package. Why? What makes us so special and so different?

I'm also troubled by the fact that we have a \$50 million

kok

178

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

appropriation, or authorization, rather, and we don't know what we're buying. We know we're going to buy 200 square feet of office space, but I don't know if we're going to have offices. I don't know exactly what's going to be in that building.

We don't even know what's underneath that building that's going to be built.

I just want to express concern to you on one last level. We have a roadway that is falling apart literally. It's going to cost over \$5 billion to correct. There is no way that we're going to be able to properly finance all the expenditures that we seem to be eager to have. I believe that we do need an office building, but I don't think it deserves any higher priority than some of the other issues that have come before us.

And it just strikes me, and I'll make this final point, it just strikes me as rather interesting that we seem to really understand the need for an office building, but what about the other needs that we have? Why don't we seem to understand those needs, and what gives this such high priority over everything else? \$50 million is a lot of money. If our roads weren't falling apart, maybe that'd be another story. But we have already authorized, allocated -- I'm on the Bond Commission, and we have already

kok

179

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

allocated more than \$200 million already. We're going to be over \$300 million by the end of the year, which is about \$100 million more than we were told made sense in terms of going to the bond market.

But wait until the next year when our roadway package really is in full force and the year after. We are providing so many authorizations, and we do not have the financial ability to pay for them all.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further? Rep. Paul Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE: (87th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Rising in support of the bill. It is true that I have served on the Legislative Management Committee and have spent some time in reference to this particular bill.

I think the first thing you have to do when you get into a particular situation of this type is that you, in fact, analyze the needs as best you can as it relates to any particular issue, and as it relates to this building I think over the years, numerous people, through studies, looking at some of the problems we're faced with the Capitol Building, the restoration and what we have when we get through, comes down very clearly on this side, that the only way that we can satisfy these needs is by construction

kok

180

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

of a new office facility.

And when you speak of \$50 million, that of course, is not just for the building, but does include a parking garage of approximately 1,000 plus.

Over the years that I have served in the General Assembly, and have had constituents and friends visit here at the Capitol, they, in all cases point out the inadequacy of this facility with the business that we try to carry out, and I think another crying need that people have and we have to be concerned about this, of those persons coming here for the purpose of trying to do business and the problem with parking.

So yes, I think the need has been demonstrated over the years that this facility, the legislative office building and the parking garage are definitely needed for now, and we really have to be looking down the road 25 years, and 50 years, so that if we don't talk about spending \$50 million now, in 10 years, who knows about it'll be, probably \$100 million.

The other thing that has concerned me to some degree, were the political considerations in reference to this proposal, and I would just say to my fellow Republicans that an attempt has been made from the beginning that this not become a political issue, and it's a policy that I have

kok

181

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

avored, and will continue to favor, and feel that we should follow on that course, because in fact, if it gets involved in political debate, we will never build this facility.

But we have to be sure that we restore, finish the restoration of this Capitol Building, and with that, as I stated before, it's my expressed opinion that the need has been demonstrated for the legislative office building and that parking facility adjacent to this structure.

So I would just encourage all members of the House to support the proposal before us. Thank you.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further? Rep. Michael Rybak.

REP. RYBAK: (66th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rose, not with the intention to speak on this bill, until Rep. Shays addressed the question of the Bonding Subcommittee, and perhaps some members are questioning why the bill was reported out by the chairman of the committee and not the Subcommittee Chairman, and I suppose the reason for that was that I voted against the bill in committee.

Since that time I have had the opportunity to speak with a number of people. My concerns in the committee were first of all, I felt on an instinctive basis that

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

renovation of the two buildings on Trinity Street and removing some of the state agencies to other locations that were in those buildings would be an alternative. I have since been advised by a number of people, both in not only Legislative Management, but also Administrative Services that that would not satisfy the needs that are attempted to be addressed by this bill.

Secondly, I was concerned that the bill did not go to the subcommittee, but as I thought more about the matter, it is not the subcommittee that's going to be carrying out the very heavy responsibility of building this building, and it is a very heavy responsibility. In a sense here today, I think we all honestly recognize the need. All of us have been in hearings in rooms in this building which we know full well are unsafe for the public, that do not comply with the fire code, that are inaccessible to the handicapped, and yet we continue to attempt to do business in derogation of statutes which even our own municipalities are compelled to follow. But in the construction of this building we're engaging in an act of faith, and the act of faith is that our leaders on both sides of the aisle who sit on the Legislative Management Committee will do their utmost to be sure that we get the best value for our dollar here,

kok

183

House of Representatives Wednesday, April 4, 1984

that there won't be the change orders and cost overruns and all of the other accoutrements that the newspapers fear will emerge in this building.

We're trusting the leaders on both sides to make the best decision possible. The alternative is, we do nothing, and that alternative is intolerable, so to a certain extent I'm engaging in an act of faith in urging that the members of the subcommittee endorse this bill.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the bill?

REP. GROPPA: (63rd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Rep. Groppo.

REP. GROPPA: (63rd)

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to clarify something that Rep. Jaekle raised a question on, and I know that the subcommittee and Legislative Management have been working on this particular issue since last July. It's not something that Rep. Shays made reference of fast track. This is something that the legislature's been concerned about back in 1962 when the same concept was developed then and for obvious reasons nothing ever took place until the renovation of the interior of this Capitol and we found

kok

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

ourselves in a position that once the renovations take place inside this Capitol, there won't be room for many legislators. It's as simple as that. It's not something that was created by a committee. It's just a fact that we are in violation of fire code, safety codes, and what have you, and here we sit in the seat of government, telling municipalities what to do and yet we can't wash our own linen, it's as simple as that.

But in reference to the question raised by Rep. Jaekle, and if I remember correctly, this was discussed at Legislative Management, and it was agreed on a bipartisan level that we would go forth with recommending a new office building after all the options were looked at, and if I remember correctly, I think it was Sen. Skelley at that time said that certainly he would raise the bill in Finance, Revenue and Bonding, and whether Legislative Management at that time at one of the meetings referred that proposed legislation to Revenue and Bonding, I'm embarrassed to say I don't remember because things have happened so fast over the past, particularly three months. So I think the bill is properly here before us.

I don't know, I think if you look at the jacket, I think that would give reference of whether it was referred to Legislative Management, raised in Legislative Management

kok

185

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

and then referred to Finance. I'm not clear on that, but certainly the bill is legally before us, under our rules.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that certainly that could be partisan. Up until this point the committee and great respect to Rep. Abercrombie who has worked hard along with Sen. Robertson, yourself, Mr. Speaker, and Sen. Skelley, Sen. Matthews, Sen. Mustone, leadership on both sides of the aisle in both Chambers, have worked, and this is the only solution that we could come up with, for this pressing problem.

I know maybe Rep. Shays takes offense to the fact that it is fast track. It's fast tracks, Rep. Shays because if we don't move forward before the end of this session, I can assure you that it'll be 20 more years before any action's taken place.

Now, I hope this body does not use this as a political issue, because the need is there, and up until this point there has been cooperation from everybody, whether it's the administration, whether it's the Governor's Office, or rank and file legislators. The cooperation has been there and the time to move forward is now and hopefully that we understand that.

What you're doing, you're building a building that

kok

186

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

will be here, hopefully, for 100 years that this building when it was built, and I'm sure the same debates took place then, as they take place today.

Yes, the price is high, but I can assure you with the cost of construction, and what have you, that the price will get higher. The longer we delay the higher the price will be, so if you're talking about a half way decent public facility that each and every one of us can be proud of, this is the way to go, and the sooner we move the better it'll be for not only the taxpayers of this state, but also for you as legislators and those that will follow when we're gone, and I would hope that everyone would look at it that way, and say, I'm doing it for myself, I'm doing for the future legislators that will follow us. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the bill?

REP. VAN NORSTRAND: (141st)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Rep. VanNorstrand.

REP. VAN NORSTRAND: (141st)

Mr. Speaker, if I might pose a parliamentary inquiry, and ask if the Speaker might examine the jacket

kok

187

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

to this bill, because I think Rep. Jaekle has raised a proper point.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

On your point of parliamentary inquiry, the jacket indicates that this bill was raised in the Finance Committee and given a Joint Favorable Report by the Finance Committee. If I may further respond to your point of parliamentary inquiry, because having been a party to the discussions, and I believe I recall them quite clearly, we did have significant discussions on the new building and the price tag in the committee on Legislative Management.

It was decided in the Committee on Legislative Management, I believe, to basically have the issue move forward to the Finance Committee, and the Finance Committee on this individual bill raised the bill and acted on it. This was following a joint meeting of the Finance Committee and the Legislative Management Committee involving, I believe most of the members of both committees for detailed discussion of this issue.

REP. VAN NORSTRAND: (141st)

Mr. Speaker, you have answered my question some moments ago. I appreciate the more plenary remarks that followed, but the short of it is, that the Committee on Legislative Management has never given this bill a Joint

kok

188

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

Favorable. It is clearly charged under Rule 3, to handle not only the procedures and committee work, but indeed the facilities and working operations of the General Assembly.

I have seen points raised on fiscal notes marked minimal and on a variety of other things. It seems to me we shouldn't be so fast track on a \$51 million item that we don't follow our own rules.

Therefore, I would raise a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, that this matter should go to the Legislative Management Committee.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

A Point of Order has been raised, that the bill before us is not properly before us. Could you cite the rule you're referring to, Rep. VanNorstrand.

REP. VAN NORSTRAND: (141st)

It's getting awkward to cite that rule, Mr. Speaker. It's Rule 3. It starts out with a one, two, three, four under group A, and one two, three four under group B and then says, also, an added entry is, the Legislative Management Committee, numeral I.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The House will stand at ease. I would ask that the Minority Leader join me at the dais.

Will all members please be seated. Will all members

kok

189

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

please be seated.

A Point of Order has been raised, that the bill, Senate Bill 32 is not properly before us, and that under Joint Rule 3, which establishes the standing committees of the legislature, the bill should have received a report from the Committee on Legislative Management. I refer all of the members to Joint Rule 3, Subsection, Group B-I which establishes the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding. I'm not going to read it. It's available to all of you, and on page 116 of the 1983 session, rule book, maybe slightly different than the '84, after Groups A and B, it indicates in addition there shall be a Committee on Legislative Management, it sets up the purview for the Committee on Legislative Management.

It all of the years of the General Assembly, the bonding package has been formulated through a variety of measures, through proposals in the Governor's proposed capital budget, through items that have come from other committees, and a very large number of items that have originated for bonding purposes within the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding. Many of those items would have additional purview from almost every committee that is established under the first two groups. It has not been the tradition that those items also be referred to

kok

190

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

the other committees, and indeed the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding has in virtually all cases, without challenge had jurisdiction to move those items in the bonding package.

Rep. Jaekle's Point of Order, while raised I think with a good deal of merit, the item has been addressed in the Committee on Legislative Management, indeed, has been discussed both in the full committee, and in the subcommittee on physical facilities at extremely great length.

Further, as House Chairman of the Committee on Legislative Management, I do not feel that that committee has been slighted or overlooked in its purview of this item in that it has been involved through a joint meeting with the Finance Committee, and through deliberations throughout.

Therefore, without prejudice, I would at this time rule that the Point of Order is not well taken, and that the bill is properly before us.

Will you remark further on the bill?

REP. RITTER: (2nd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Rep. Thomas Ritter.

kok

191

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

REP. RITTER: (2nd)

Yes, thank you. I do not want to prolong this debate. However, I think it's very important that we have certain things on the record. I represent the area immediately around the Capitol here, so it's something that's going to be affecting my neighborhood, and it's important, in particular, that I was involved with some of the neighborhood residents who were frustrated in their attempts to find jobs when we put the new court house, which is a few blocks away from here.

And when I looked into the issue a little bit I found out that the state gives priority to neighborhood people, but then they define the neighborhood as being about 25 miles in circumference around the Hartford area. But I'm very happy to put in the record that I understand Legislative Management will insist on the Greater Hartford Plan, the Affirmative Action Plan, and that they'll try to encourage neighborhood residents to be working on this facility.

My second concern was actually that here we are building a \$51 million building which I think is needed, but that there's no plans or anything that we can show the neighborhood residents. Already we have put in a lot of state office buildings. We've done a lot of things to

kok

192

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

the neighborhood without neighborhood input, and I've been assured by the Chairman of the Finance Committee that as the plans are being developed we will be able to sit down with neighborhood groups, and again, I think it's very important to have on the record that nothing will be done in terms of where the parking lot is going to be, where roads are going to be without having a reasonable input from the neighborhood.

And lastly, I can just say, too, that I am somewhat disappointed in that I gave Legislative Management some proposals that have been done in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania where I think they were very creative in getting a system where it would have been more of a tax benefit to the local communities and where I think it might have -- we could have put some retail and other things in there, however, that disappointment of mine will not make me vote against this, but again I did want to put it on the record, the assurances we did have from the Finance Committee. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the bill?

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Mr. Speaker.

kok

193

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Rep. Raymond Joyce.

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill has bothered me to some extent, and I think it has many other people here. Location, is where they're putting this building really accessible here? The cost, Chris Shays says weighing the cost of this, \$51 million against building prisons, or weighing the costs against the needs that are brought out in the booklet put out, "The Child At Risk".

But there's not much we can do about it. Like many other things around here, we get caught short. We don't do anything until the roof falls in. We're acting as is normal around here, it seems.

Twenty years ago, the General Assembly looked forward to this time, they decentralized, or tried other ideas, maybe putting some of these agencies in the towns around here where the public gets better service, probably gets better service, then maybe we wouldn't have this problem today. Maybe we could take our time and do things slowly, carefully and well. But we can't. It's either this or nothing, and I'll vote for this bill, as I think we all will here, probably, but I hope we can learn something from this.

kok

194

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

I hope we start acting now, or in the next session so that 20 years down the road this assembly at that time won't be caught short, wouldn't be caught so that they had to act when the roof was falling in. Again, I urge passage of the bill, but I hope we learn from it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

REP. VAN NORSTRAND: (141st)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Rep. VanNorstrand.

REP. VAN NORSTRAND: (141st)

Mr. Speaker, I was obviously not moved to appeal your ruling. I would have preferred we had had a formal vote in Legislative Management because it does seem to me that if that's our charge, notwithstanding what precedence you cited, and I'll leave it where it lays, or now lies, but it seems to mark the whole consideration of this building. It has in a sense, a momentum of its own, yet we know so little about it, we don't even know who's going to be in it. We don't know exactly what's going to happen here, and yet we are faced with a crisis in this building where we can see some evidence of it, and see still other

kok

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

evidence up in the Senate and other places.

I'm told now we're in a position where you can barely take a wrench to a pipe in the plumbing system or else it'll crumble, and I don't know that we can gamble that long. I would only say to brother Rybak, I hope we're worthy of your trust, brother, because this thing is very wide open, and an awful lot of effort is going to have to be expended and a lot of nos are going to have to be said, because I have a feeling there may be 151 different versions of how this is supposed to turn out and what it means to each individual. The only bright spot I can say is, probably none of us will be here when it's built, and so we don't have to worry about it.

I think the -- I am convinced, and it's taken me a long time, and I've not been happy about every decision we made along the way, I am bitterly disturbed that we are on the brink of turning this building into a museum, not one that is occupied by the public, not one that is occupied by the legislature, but only tangentially so, and maybe even some day, only sessionally so. I find that most regrettable. I think the real historic seat of government, should be, to the extent it can be, where the action is, but I am now convinced that we cannot squeeze the people into this building in any satisfactory

manner once we start to undertake the corrections in terms of building and fire code that we are supposed to take.

I guess it reminds me of a story that a former Democrat once told me, he's still a Democrat, I'm sorry, but he's a former legislator. He used to come, he sat down here. He had the ability to drive Speakers nuts. His name was Bill Collins, and boy he was a relatively -- I think I've seen it in print, described as a liberal. He was for everything. You couldn't do enough for handicapped codes, building codes, fire codes, you name it. When he became a mayor he had a totally different attitude and found out what he had to do and what it was going to cost the City of Norwalk.

Well, we're now faced with that, and I guess we have to face up to it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further? Rep. Tony Miscikoski.

REP. MISCIKOSKI: (65th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I tell you, I'm for a nice building like that. I mean, I've been in this building since 1955, so the only problem that I'm having with this, is in my district, they're trying to close the branch to close \$35,000. But I know that we could have the branch kept open and build a building and still

kok

197

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

have money left over and pay for the infrastructure, 342 million, and a half by just keeping the tolls, because in the next ten years there'll be \$630 million that we're throwing away, and we'll take that up next time. Thank you.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the bill? If not, will members please be seated. Will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is now voting by roll.  
Will the members please return to the Chamber immediately. The House of Representatives is now voting by roll. Will the members please return to the Chamber immediately.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the Clerk will take a tally.

REP. RUDOLF: (139th)

Mr. Speaker, in the negative, please.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Rep. Rudolf in the negative.

The Clerk please announce the tally.

kok

198

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 4, 1984

CLERK:

Senate Bill 32.

Total number voting	147
Necessary for passage	74
Those voting yea	101
Those voting nay	46
Those absent and not voting	5

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Calendar No. 221, File No. 170, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 489, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A CONNECTICUT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION FOR THE STATUE OF LIBERTY AND ELLIS ISLAND. Favorable Report of the Committee on Education.

REP. GROPPA: (63rd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Rep. Groppo.

REP. GROPPA: (63rd)

May this item be referred to the Committee on Government Administration and Elections.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The motion is to refer to the Committee on Government Administration and Elections. Is there objection?

S-222

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1984

VOL. 27

PART 2

411-809

Regular Session  
Wednesday, March 28, 1984

Page 99  
jgt

calendar No. 155, File No. 172. The machine is open. Please record your vote. Senator DiBella. Senator Martin. Senator Johnston. Has everyone voted? Machine is closed. Clerk, please tally the vote. Result of the vote, 31 yea, 2 nay. The bill is adopted.

THE CLERK:

On page 10, calendar 156, File No. 160, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 32. An Act Authorizing Bonds of the State for a Legislative Office Building. Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Skelley.

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR SKELLEY:

Yes, Mr. President. Mr. President, this bill, this bond authorization is for fifty-one million dollars for a new legislative office building so that the returning General Assembly will be forced to build when the restoration and renovation of the Connecticut State Capitol is in progress and after it's completed. Long before I happened to join the circle, the Capitol restoration commission was founded and began the restoration of the State Capitol. The outside work was completed, I think, approximately two years ago, and bond authorizations were issued by the General Assembly to continue the work on the mechanical, electrical and code violations in the building. The

Regular Session  
Wednesday, March 28, 1984

554

Page 100  
jgt

Connecticut State Capitol has flagrant code violations. Its mechanical system is in total and complete disrepair. Its electrical system is outmoded and it's the feeling of the General Assembly by the authorization of those bonds and also by the Legislative Management Committee to proceed with the work. Once that work is completed, there will in fact not be any more than two rooms in the Connecticut General Assembly that can be used, in the Connecticut State Capitol that can be used for public hearings. The space will be definitely altered. We'll be dealing with areas that will only have office space and we recognize the fact that the work of the General Assembly must proceed in an efficient and orderly manner, not only its members but also the public must be well served. We looked at several alternatives. We looked at alternatives for existing buildings. We looked at alternatives for additional rental space, and we came to the conclusion that the most logical place for any other expansion of the General Assembly or not necessarily expansion but what would make up for the loss of space that we're going to have in the State Capitol is next door in the Armory parking lot. We hired a firm called Morganti to handle both the restoration of the Capitol and, if approved by this General Assembly, the construction of the new office building. They are a large and reputable firm from the Danbury area and we asked them to put together some fact and figures for exactly how much this particular project would cost. They did a comparison of buildings in other states, comparable buildings. The fact of the matter is that the new office Building will in fact have to blend into the area but will not overshadow the Capitol which means that it has to be no more than three or four stories and basically with a formal granite exterior, but would also be connected to the Capitol

Regular Session  
Wednesday, March 28, 1984

Page 101  
jgt

through some sort of a tunnel underneath because you cannot connect anything - a bridge that would do any type of esthetic damage to the Capitol as far as the outside exterior is concerned. After taking a look at other programs and projects that were done in other states, they came up with a cost comparison of the office building costing approximately a hundred and forty-five. This is the outside limit - the maximum limit. Based on that figure, the outside limit was \$145.00 a sq. ft. which came to twenty-nine million dollars for the building. There's a conduit out there that has to be spanned. We may not need all the money on that, but the conduit allowance comes to 2.5 million dollars. There also happens to be something that if you, we recognized and our staff recognized, the public recognize, the lack of parking. Included in this proposal is a thousand car parking garage at a minimal price of approximately \$8,000.00 a space. That may sound expensive, but it isn't really. That's \$8,000,000.00. The passage to the Capitol allowance was \$800,000.00. That would be some sort of a conduit - a walkway from the Capitol office building over into the Capitol. The sub-total was \$40,300,000.00. We have professional fees included in that of 15% which is an additional \$6,000,000.00 which came to \$46,300,000.00, a contingency fund of 10% which is \$4,630,000.00. The total that was recommended by Morganti is the outside figure was \$50,930,000.00. We rounded that off to \$51,000,000.00. Mr. President, we've been working on this program, Legislative Management and the sub-committee of Legislative Management, since September, and I probably never appreciated the Capitol and I probably have been responsible for putting up a few petitions on my own, but the more I became involved with this particular project, and I have really thrown myself

into it and so have the other sub-committee members, I feel it's probably one of the most worthwhile things that we've done. We are not building ourselves a legislative office building. We are building a building that will serve the government of the State of Connecticut and the people of the State of Connecticut for fifty to seventy-five years. The chances are that those of us, hopefully when it is approved, many of us probably won't even reap the benefit of the building. We all know the type of conditions we work under. The public is inconvenienced. The public is annoyed at some of the conditions that in fact they have to endure when they come up here. I suppose that the only way that you can really have three equal branches of government is to make sure those branches are equal and accomodating the public and making sure that this General Assembly works in an efficient manner is really our responsibility. I would ask for the support of the circle and thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Matthews.

SENATOR JOHN MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. President. As a member of the sub-committee in which Senator Skelley did such an admirable amount of work to try to get a project together with the rest of us that would do real commendable results for the public as well as for the use of the people who are serving the government, I think deserve your support. I'd like to point out a number of things that we feel are important about the bill and one is you know what your conditions are now in terms of the working facilities and activities. Secondly, as Senator Skelley has pointed out that it is really against the law practically

Regular Session  
Wednesday, March 28, 1984

Page 103  
jgt

in many areas in this building to be working. The fire hazards and the other health hazards which we have now - in our building are serious - we have been told actually, legally, that we should not be in the building. I think the facts are that we have a building that is now being thought through with great diligence, great prudence and with economics in mind. When you think of what we will be doing in next fifty to seventy-five years in forming our government activities here. I think it's a very desirable, necessary and important thing to do and I support it very strongly and hope you will support it at this time. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gunther.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Mr. President, I rise to support the bill. Senator Skelley said he's been working since September. I'll say there's been eighteen years of working on this program that I know of and there's never a right time. I don't care what it is. If we had taken - bit the bullet back eighteen years ago, we could have probably built it for \$500,000.00, but we have the continuing rising in costs. I can remember even some ten or twelve years ago. We could have bought the Hilton Hotel for \$4,000,000.00 and there were some people up here who were willing to bite the bullet then and said, "My God, what a potential we have down there - meeting rooms - we could have the sessions down there." You could have everything you need, but at that time, \$4,000,000.00 was a lot of money and now you've got it almost ten times that and that's not unusual. It's the cost of construction. All I have to say is those that complain about building a building up here for the use of the legislature, 99% of them

have never been up here because the ones that come up here are crabbing like the devil about the parking. They crab that you have to go to a little cubicle in order to talk to their House man or to their Senator, they complain about the hearing areas, they're sitting on top of one another, they can't get in the room. There are so many areas here and those that come up and realize why we should have this type of a facility. I say it's time to bite the bullet. I know it's an election year and what I usually love is the ones that'll crab and complain and vote against it and say, "Oh, God, no. We can't do this." But it's just like the salaries. The next year they like to come up and use the facility or draw the salary, so all I can say, Mr. President, I think it's about time we did something. I think this is the time. It's never going to be any better.

THE CHAIR:

Senator O'Leary.

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Mr. President, I rise to support the motion and you know, it's been about a hundred years now since we have expanded the facilities for the legislature. Can you imagine any business or any enterprise functioning today in the space that they functioned in one hundred years ago? There were far fewer people in the State of Connecticut for one thing a hundred years ago and those who came to this Capitol were probably a trickle, but in the few years that I've been here, that trickle has swelled to a torrent. I remember a few years ago when we were dealing with hazardous waste, there was a proposal to put a large hazardous waste site in my district. Three thousand people attended a meeting in a high school in the district. All that session

Regular Session  
Wednesday, March 28, 1984

Page 105  
jgt

we were working on hazardous waste legislation and I had a flood of people coming from my district to meet with me at various points and I couldn't find a place to meet with them in this building. Just the other day, we had the EDB question - people now looking to the state for protection against this carcinogenic insecticide that was used. Many people are concerned. Wells have been shut down. They come to their State Capitol for a redress of these problems. They look to us to do something for them and naturally they come here. They have no place to park their car. We have no place to meet with them. Yesterday I met with four of the first selectmen from my town on a matter that concerned - four from my district - on a matter that concerned their four towns. I walked around this building with them in tow because we wanted a quiet place where we could review a piece of legislation. We tried two floors in the building. Finally we found a quiet room where the attorneys and the four selectmen and their assessors could sit down and review the piece of legislation. When we got through with a two hour meeting that was interrupted several times, we decided we would have to meet again next week. One of them turned to me and he said, "Is it possible, and I know you're very busy at this time of year, but is it possible for you to come up to the towns because we couldn't find a place around the State Capitol to park", and that was why they were forty-five minutes in some cases late for the meeting. That's a very foolish procedure to have to go through and I think that meeting as recently as yesterday highlights the need to expand this operation finally after one hundred years. Thank you, Mr. President.

Regular Session  
Wednesday, March 28, 1984

Page 106  
jgt

THE CHAIR:

Senator Streeter.

SENATOR STREETER:

Mr. President, I also rise to support this motion. We are not going to go forward with this only because we have inconvenience for the public, only because we need more space. The real reason we're going forward is because we cannot afford not to do it. In other words, if we touch this building, we have to live by our own laws that we have made throughout the years and that is that we have to bring it up to code. Anybody who has had anything to do with renovating schools or town halls knows that as soon as you start to improve, you must meet the fire code, you must meet the health code, you must meet the public assembly codes, and this building cannot be repaired - nothing can be done to this building if we continue to use it the way we are presently doing it. No public hearing room can possibly stay the way it is today.

Now the choice that was before the committee is to change the laws for ourselves while we expect the rest of the state to live by the laws that we make up here, and for me, this is the most telling argument and that is if we say to the rest of the state that you must make your buildings accessible to the handicapped, you must make your buildings safe, you must provide for the public presence in your building by protecting them in all manners of ways, then we who are the leaders of the state must also follow through on that promise.

THE CHAIR:

Do I understand there's unanimity on this or do you want to be heard further?

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Yes, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Robertson.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Mr. President, for one who normally rises to fight any additional expenditures, I thought it would be appropriate for me to rise. I, along with Senator Skelley and Senator Matthews and Senator Mustone have been on this sub-committee of Legislative Management. We have interviewed the contract managers. We will also be interviewing architects, and one might suggest that if we were to authorize the expenditure whether it be appropriated money or bonded money of \$51,000,000.00, there are higher priorities, and certainly we can agree or disagree with that statement. In my eight, approaching eight years in the General Assembly, I have seen the level of professionalism of Representatives and Senators grow beyond my belief. I have seen the conscientiousness of Senators and Representatives grow also with an equal amount of greatness. I think the quarters that we serve in, if our constituencies were aware of the kind of tight quarters that Senator Streeter, Senator Matthews, and Senator Rogers and each and every one of you have to work in, something which has not been emphasized which I believe needs to be emphasized. 1. We have to have the public hearing rooms, otherwise we can no longer legally have public hearings, and secondly, how many of you have been in public hearings that have gone beyond four o'clock and you lose half of your public before they've had an opportunity to testify because they have to get out onto the street and remove their cars before they're towed. Understand, eight to nine million dollars of this fifty-one

million dollars will be for a one thousand car garage, so therefore constituents when they come up here, they'll at least be able to park and not have to run before their cars are towed. I think each and every one of you have to evaluate as to whether the future of Connecticut is worth fifty-one million dollars. I, for one, will accept the criticism of my constituents because I firmly believe the future of our state government is important enough to vote for it. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

I don't see any objection. Do you want to move this to the consent calendar, Senator? Oh, there is?

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Mr. President, I would ask that there be a roll call vote please, Sir.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. All right. A roll call has been requested. Clerk, please make an announcement for an immediate roll call.

THE CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been called for in the Senate. Will all Senators please take their seats. An immediate roll call has been called for in the Senate. Will all Senators please be seated.

THE CHAIR:

The question before the chamber is a motion to adopt Substitute for Senate Bill No. 32, calendar No. 156, File No. 160. Machine is open. Please record your vote. Has everyone voted? Machine is closed. Clerk, please tally the vote. Result of the vote, 28 yea, 7 nay. The bill is adopted.

JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS

FINANCE,  
REVENUE AND  
BONDING  
PART 1  
1-371

1984  
INDEX

1  
kok

FINANCE

1  
State Capitol  
Room 409A  
February 14, 1984  
2:00 P.M.

PRESIDING CHAIRMEN:

Senator Skelley  
Representative Smoko

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SENATORS:

Skelley, Streeter, DiBella,  
Johnston, Smith, Martin

REPRESENTATIVES:

Smoko, Wenc, Shays, Adamo,  
Abercrombie, Biafore, Casey,  
Butterly, Dickinson, Emmons,  
Flinn, Gelsi, Goodwin, Karsky,  
Karbowski, Kezer, Looney,  
Rybak, Ryan, Savage, Torpey

s. 1  
REP. SMOKO: -- proposed Raised Bill 32, An Act Authorizing  
State Bonds for Legislative Office Building. We have  
speakers list. The first individual has requested  
committee time to testify is Father Devine. Father  
Devine, if you would.

FATHER JOSEPH DEVINE: Thank you very much, Ron. The points  
we'd like to make this afternoon in this presentation  
is that the whole question of the needs of the State  
Capitol grew out of the Connecticut State Capitol  
Development Plan which was a plan that was drawn up by  
our architect, which was commissioned by the Department  
of Administrative Services, and also the Legislative  
Management Commission. Because in the plans for the  
renovation and restoration of our State Capitol we found  
that in order to meet the requirements of the fire code,  
in order to try to have some kind of a reasonable space  
utilization for the various members of the legislature,  
we found it necessary to have this space utilization  
and master plan drawn up.

The idea being, of course, as is done in so many instances  
in state government, where you go in and build an office  
and then you come in six weeks later and the partitions  
are torn down and somebody else decides you're going  
to build a different office, and so it goes on and on and on.

FATHER DEVINE: (continued)

And I might say this not only happens in state government, it also happens in rectories where one pastor comes in and he'll put in bookcases, the next pastor comes in and he tears them out. One guy comes in, he puts in valances, decorates it, the next guy comes in three years later and tears them out. So that it's a continuing plan no matter where you have a change of the guards, so to speak.

And so that we wanted to have some kind of a master plan that would be a development where all could look at where they were going to go and just how the plan was going to work out. In the drawing of the master plan we found that with the renovation and restoration of the State Capitol we found that we were going to lose a lot of assignable square footage, we were going to lose a lot of space, and therefore, the architect came up with three options of providing more space for the office of the legislative committees and the various legislators.

One plan was to find some kind of other space outside the building because it became very obvious that there was not enough space within the building in order to carry to satisfy the needs of the Connecticut State Legislature.

So the options were to find space in the neighborhood. For example, the State Office Building or somewhere else in the neighborhood. The other possibility was to build some kind of new structures. The option was either to build a new structure over the Armory parking lot or to build a new structure underground on the front lawn of the State Capitol. That has been bantered back and forth and even we found, for example, in trying to find temporary space, temporary office space in the neighborhood, the legislators, it was absolutely impossible to find anything that was anywhere near what could be practically used for this Connecticut State Capitol and the State Legislature.

Therefore, the decision has been suggested that there be a new structure built. Now, you know, the question is, why do you need a new structure. Well, one of the problems is that in our State Capitol now we presently have 182,000 gross square feet, which means that we have

FATHER DEVINE: (continued)

in assignable square feet, 66,937 assignable square feet. In other words, that is office space or space that we can assign for the use of the state legislators.

Now, that comes out to the fact that we have 64 square feet per person for each person assigned in our State Capitol, and any kind of state facility and any kind of private facility the plan is always for between 160 to 200 square feet per person, so the problem now is that here we have 64 square feet, and now we're going to lose probably, oh probably 3,500 square feet because of the construction, and so that if we've only got 64 square feet per person presently, and those who are our representatives and those who are senators know how limited their space is for themselves and for their staffs at the present time, and then you take space away, you say, where can you go? There is nowhere really to go.

Now, for example, you say, why is that loss of space so imperative. I just have this drawing here which will give you an idea, very quickly. This is the third floor plan and here on either side of the Senate, if you look here in these boxes, you'll find the fire stairs. Now those fire stairs are going to run from the basement all the way up the fourth floor, because the fire code requires that you must have an enclosed stairwell that runs down to the outside from all parts of the building and so that in order for people to have egress, for people to get out safely.

When we presented this at first and tried to talk about it, I was somewhat amazed, dismayed, taken back, whatever description you might have, when someone said we'd been in the building 100 years, and we've never had a problem. You can't believe the problem you have here if there's a fire. You can't believe what it was like that night in oh, 1978 I believe, or was it in 1980 when we had the fire, 1980, shortly after Christmas 1980 and I got a call the State Capitol was on fire. I couldn't believe it. I'm down the south end of Hartford. I come up immediately and I came into the building, you couldn't see from security across to the stairwell going downstairs. That smoke was pouring up through those vents, pouring out through the vents. The firemen couldn't even find the fire.

FATHER DEVINE: (continued)

And finally they figured it must be downstairs. In the vents and the Secretary of State's Office and also on the other side where the Democratic rank and file offices are. They have the registers there and the smoke, the black smoke was pouring out through them. The soot was running up the side of the building. If you felt the side, the wall above it, you could feel the heat, and that was from only one small area downstairs, the area was as small as this area right here where the fire actually was, but because of that soot and that smoke it was unbelievable how it went through the building.

Later on in the evening when they thought they had the fire under control, we went up, I went up with the fire chief and some of the firemen, and the security people up into the Senate, there was so much smoke on the third floor in the Senate that they actually sent men looking around to see if there was not another fire because this building is almost like a smoke stack. If you get a fire anywhere, because of those large atriums on either end, because of the, or the wide area going up into the dome, it's just like a flu. That's going to draw that right up, and just thank God that it was 8:00 o'clock on a Saturday night. No one was working here except the security people. If that had ever happened at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon with people throughout the building, you would have had nothing but panic on every side, because the smoke was everywhere, and no one actually knew where the fire was.

Suppose there were people in the building and people tried to get out of the building and all they saw was smoke, you can imagine what could have happened, and that's the problem for the fire stairs.

Now, after that fire, there was a request made of the fire marshall to make an inspection of the State Capitol Building and he came up with an inspection that listed 35 areas that were general violations of the State Fire Safety Code, and so that when you find there were those general violations and the new fire code went into effect on September 1, 1981, and they are more stringent on their requirements, that it becomes all the more necessary for us to provide for the safety of the people that work in

FATHER DEVINE: (continued)  
the building, and that's the reason for the fire stairs.

This is not a question of trying to do something cosmetic. We're not giving up space because we're trying to give a broom back to the Governor to sweep his office. We're not trying to go back to what the building was when they built it 106 years ago. What we're trying to do is to provide for the safety of the people who are working in the building today, and that's the reason for the need for the fire stairs, and of course since that is a requirement and we're going to lose that much assignable square feet then it becomes necessary that some provision be made outside the building and in trying to find even some kind of a way to come up with a reason temporary space, we realize that the only possibility would be build another building somewhere in the neighborhood and it was felt that building over the Armory parking lot would be the best way to do it, would be contiguous to the building we presently have and at the same time would provide the kind of square footage that is necessary for the proper movement of the state legislature.

SEN. SKELLEY: Father, can I -- just to point out a few things, because I'm familiar with this as Paul is. Once you make a code change in the building, we have to go through the rest of the codes, and maybe you should tell them that this particular room, under the code, is not suitable as a hearing room, and neither is education --

FATHER DEVINE: We don't have any hearing rooms in the building today that will meet the fire safety codes because whenever you have a place of public assembly, according to the newest code, that if there's a place of public assembly, and that is a place where there are 75 people or more gathered together in a public way, then you have to have two exits and they must empty into an enclosed stairwell that will take you to the outside of the building.

We had thought that perhaps because we could set up some kind of detection along the corridors that maybe we could get away with using these hearing rooms, but all the hearing rooms in the Capitol that we have now are not useable according to the new code, because wherever you have 75 people or more in a room, then you have to have a provision for two egresses and this room would not be

FATHER DEVINE: (continued)

acceptable because one of the exits is through an office and that is not permitted and the exits must empty into an enclosed stairwell that goes to the outside, so there are no hearing rooms in this building that could be used as hearing rooms and meet the requirements of the new fire code.

That is one of the other reasons for the new building because all the hearing rooms in the new building will be according to the present code as it's required.

REP. SMOKO: Does that complete your testimony, Father?

FATHER DEVINE: If you have any questions --

REP. SMOKO: Are there any questions from members of the committee? Rep. Savage.

REP. SAVAGE: What was your connection between this building and your building in the Armory parking lot?

FATHER DEVINE: Well, actually you see -- what was printed up in our space utilization and master plan was simply some kind of a suggestion or an option in schidzo form. Presently there has not been any determination of how the building would be or exactly what would be done, but there is a plan that there would be a connection underground between this building and the other building. Now exactly how that underground is going to go, I don't know, and the reason we talk about underground, because we don't want to interfere with the architectural integrity of the present State Capitol. In other words, we don't want a ramp going across coming into, say, the third floor to take away from the building as it is.

REP. SMOKO: Father, just one clarification, you mentioned there was 64,000 square feet of current useable office space --

FATHER DEVINE: 66,937, and we probably will lose something in the neighborhood of 3,500 square feet.

REP. SMOKO: Roughly 5% of the useable space.

FATHER DEVINE: Right.

REP. SMOKO: Any questions? Rep. Rybak.

REP. RYBAK: You said that none of the hearing rooms in here comply with . . . . What happens if we go to legislative office building, put the hearings over there. What are the so-called hearing and committee rooms in this building going to be used for?

FATHER DEVINE: This could be used for office space. For office space it's all right, because it's not as stringent. For example, the fifth floor, our fifth floor, could not be used for a hearing room. We have a couple of -- we have one hearing room -- now we have one place of public assembly where we have the cafeteria. That could not be used for a place of public assembly, for example a cafeteria or a hearing room, unless you built the fire stairs, and because of the extensive cost of trying to go through the roof because the building is 106 years old, we're not exactly sure what those timbers are like in the roof. We're afraid to even consider going through the roof with the fire stairs, so what we're planning is going up to the fourth floor, and that would mean that the fifth floor could be used as loft office space, because the requirements for a loft office space are not as stringent for a place of public assembly.

REP. RYBAK: What kind of offices are you envisioning, your legislator offices or staff offices?

FATHER DEVINE: It could be legislative, or it could be staff, or it could be whatever, just could not have public hearings in these rooms.

REP. RYBAK: If we empty all these hearing rooms and use them over there, assuming that building is built, is there enough room in this building, then to accommodate all the legislator offices in the revised hearing room areas?

FATHER DEVINE: I would be reluctant to say yes or no because the legislators are presently so crowded and I'm not sure exactly, you know, how much space you would have for leadership or for committee chairmen and so forth. Probably if you're building a new building you would have provision for committee rooms, for committee staff and I would think that committee chairmen would have their offices too, but that's not a determination that we have addressed, at least I haven't addressed it.

REP. SMOKO: Just before we continue there are some additional chairs here in front if anybody is standing that would like to be seated, just pull one, and take care of it that way.

I think Rep. Emmons had a question, and then Senator Streeter.

REP. EMMONS: (inaudible - speaker away from mike)

FATHER DEVINE: Assignable space. You might say, you know, if you're talking about 182,000 square feet in the building and you're only talking about 66,937, you know assignable square feet, what happens to the rest of it, and that's a valid question, but of course, the problem is these big atriums at either end of the building and you know, there's a lot of public spaces here that you really don't realize until you start looking at it.

REP. EMMONS: Well, I'm trying to put it in context when you said there were 64 square feet per person, and I'm trying to decide if it's all people who work in the Capitol or just legislators.

FATHER DEVINE: No, that was all the people that work in the Capitol, those who are presently involved in the Capitol structure. I mean, that includes not only legislative but also the executive as well.

REP. SMOKO: Sen. Streeter.

REP. EMMONS: I have one more question.

REP. SMOKO: Rep. Emmons, one more question.

REP. EMMONS: Thank you. It would seem to me in the total whether it's \$30 million or however much it's going to be, there would be a difference to whether, say the legislators stay within the Capitol and used the viaduct, present committee rooms, etc., the legislative space, or you build space for them in a new Capitol. I would think that the cost would be quite different depending on which way we go.

FATHER DEVINE: Okay, one of the problems is that whenever you're trying to build a building, I think it's very

FATHER DEVINE: (continued)

important that we not be shortsighted in our approach to it. One of the things, there has been a study made by those who had built in recent years, their corporate headquarters, and they had found that in 98% of the cases that when they built their corporate headquarters they did not plan far enough ahead so that the space that they built was not adequate within a five year period because of the expansion of their work force, and so I think it's important here when you're speaking about the whole legislative process, that we not only plan for today, but since we're building a building that has to have a thread of continuity between the buildings around it.

SEN. S. We're talking about a building that has to fit into a kind of unique architectural setting with the State Capitol, with the State Office Building, with the State Supreme Court and the Armory, that I think you have to build a building that you can plan for the next 50 or 60 years, so I think provisions have to be built into that building, so that you won't have to worry in 10 or 15 years, we have to think about this again, why didn't they think about it in 1984. I mean, that's really all I can say to you, I think.

REP. SEN. STREETER: You had mentioned the construction of fire stairs on either side of the Senate, running all the way down. Does that mean that the House would be out of conformance because you have more than 75 people in the House.

FATHER DEVINE: Okay, one of the things is that we had many meetings, Mr. Semino and I had many meetings with the Fire Marshall, the State Fire Marshall, and you know, we tried to point out at the time that this is a unique kind of building and it might just be possible that we can't fulfill all the requirements of the State Fire code, for example, with the Senate and the House, and so that they would be glad to give us variances because of the unique character of those particular areas, and as long as we have the fire stairs on the north side of the building, two enclosed fire stairs, running from the fourth floor to the basement, that emptied to the outside that they would be willing to give us the variance so that we can continue to use the Hall of the House and

FATHER DEVINE: (continued)

the Senate and also that for example from the Hall of the House in the gallery that they could come out of the gallery and come across the corridor into the enclosed stairwell.

There is no other way you can really make that useable if he was very strict and stringent about how it should be done, but he has given us that variance that if we do build those enclosed fire stairs, which we assured him we would, as part of our plan, then he would give us a variance so that we could continue to use the Hall of the House and the Senate Chambers.

SEN. SKELLEY: It should also be noted that we talk about bringing people back into a building or utilizing space, we're talking about bringing back Fiscal Analysis, we're talking about bringing back research, we're talking about bringing back some of our support people that are currently outside the building which tends to be inconvenient and you know, bringing those individuals back, plus there has been discussion about bringing OPM into the building, so most of the services that we currently require would be in one central location.

REP. SMOKO: Rep. Looney.

REP. LOONEY: With the new office building being built in the Armory parking lot what provision would be made for if parking is lost and additional parking needs.

FATHER DEVINE: Okay, the building is envisioned now as a building of 200,000 square feet for the legislative office building and a parking garage of 1,000 cars. Presently there are 650 parking spaces, I believe that are in the Armory and also around the State Capitol and then there would be the provision of probably 150 spaces for our future needs, so there would be 1,000 parking garage there. That's part of the particular plan that we're talking about.

REP. SMOKO: Additional questions? Rep. Butterly.

REP. BUTTERLY: I missed the beginning. How many levels of parking would you have?

11  
kpt

FINANCE

February 14, 1984

11

FATHER DEVINE: I didn't mention levels. I said 1,000 car parking garage. One of the things that we think is very important and that is being addressed, and hopefully will be continued to be addressed is that the building that is built there will be built in such a way that it will not interfere with the State Capitol.

In other words, we don't want a glass menagerie there that's going to take away from the State Capitol that we have. The building there as we look at it now in the terms of two or three stories at the most, and of course, your level there is much lower than the Capitol, so that you've got probably two stories before you come up to the level of where the Capitol grounds begin, so that's part of the plan. That it should remain below the State Capitol so it's not going to interfere with it.

REP. SMOKO: Rep. Flynn.

REP. FLYNN: Father, what percentage of the 200,000 square feet would be utilized for immediate need as opposed to future need?

FATHER DEVINE: Well, if you're looking at a 10 year projection, it is felt that with a 10 year projection, for the needs of the State Capitol, you would need something in the neighborhood of about 180,000 square feet. The fiscal planning committee felt that since we are projecting a 10 year requirement of almost 180,000 square feet, it would behoove the committee to look more closely at it, to look at a longer stretch of time and build in terms of the 200,000 square feet. I don't think that they have, the committee has sat down and met to my knowledge and figured out, well, let's see, Judiciary needs x number of square feet and so on. What we've done and what has been done is that they've looked at what's available, what we look to in 10 years and then in the 10 years they look further and said, beyond that 10 years, if we're talking about needing about 180,000 square feet now, then perhaps we should add another 10% in order to take care of say, the next 25 on top of those 35 to carry us hopefully into a 50 year span.

REP. FLYNN: I'd like to follow on, Father, what number of bodies do you anticipate as an increase for 10 years?

FATHER DEVINE: I really couldn't give you the number of bodies, but I think if you look back at the history of the State

FATHER DEVINE: (continued)

Legislature in the past say, 15 years, for example when the State Legislature only met every other year and 14 years ago, when they started to meet, every with a short session, from February to May, we found that there was a dramatic increase in the number of staff people involved.

REP. FLYNN: Could you be a little more specific, the state troopers?

FATHER DEVINE: I don't know the exact number. Peter Walden might be able to tell you that. 150.

SEN. SKELLEY: It also should be noted that we also discussed on the subcommittee the fact that that space would be totally utilized. The present time, the State of Connecticut leases property. It leases property, I really don't know at what cost, but it is definitely a cost to the State of Connecticut because of our needs. Many of our agencies are in fact called satellite agencies that don't necessarily reflect. Every piece of that property would be utilized, either by the legislative office staff, or by bringing in other agencies.

It also should be noted that we're separate than other agencies. In other words, we don't deal specifically under the guidelines of the public courts and legislature cut themselves free approximately three or four years ago. So any additional space that is not utilized by the legislative branch would be utilized by other state agencies or other chief state elected officials, whether it be the comptroller's office, the secretary of state's office, the attorney general's office, so there would be full utilization and perhaps, in my opinion, some cost savings involved. I didn't mean to interrupt your testimony.

FATHER DEVINE: No, no, I'm glad. Helpful of any suggestions.

REP. SMOKO: Rep. Rybak.

REP. RYBAK: Father, you were projecting, well, it's been projected oh, say, two and a half years to complete this new structure on the armory grounds if we begin work today, that's correct, isn't it?

FATHER DEVINE: That would be a very optimistic approach, I believe.

REP. RYBAK: Would it take longer?

FATHER DEVINE: Yes, I think so. As a matter of fact, you have Mr. Morgante here who has been signed on as the construction manager and he could address that question in terms of cost and in terms of time much more fully, but certainly it would something in the neighborhood of I think you have to say, three years, forty-four months.

REP. RYBAK: When we discussed the code compliance changes needed this spring with the Bonding subcommittee and the, I guess about \$8.5 million we put up for electrical, heating, mechanical, fire escapes. It was an immediate problem, a pressing problem. Now, is this work, the co-compliance work in this Capitol that you're talking about going to be under state, and within that two year, or three year or four year period it takes to building the building, if so why does everyone call it a (inaudible)

FATHER DEVINE: The facilities planning committee has been meeting and trying to address this problem and that's why they've been looking for temporary space, because the problems within this building in terms of mechanical and electrical, are, indeed, pressing. As a matter of fact, if you were to take a tour with me through the basement or some of the building and look at some of the electrical panels and have them take that panel off and see the rats nest of wires, you know, frayed, and worn and taped up, you'd hardly want to come in the building, it's really that bad. And I'm really not trying to be dramatic. It's that bad.

REP. RYBAK: I think we all agree on that one problem, the money, but the question is, what happens as a temporary solution? Are we going to construct it since they are temporary quarters, are we going to lease quarters?

FATHER DEVINE: The facilities planning committee had voted at the last meeting that the renovation and restoration of the present State Capitol should continue concurrently with the construction of the new building. The Morgante Construction Company was with us. They told us at that meeting that would be the most economical way to do it, would be to start work immediately on the State Capitol and also to start your plans for the construction of the new building, and in order to house people temporarily, they were recommending some temporary office space on the front lawn of the Capitol. The facility

FATHER DEVINE: (continued)

Cass. 2

planning committee had looked closely with the help of administrative services, into the possibility of some kind of (gap in tape) and believe me, there was none. There was not only none that was acceptable, there was not only any available. So we're not talking about, oh, we don't want to go in that place, oh that place is terrible, that place is too far away, there was just nothing available, and so that they have looked at some temporary office space, they have had a slide projection of what the buildings would look like. There have been some drawings made, and as a matter of fact, some of the committee chairmen have looked at what those office buildings would look like, and what the office space would be like and they found that the space in the new temporary buildings would be more adequate, would better serve them, would better serve their committees and the public than the space we presently have in the State Capitol.

REP. RYBAK: Now I assume that's not included in the 30 or \$45 million in bonding.

FATHER DEVINE: No, it's not.

REP. RYBAK: Do we have any idea of what this temporary space is going to cost on the front lawn?

FATHER DEVINE: Well, they're in the process of negotiations now. We did put it out to bid and the bid came in, the bids were higher than we had hoped, and so then, they are in the process of negotiations and hopefully by the time Legislative Management meets on Thursday, that we should have some firm idea of that the negotiations will bring us into a frame of reference that would be acceptable to the planning commission as well as the legislature.

REP. RYBAK: Could I ask you what did the bids come in at?

FATHER DEVINE: I don't remember specifically. We had hoped that the bids would come in somewhere in the neighborhood of a million and a half dollars over a three year period, and again, I'm not talking from the full figures, I'm just talking off the top of my head. Actually, they came in at a much higher level and so that we did sit down, the architect, myself, Peter Walder and David Ogle sat down with the company that would come in. We sat down, we made

FATHER DEVINE: (continued)

some adjustments. We dropped a few things, we added a few things, and I think now we could come in something in the neighborhood of \$1.5 million over a three year period. Now if you'd stop and figure that out, that would be less than what it would cost us to rent comparable space in the area if it was available. But certainly in the area, for example, of 60 Washington Street, I think it's \$22 a square foot at the present time, plus the moving costs and so forth, so it would be costly, and it would be to our advantage to have everybody on the premises on the property.

REP. RYBAK: Thank you.

REP. SMOKO: Thank you, Father. Additional questions? Rep. Torpey.

REP. TORPEY: Father, at some time in the past, it was talked about an underground building out in front of the Capitol. Was that a pipedream or (inaudible)

FATHER DEVINE: Yes, we did look at it. It was not a pipedream. As a matter of fact, when I first heard it, I thought it was a pipedream, but you know, I went down to New Haven to look at the Sterling Memorial Library at New Haven and saw where they had built two stories underground there and many of the misgivings that I had were put aside by seeing what they could do underground, and in terms of the cost savings, in terms of energy, in terms of maintenance, in terms of many of the costs that come with an ordinary building, there would be savings by putting it underground. One of the biggest problems seemed to be to be the psychological problem with people saying, you want me to work in a cellar? People just naturally kind of react to that kind of thing, but that's not really so, because there are places in Hartford, there's at least one place in Hartford, I think it's Travelers that has an underground building and people work there and they do amazing things with colors and with light areas and so forth, so the people who work there a while don't even think about that.

So they investigated that, I wouldn't say how thoroughly, but it was dismissed as being not cost effective and not being what the legislators would want.

SEN. SKELLEY: I guess we'll all be underground soon enough, we don't want to live there.

REP. SMOKO: Additional questions? The questions are getting a bit subliminal, could we keep on the case at point.  
Rep. Ryan.

REP. RYAN: Yes, two questions, Father. Won't they be in the category Ron was talking about. I have six square feet now, I'm just wondering who has 158 square feet.  
(laughter)

FATHER DEVINE: Somebody else is using them.

REP. SMOKO: Very good question, Rep. Ryan.

FATHER DEVINE: That's one of the points that we have made continually, you know, that when those, up to five years ago, or six years ago, that when the Senators and the Representatives came to Hartford and the Senators had a locker room outside the men's room on the third floor where they could hang their coat in the locker and put their lunch there, or put their books or whatever, Representatives had nothing, so that when six or seven years ago when they made over those areas for the rank and file members, that was a great step forward, at least the man had a desk, at least he had a telephone, he had two chairs and a place to hang his hat. And at that time we remarked, this is going to be fine for the legislators who were here last year had nothing.

But wait until the guys elected in four years, and he comes in and says, I won my district and I got this. That's precisely what's happened, because they're just not right.

REP. RYAN: My second question I hope will be more realistic (inaudible) What is the (inaudible) doing, number one, and number two, going to be another Millstone, what kind of control are we going to have over the bottom line. In other words, what's the bottom line first.

REP. SMOKO: We have the construction people here, I think that question would be better directed to them. Father, did you finish?

FATHER DEVINE: Yes, absolutely.

REP. SMOKO: Additional questions? Sen. DiBella.

SEN. DI BELLA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Father, I assume, or

SEN. DI BELLA: (continued)  
am I assuming too much. Have we met with City of Hartford planning people and the State Traffic Commission in terms of thousand car parking garage, (inaudible) something the traffic dumped and which direction it's going to go?

FATHER DEVINE: You see, in order to come up with anything like that, there are certain things we have to do in terms of the environmental impact study with the DOT in terms of transportation, in terms of the Hog River Conduit which runs under the center.

SEN. DI BELLA: Is that the Army Corps of Engineers here?

FATHER DEVINE: Yes. The Army Corps of Engineers, and part of that property was also deeded to the City of Hartford. There was 100 foot right of way deeded to the City of Hartford in 1941 originally, and then it was changed in 1957 and so that the City of Hartford has a right of way for the conduit running through the center of that Armory parking lot. At the last meeting of the facilities planning committee which took place on last Friday, it was voted unanimously by all of those present that Morgante and Company should begin to investigate the environmental impact, the transportation, the City of Hartford, the Army Corps of Engineers, and so forth. That they should begin immediately to look into these problems because we realize there are problems in that area.

SEN. DI BELLA: question to Mr. Morganti.

FATHER DEVINE: Pardon?

SEN. DI BELLA: Are you saying that we can ask the question of Mr. Morganti?

FATHER DEVINE: Well no, it was only voted last Friday, so that he really hasn't had a chance to do anything since today is only Tuesday, but he has been, it was suggested by the facilities planning committee that has been in charge for the planning for this building and the new building, that we should immediately look into that whole aspect because it is a difficult question.

SEN. DI BELLA: Excuse me. What happens if we get five or six months down the road and we find that we've got an environmental impact problem?

FATHER DEVINE: Of course you're not going to wait, you're not going to do anything unless you have a clearance on the environmental impact, you know.

REP. SMOKO: Rep. Shays.

REP. SHAYS: I just want to (inaudible) when you're talking about \$30 million and I want to ask you a few questions. When we were renovating this Capitol, this was overseen by a committee that you headed, I understand. Is that correct?

FATHER DEVINE: Yes.

REP. SHAYS: When we put up the scaffolding around the building it was left for a longer period of time than we had originally felt it would be. In your judgment, did the committee err in its ability to estimate the cost here and was there, what kind of penalty was there? And I ask that in reference to other points.

FATHER DEVINE: Did you have something else on the same line? Well, I must say the committee was in charge of approving all the plans and specifications for the building. However, the committee was under the Department of Administrative Services for administrative purposes. The Department of Administrative Services had full control of everything that had happened with the building, just as at the present time our commission was under legislative management. So legislative management will have full control over the progress of the whole project.

REP. SHAYS: So the apparatus that oversaw the restoration was not necessarily the group that would be seeing this.

FATHER DEVINE: It is not the group at all, as a matter of fact, it was my recommendation two years ago that the commission for the renovation and the restoration of the State Capitol be taken away from Administrative Services and placed under the Legislative Management Committee in order that we would be sure that the problems that we encountered on the exterior of the building would not develop into a disaster in the interior of the building. Because, if we came into the interior and started renovation and we had someone in charge of it as insensitive to the needs of the state legislature as Administrative Services was in the exterior,

FATHER DEVINE: (continued)

we would have had a total disaster and a total conflict in terms of the use of the building.

REP. SHAYS: My last question. I (inaudible) not capable of overseeing or (inaudible-not speaking into mike) Are these people on these committees that are capable to oversee (inaudible)

FATHER DEVINE: Okay. I must point out that according to the statute that was passed in 1973, the commission for the renovation and the restoration of our State Capitol was charged with the renovation and restoration of this Capitol building. We have nothing to do with the new building unless there's some new statutory responsibility that's placed upon us. The new building is in totally and completely in the hands of the Legislative Management Committee. So I'm sure that in that case, they would purchase whatever expertise they needed and that's why for example, with a construction manager, with a man with the expertise of the Morganti Company, Incorporated, with their extensive experience in building, with their reputation that is without stain, with men who have accomplished a great deal both here and in Florida, built many corporate headquarters down in Fairfield County. I'm sure that you're in good hands with Morganti and I'm sure they will take care of it.

That was a very long process. I think there were 29 large companies that answered the add from Administrative Services that wanted to be the construction managers for this project. Administrative Services submitted six companies to the facilities planning committee. The facilities planning committee met for two full days with each of these six corporate entities. They all presented their credentials, presented what they had in mind. They were questioned extensively and finally after a unanimous vote, Morganti was chosen as the one to be the construction manager. So they've gone through.

REP. SHAYS: We have already picked a construction manager for this new (inaudible)

FATHER DEVINE: Well, what has happened is, we've picked a construction manager for this project and the new building. However, there is not a contract signed with them. They are

FATHER DEVINE: (continued)

also going to oversee the interior restoration and renovation of the present building of the State Capitol and that's what they're in the process of doing now. If the legislature appropriates the money for the new building, they will be the construction manager for the new building. They have not been, let's say, contracted with for the new building because the money's not available.

REP. SMOKO: It's the Management Committee recommendation, I think at this point. And they are going to testify and will be testifying shortly. Additional questions for Father Devine? If not, Father, thank you for your testimony today, and your diligence in the past.

FATHER DEVINE: Thank you very much.

SEN. SKELLEY: You said a construction manager. We have Rep. Ritter from Hartford who would like to testify. Tom, if you would.

REP. RITTER: Thank you. I may need this (inaudible) I'd just like to say that, well, personally, I really am hopeful that the office building will come off and, obviously we need the space. I would just encourage the committee to also think about the neighborhood that will be affected very much by any such construction. I happen to represent the area directly around the Capitol along with Sen. DiBella, so I'm here to speak in their interest to insure that as this develops, the committee will keep in mind some of the problems that will be faced by the neighborhood and we'd like at the appropriate time to be part of any discussion that will affect them.

I think sometimes we think of ourselves as a state. We need the office space at the same time. There are many people who own property in the area who lived there for many years who will be dramatically affected by whatever decisions are made in this room.

I have here also, just a letter written by Ron Cotera, who's president of a block club which I would encourage people to look at at your convenience. But basically, the things that I would like to discuss and have input into are like what Sen. DiBella raised about traffic, which way is it going to flow out toward Hungerford Street, or is

REP. RITTER: (continued)

is going to flow out to Broad Street, things of that nature. Obviously something like that has a tremendous impact and it's in an area that is already, I think overcrowded by people who come to work here, and I would like to encourage you, however your designs are, to have the maximum respect for the people who will be living there.

Also, in working in conjunction with the city, I'm sure we could work things out, making certain streets one way or whatever, but that's very important.

The second important criteria, jobs for the neighborhood. People came to me. They were very frustrated with the new courthouse being built just a couple blocks away, that people in the neighborhood can not get any construction jobs there. I talked to the Labor Department and I said, isn't there any criteria, anything on the statutes that tried to satisfy jobs for the neighborhood, and they said, yes, there is. And then it defines the neighborhood in this area starts in Enfield and it ends in New Britain. So as long as people were hired from that area, they were considered to be part of the neighborhood, and it certainly is very frustrating to see state property being built in one's neighborhood, especially a high unemployment neighborhood. I talked particular to Sen. Skelley on this issue. He promised me that would be addressed, but I would hope, I wanted to bring it to the attention of the committee because I think it's very, very important that we consider the neighborhood for many of the jobs that will be created by this construction.

Third, we have not seen, obviously any design plans and I certainly would not, I would encourage now with my colleagues rather than anything else, that I would not vote \$32 million without seeing what we're getting. I would hope again that you would make sure that you see exactly how everything is designed. Make sure it's appropriate. As you know, there have been several other decisions made, this one by a City Council affecting the neighborhood, but this is certainly something that's my own point. In other words, we haven't seen anything and we would like to be able to comment on the design plan before we appropriate the money, and that's certainly something which I think would be very important.

REP. RITTER: (continued)

Finally, I would just encourage you to, to look at other state capitols and see what they've done. There's a piece of legislation now in Planning and Development that calls for a certain partnership between the public sector, private sector, they've done that in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania where they have retail and everything else in the, with their capitol center and it helps the property tax base in the, certainly in the City of Hartford and it might make it something that would be used year round rather than six months out of the year. It really might improve the whole neighborhood as well as the state facility.

So I would encourage you to look at it for other purposes than just a state capitol. It's something that again, in working with the city and other entities, you might be well served. So I guess that's why now I'm sure that Ron is here, I want to get those concerns on the record and I would really hope as my colleagues that you would allow people from the neighborhood or that your representative, be part of that decision making process. I would encourage you not to make any decisions affecting their homes and neighborhoods without the proper consultation. I thank you.

SEN. SKELLEY: Rep. Ritter is right. You and I talked about this before. I think that we talked about the fact that this would be the first concept for the state in legislative management has discussed this when we developed the construction manager concept, that we were talking about utilizing the Hartford plan. The state is not obligated to use the Hartford plan. A private entrepreneur looking for certain tax credits in the city is obligated to use that and I think that's a responsibility I think, legislative management feels that's a responsible way in which to go.

As far as looking at plans, there are no plans currently appropriated. If we were to let, and this is no criticism of public works, but if we were to let public works build this building, this concept was started something like 15 years ago and we had finally, after restoration of the Capitol, but by all means you and the Hartford delegation at least from my viewpoint, and I'm fairly certain that I can speak for the rest of the committee and Legislative Management, that you will be kept abreast of everything that

- SEN. SKELLEY: (continued)  
goes on since it directly affects your constituents.
- REP. RITTER: Okay, I would just hate to see, say, trust me, we vote \$30 million and suddenly --
- SEN. SKELLEY: It's not \$30 million by the way, but we'll get into that in a little while.
- REP. RITTER: Particularly in the whole traffic question --
- SEN. SKELLEY: Yeah, and I think when the Morganti people testify in front us, the fact that you want to join us in the questions, I offer the invitation to you, but we're going to have to go to the necessary permits and everything else, so it's not a matter of (inaudible) whatever political assistance or expertise that we've gathered along the way hopefully will come into the process too.
- REP. RITTER: Coming from you, I appreciate it very much, Sen. Skelley.
- SEN. SKELLEY: You want to join us Tommy?
- REP. RITTER: Sure. Thank you.
- SEN. SKELLEY: Any other questions? Morganti Construction Incorporated.
- MR. PAUL MORGANTI: I want to introduce myself. I'm Paul Morganti. I'm Chairman of the Board of Ralph Morganti, President, of Morganti Incorporated, and we've chosen Tom Gilmore to make the presentation to you and then we can go on from there.
- MR. THOMAS GILMORE: In preparing for this testimony we did some homework and we have put together a few sheets on the methodology we used and I'm a bit concerned that we don't have quite enough to go around.
- SEN. SKELLEY: So if we could ask the committee members to share some of those sheets.
- MR. GILMORE: It's important to note that our -- the objective of Morganti Incorporated here into this testimony is to

MR. GILMORE: (continued)

try to be realistic and to establish the preliminary budget that will be adequate for the quality and size of building that we believe will be required by the state legislators. That's quite a leap of fate to some extent since there is no design criteria at this time. The only information we really have is a square footage estimate and the general sense that the quality should somehow be an architecture that is sympathetic to the building we're standing in right now, and I think I'm talking about the exterior for the moment, the quality there.

What we are doing in the , we're trying to almost educate you. We're trying to bring you through the process that we have gone through, and that is if you will turn a couple of pages, you'll see a page entitled "Building Construction Cost Comparison". Buildings, like anything else in life have very low cost, high cost low quality, high quality and I think what we want to do is present a wide range of construction costs for a variety of types of buildings.

And as you might note, the most important information on these sheets are on the right hand side, \$81.00 per square foot for a building in Fairfield County, brick exterior. That's relatively low quality. That's a standard, smaller office building that will be thrown up on a corner or part of an industrial park or an office park. The mentality when that is constructed is that it should have an economic life, as long as the mortgage. It really isn't built for a long history.

And you can see that we have a range of costs as we work our way down the page, \$84.00 a foot, \$110.00 a foot, \$160.00, \$137.00, that is a very high quality building for this particular market. \$175.00 per foot is a truly extraordinary building which was not built because of those costs. That was in 1982 on top of it. It was not built. It was designed and it was priced, and it's a fairly small building as you might notice, 30,000 square feet. It was an owner who wanted to build a Taj Mahal and he was alone in that effort. The market didn't want to join him.

The last statement we have on that sheet is RS means, this is a nationally published construction cost estimating guide. It is nothing that we would hang our hats on totally, but we

MR. GILMORE: (continued)

feel that it's one more piece of evidence, and they are suggesting that a median building, an office building on a national basis should have a cost of approximately \$108.00 a square foot.

On the next page, we're looking at some state buildings. The court facility which is currently under way, our understanding of the cost on that facility is \$156.00 per square foot. We also looked at the State of Massachusetts which is constructing a state archives building which is a library and storage type of building. That had a cost of \$138.00 a square foot in 1982 and were we to be talking about that building today, we would have to increase that number somewhat in order to be realistic relative to inflation.

Finally, the Massachusetts Department of Transportation building which is a brick structure. It is not in any way ornate and I know a fair amount about the building. The original plans didn't really call for interior partitioning. It does not have a lot of offices built within. So it's pure shell. So we see cost here at \$125.00, adjusted for inflation in the case of Massachusetts, up to \$156.00 per square foot for the courthouse and criminal facility in Hartford.

One other step we went through and attempt again to be objective to gathering information is that we called four states that have populations similar to that of Connecticut. We asked about their history on legislative office buildings and we got the following reports.

The first case is Minnesota, which fortunately had a building which would work quite well for them on a renovated basis. And their costs were, or are \$63 per square foot to renovate a very high quality building, as I understand it, columns, it's more like your state office building over here.

North Carolina took the prize for low cost. It's a six story granite exterior which sounds quite encouraging. However, the building has had a tremendous amount of problems which incidentally, let's talk about the price first, the price if \$50 per square foot. That was 1982. Inflation might make that equivalent of \$60 to \$70 per square foot today. I spoke with someone in the legislative office there and the building

MR. GILMORE: (continued)

has just been completed. They have tremendous problems with leaks. They have a situation where a legislator is meeting with his constituents, windows leak in particular, which means that anyone who has been fortunate to get an outside office gets the benefits of the leaks, they have leaks on the floor. They're even concerned about the long-term value of this building. What will it be like in 10 or 20 years. Does it have any long-term value to it.

Relative to the interiors, they did most of the built-in construction in white formica which was reminiscent of an ice cream parlor or a medical facility. The punch line of all of this is when asked rather straightforwardly, how do you feel about that project, given the tremendously low cost that you've experienced with, I'm afraid that we may have made a terrible mistake and I'm not sure that's not money that's just gone by the boards. It was based on price entirely and did not have a construction manager on board to try and let everyone know what the costs were and what the problems were, if not the . So, they wouldn't do it again.

SEN. SKELLEY: White formica, the whole thing would be --

MR. GILMORE: Great, isn't it? Finally, moving down to South Carolina, South Carolina we're moving more into the range of reality. Their price is sufficiently high that I have some doubts as to whether it really was that high. They did a five to six story, pre-cast exterior building of 200,000 square feet which sounds quite similar to what we have in mind and the fellow with whom I spoke, and all of this was rather on short notice, I should add, we didn't have time to go down and visit the building or anything, it was all by phone, he suggested that their budget had been in the range of \$35 to \$38 million for this project at 150,000 to 200,000 square feet. So we're going to do some interpolating and used \$175 a square foot, which we feel is probably too high. It was probably closer to \$160.

Cass. 3

Florida has a, Florida has handled it with a very good quality building, I'm told. They did two buildings with approximately 100,000 square feet each. One for the House and one for the Senate. They are side by side. The costs

MR. GILMORE: (continued)

there were approximately \$46 a square foot in 1973. We have adjusted that number for both inflation and the geographic differential. The northeast is more expensive than is Florida. That number comes up to \$138 per square foot as of this date, with this location.

Now, having said all of that, I'd like to unveil, you're looking at this, it's the last sheet of the information we've given you. I don't mean to hide it from the public, but (inaudible) Now an attempt, really two things we've tried to do here. We've given you a range of (inaudible) prices as low as \$80 a square foot, as high as \$175 a square foot. We have no design at this point, and the gentleman who spoke before me, there is really nothing aside from a very general description of the square footage, probably will be required, I'm not even sure of the shape of the building. We don't know about the technical conditions of the site. We're not even sure exactly on the site it's going to sit. It's very premature.

The importance is that it's an attitudinal thing here. I don't know what the history of this kind of situation is. I think it's a general history to understate costs. Yet, (inaudible) and I think what we're trying to do is establish a side, say, we've given you numbers that suggest that buildings are built from \$80 a square foot to \$175 a square foot. We're picking this number, somewhat objectively, somewhat arbitrarily as well.

So we're starting with a number of \$145 a square foot. The of a box conduit that's on the site, we're carrying an allowance for this suggested in Mr. Cimino's study. I don't think any of us really know what those costs are or are likely to be until we have feedback as to the requirements of the corps of engineers in the City of Hartford. (inaudible-not speaking into mike) We just don't know what the requirements are. We would hope that they would be under. We don't know. We don't want to understate case, and we're carrying that number. I guess the total on the office building of \$31.5. Structured parking, there are a variety of ways to design structured parking with a range of costs there once again, probably a lot in the \$5,000 range, to a high, my personal experience is that we had a high of \$25,000 per space in major urban setting can be very expensive. We feel that a

MR. GILMORE: (continued)

reasonable number is \$8,000 per car, or \$8 million. There has been discussion of a passage to connect the office building and the garage back to the Capitol. We don't know how long it is, how wide it is, we do not know of what it's made, we don't know what it's going through, is it going under the road, over the road, all those kinds of questions.

We are carrying an allowance of \$800,000 with the hope that it's accurate. We hope that it's at least appropriate. We have been trying to make sure that whatever's appropriated for this is not insufficient.

All of this brings us to a total of \$40,300,00. You then have the design side of life. The architect, the technical engineer, electric, and rot for that matter. We feel that the state should not be spending more than 15% of cost of the construction for all of those things.

That brings us to \$46,300,000. We are writing a contingency of 10%, \$4,630,000 which unfortunately gets us over the magic \$50 million mark at this very preliminary stage. That really is our presentation relative to cost. We welcome any questions.

SEN. SKELLEY: I think the best thing to do is for the committee to ask the questions on basically how those figures were derived at (inaudible)

REP. EMMONS: When we went through this building a library, the question would come up, did you now knowing who's going to go into the building and who's going to be in this building and exactly what we're building it for, if we decided what we were building it for, then would you build your exteriors to have some future capacity for 10 years, but not finish it all along in the present time. I mean, say (inaudible) but I know you can't (inaudible) but it is harder to add on once a building is completed.

MR. GILMORE: Yes.

REP. EMMONS: Would that make a significant difference on the \$50 million.

MR. GILMORE: Well, of course it would if you're (inaudible) Some of our difficulty, the real tiger in this is right here. We do not know if the committee has had the experience with both the private sector and the public sector that some projects get carried away in terms of extraordinary interior finishing. Look at the (inaudible) it's really tremendous. And we don't see that kind of quality a building, but we will see a tendency of quality to creep in. We think (laughter)

At any rate, if we had a clear outline of exactly what the building was, we would have a different kind of estimate. Absolutely. Preliminary style estimate. Barometric estimating of square footage. We're taking costs from buildings in Minnesota and South Carolina, that sort of thing. We find it, put it all on the table and we try to be realistic. You certainly can spend this kind of money on this kind of a project. Do you have to spend this kind of money? No. But we're not going to say that it's less than this, not given details, and we're trying to protect ourselves.

SEN. SKELLEY: Tom, maybe you ought to explain to the committee basically why it's important to bring a construction manager concept on board early before you've done a lot of preliminary work.

MR. GILMORE: Well, it boils down to two objectives that we have. First, we are trying to establish an upside, if you will, guideline, . That is very far removed from what you actually do once the project is under way. The construction manager is the construction company that understands costs, scheduling, understands the design, understands the impact of design on the construction costs. What we do is join the team. It will be a team between the State of Connecticut, the architect and the construction manager, Morganti Incorporated, and through each step of design, we would be looking at scheduling impact and and to understand design and all you have a preliminary design. Maybe this is the appropriate number, maybe it isn't. We don't even have that level of design yet. We haven't had the first meeting. We then would make comments from a construction standpoint to the designer about that particular structural system, it's going to be more expensive than this alternative or that alternative. The net result is we try to have an impact on the design so that it is efficient

- MR. GILMORE: (continued)  
and it's cost effective wherever possible. And we go through every step of the way.
- REP. BUTTERLY: Are you familiar with the term (inaudible) (more than one talking at once--and not into mike) In the event that that is a big problem, what are you going to do? (inaudible)
- MR. GILMORE: Since last Friday, we've already started the wheels of research going in terms of environmental impact studies. We don't have any feedback to give you at this point, and that's sticker-sharp (inaudible) with our not having detailed information. This is most likely not an item that will have tremendous cost impact. I'd like to think that what you're looking at is (inaudible--talking in background and noises--inaudible) There's water running. You need the corps of engineers, it probably requires access to it. (inaudible) What does that do with construction? It probably causes it in some fashion to scan over it where normally you would not scan. You might have a foundation system there. But depending (inaudible)
- REP. GOODWIN: You haven't made any provision in this to the bill that we passed some years ago which requires 1% of the cost of a state building to be set aside for art. (inaudible)
- MR. GILMORE: We haven't specifically taken that into consideration. Obviously, because it's extremely preliminary. (inaudible)
- REP. GOODWIN: Well, it would have to be designed with that (inaudible)
- MR. GILMORE: That is something that has to be taken into consideration by the design team of the state.
- REP. GOODWIN: That's a cost consideration as well.
- MR. GILMORE: Maybe what you have is cost in there. I'm not going to guess on that at the moment.
- REP. SAVAGE: I would like to relate this square footage cost a little bit, to building that is going on just to get a feel for what is happening in the area. Have you any idea

REP. SAVAGE: (continued)  
of what the square footage costs in structures that have  
been going up recently?

MR. GILMORE: Yeah, I think we do. One of our concerns is  
we're looking for low rise buildings.

REP. SAVAGE: (inaudible)

MR. GILMORE: (inaudible) that's why I mentioned Massachusetts,  
because we're looking for three story type of structures,  
there are certain cost indications.

REP. SAVAGE: (inaudible)

MR. GILMORE: Well, I might claim that the high rise would be  
more expensive.

REP. SAVAGE: A model?

MR. GILMORE: Or a skin of pre-cast concrete. There are a wide  
variety of choices on every one of hundreds of items that  
go into a design. We have nothing specific on it. We have  
tended to say, look at the Capitol and look at the quality  
of a building that you might want to emulate the Capitol  
and don't understate what it might cost. We're talking  
granite, marble, those kinds of exterior skins, which would  
be very expensive. No one ways the building won't work  
without that kind of a skin. But, for the moment we are  
rather arbitrarily making that choice for purpose of  
this preliminary budget.

REP. DICKINSON: The passage for the Capitol Building, your  
figure of \$800,000 and you said you really don't know what  
it's based on. Or you don't know what the distance is  
going to be. What did you base that \$800,000 figure on?

MR. GILMORE: Opinions. We had an opinion that it was worth  
\$300,000 and we had an opinion that it was worth \$1.5 million.

REP. DICKINSON: It's probably closer to \$1.5 million.

MR. GILMORE: The problem is that there have been an awful lot of  
these that have been built, and they have been, I've talked  
to states that have studied the problem, they were going to  
put offices, they were going to put retail stores, so that  
at one level of the garage to go to the capitol, you can

MR. GILMORE: (continued)

pick up lunch. So the costs there were something again from what I think is intended here, and it was built, so we don't have good information.

REP. TORPEY: It seems the door has been closed on this underground building out in front. The only reason it's been (inaudible) is that people don't working in that surrounding. But as soon as you're talking \$51 million and you really haven't started and it's going to go up to \$75 before you're finished, it would seem to me that we ought to have some figures on what it would cost to go out there and so forth. We have a choice of location but I don't think we really (inaudible)

SEN. SKELLEY: That actually the cost of underground construction is one-third more than above ground structure. And the fact of the matter was that if you could build an environmental, a building that responds in energy costs and everything else, similarly, above ground, then there's no sense in spending an additional one-third. In other words, if you built this building underground, it's going to cost you, you could add another one-third on that price. Isn't that correct?

MR. GILMORE: It could.

SEN. SKELLEY: So basically, it's not cheaper to build underground, it's much more expensive.

REP. SMOKO: Additional questions? Sen DiBella.

SEN. DI BELLA: Thank you. One question. You said, how much experience have you had building in the greater Hartford area, greater Hartford market, and I'm asking the question based on some of the numbers I see, I think they're rather high, but --

MR. GILMORE: We are currently on Putnam Park which is a ten story structure just south of the state --

SEN. DI BELLA: What's that (inaudible) What's that right on the square foot.

MR. MORGANTI: About \$85 a square foot. It's an empty building. But let me tell you about our experience in the area. Our

MR. MORGANTI: (continued)

experience in the area is that Travelers is remodeling Constitution Plaza. We were second bidder on it. It's a hard bid job. We just started a job up at Bradley Airport. We have an office building here on the Wethersfield line on 91 and I don't know whether they call Milford the Hartford area, it's Connecticut, mid-Connecticut, and we're doing there about 360,000 square feet for Equitable Life Insurance and IBM.

But the point, some of these figures are taken from experience. They're not just taken at random by calling other cities. We are a major contractor in Connecticut. We have a big cost department, a big estimating department. And what we've done, we've taken costs that we've had on previous jobs and knowing what that cost, we either upgraded them because of inflation and, or jobs that we've lost that we've bid and know what the price for square foot is because we still have the plans, we have taken all of those factors and this is what we think is the maximum you ought to spend for this project.

I don't think what Tom has said is that although you may appropriate this kind of money, it's not necessary to spend all that money, because there are intangibles there. And the other question that someone asked about the conduit was that you maybe put a few piles in there, build some kind of a tress across. It may not be a major thing. But our experience in Hartford has been adequate to know what these labor costs are.

SEN. DI BELLA: I'm just saying that you're a little inflated on \$145 a square foot. So that's what you're saying. Is that your outside number in terms of what you're doing. If you look at high rise construction in downtown Hartford the last building that was completed was the Steam Boiler Building which ran about \$125 a square foot. That was hard and soft glass, and it also has, I think an exterior skin that is granite --

MR. MORGANTI: Marble.

SEN. DI BELLA: I think it's granite, or marble, whatever --

MR. MORGANTI: You'll find that building didn't include any interior work. They leave open spaces and rent them to the tenant who does the interior work. If that building

MR. MORGANTI: (continued)

\$125 a square foot was for the structure, outside, foundations, outside, roofing, hallways, and the lobby, of course.

SEN. DI BELLA: Lobbies and things like that. You also had --

MR. MORGANTI: And that was also contracted for in 1981. A big difference between 1981 and 1984.

SEN. DI BELLA: But the offset is high rise construction which runs more than low rise construction that you're doing over here, given the fact that maybe the conduit work might --

MR. MORGANTI: Not necessarily. That's not a factor.

SEN. DI BELLA: All I think I'm trying to establish, is that I don't think, I think the \$145,000 is realistic.

MR. MORGANTI: \$145.

SEN. DI BELLA: \$145 a square foot seems realistic. I think you're low on the garage but (inaudible)

MR. GILMORE: Thank you. We appreciate (inaudible) The fact is that \$125 could be on this board as easily as \$145.

SEN. DI BELLA: All I'm saying is that you're not coming in and saying it's \$65 a square foot and we're sitting in this room realizing you're going to come back and say, gee, we made a calculation mistake and it's going to be \$145. I think I'd rather see the upside.

MR. GILMORE: We've already spent a substantial amount of time trying to recognize that the traditional history is a budget that just keeps going and keeps going. We take very seriously our corporate reputation. This is very much public information so believe me, we gave it a great deal of thought to what the numbers should be on a very preliminary basis. We are saying this is an expensive quality building. We are trying to make that as clear as possible. Construction management is the reason we can go with construction management is to try to control costs, but we certainly can't do much to control the cost before the design starts. That's when we really are engaged. At this point you're asking us to take a crystal ball for

MR. GILMORE: (continued)

what we think will be the high quality building and with that crystal ball in our hands we are not going to be optimistic about those costs. We're going to try to be realistic, project --

SEN. DI BELLA: One last question. Has there been any consideration for an internal system that controls the environment, the heat, the air-conditioning, ventilation, some of the modernistic types of technological advancements that are being now utilized.

MR. GILMORE: Way ahead of us. Yes, that's included in that. That's the type of thing we've included. That level of quality is certainly implied in our costs. Have we thought about what is the cost of the mechanical system.

SEN. DI BELLA: I'm sure that you haven't started to design the systems, no, but I'm saying, that's --

MR. GILMORE: We don't design them. We haven't even chosen an architect for the building.

SEN. DI BELLA: But you're looking at the state of the art of technology, you're not talking about --

MR. GILMORE: Again, we're looking at high quality building and we're putting them down in writing, and we really didn't see much that was above this kind of cost, so this should deliver a very high quality construction.

REP. SMOKO: Rep. Rybak.

REP. RYBAK: You're a construction manager. I take it to mean there will be no general contractor on this job, that legislative management committee on your advice will be acting as the general hiring all their subs, or how is this going to work?

MR. GILMORE: No, it happens to be, the concept of construction management, is we save the real embarrassment, you know \$1 million on an architect's drawings and he's got this project all the way complete, that's \$1 million invested in drawings. The contractor has not yet looked at it. It's put out to bid, it's over budget, and they're trying

MR. GILMORE: (continued)

to redesign to get the costs back . Construction management says, why should we waste all of that time, spend all that money on design and then for the first time, let the people who are going to build it see it. Why not bring a contractor on board as early as possible, and in this case, prior to even the choice of the architect, through all this flip-flop system. Morganti is a long-time general contractor, largest general contractor in the State of Connecticut. We have the experience and all of that.

MR. All we're doing is shifting our approach to delivery of the same service. We're going to build that building from the standpoint of, we're going to get the most out of the mechanical contractor and we're going to bid that competitor. The same with the roofing contractor, the drywall contractor. Morganti, Incorporated can do a number of the major trades without and in this particular case, we are agreeing not to do it, to remove any possibility of conflict of interest.

What are we doing? We are consultants during the design phase to maintain the budget. And if the budget is going to be \$50 million, good. If it's going to be \$40 million, fine, that's our job. That every step of the way along through the design, the budget is going over that, that we tell you right then and there and we come up with an alternate design to get it back on target so that you never get through the whole process and fit it in another budget.

REP. RYBAK: Could you tell me then, we have a general contractor, in effect. I think I'm a little confused now. I thought you were going to serve as the general, that you're going to serve as the construction manager of the project and that then after the architects plans, then prepare to go out and bid for a general contractor. That might be somebody other than your firm.

MR. GILMORE: All subcontractors write those up. There will be no general contractor. Well, do you know the definition of a general contractor? This is a subcontractor. The general contractor is one who brings all of those bodies together and normally, does concrete, site work.

REP. RYBAK: He's responsible for delivering that building at the bid cost. He says, I'll bid the builders, and then I'll go

REP. RYBAK: (continued)

out and hire my subs and I'm responsible for meeting the bottom line cost unless there are change orders. That's known as the guaranteed maximum (inaudible)

MR. GILMORE: That's right, that's right.

REP. RYBAK: Now what are we dealing with here as opposed to that system?

MR. GILMORE: We supply a guaranteed maximum price. We've worked our way all the way through this design and we've watched the costs and we've come up with recommendations to save money and at some stage, downstream in terms of design we feel that we are on target, whether it's this target or some other target, we are on target, we've then tendered to the State of Connecticut guaranteed maximum price. If the job runs over that, we will pay for it. If the job runs under that, it is traditional that savings below the guaranteed price, most of it will go to the client, the construction management will take a piece as an incentive, to doing the best possible job. We generally will be working on a fixed fee in this kind of circumstance.

REP. RYBAK: Say the job is \$40 million, whatever it is, we are thinking in terms of percentages, but we mark it into a fixed dollar (inaudible). As long as the project doesn't change in scope, which means, dollar quality or square footage doesn't double. That's a number. That's what we can make on the job. Having it more expensive is not a benefit to us. Change orders, those kinds of things are not in any way beneficial to us. We want the job to happen the way it's been designed. We work from the outset to try to control the design and control the cost, but when it does go to construction, it's as as possible, we have nothing to gain, except gains through buying a job for less than we guarantee.

MR. MORGANTI: I think you still have a question in your mind. What, you're doing is hiring us to run your job. We don't do any physical construction but we manage the job. We put people on that job that will manage every phase, the schedule, the quality, okay, and the buying. That's what we do for you.

REP. RYBAK: You hire the subs? You hire the electricians, you hire the plumbers, you hire the masons.

MR. MORGANTI: No, let me, I'll be more specific. What we do is, we prepare what we call a bid package. Let's just take drywall, sheetrock. We'll prepare a package with the architect. We'll describe everything he has to do and we'll put it out to bid and with the Representative from the state and with the architect, we review the bids. And you decide who you're going to give it to at that point, the lowest possible bidder, or some other person. But all we can do then is manage it for you. We tell you what we recommend this is the company you should give it to, they're low. They're not responsible, they can't get a bond, we shouldn't give it to that other company. That's what we do.

REP. RYBAK: So that the legislative management committee then would be making the decision which subs to hire.

MR. MORGANTI: We have asked the Legislative Management Committee to have a representative work with us throughout the job. Because we think construction management is what they call a team approach. It's the architect, construction manager, and the owner. And the only way you can get down to dollars, the dollars that you want to spend.

REP. RYBAK: To take it one point further, I assume that will be the Legislative Management Committee that will be responsible for making the decision whether it will be a Connecticut contractor who's doing the work or an out-of-state contractor who (inaudible) It will be the Legislative Management Committee and not your firm as opposed to a general situation that will insure whether or not the prevailing wage scale will be paid on the job. Is that correct?

MR. MORGANTI: We are hoping that we get that input from somebody of the state.

SEN. SKELLEY: What has transpired now is the we as the General Assembly are in fact, the customer, okay. As you know, the structure of legislative management makes most of the decisions of leadership surrounding the entire workings of the Capitol. There has been a subcommittee set up to deal with the restoration of the Capitol of four members that can expedite change orders if they have to. We're going to have a ton of change orders in this particular building because the building is so old (inaudible) The new building

SEN. SKELLEY: (continued)  
will function along the very same lines. Just as in Public Works. Public Works makes their decisions on the concept of who in fact, and the general contractors has it where they're locked into a low bid. A low bid, and we've got it before here, doesn't necessarily mean that the completion date, or that we're going to have a problem with the if the final input will rest with legislative management, and if the committee is not aware of this, the management committee does not necessarily run off of majority vote. There has to be input from both sides, and so far there has been so much input that it has been unanimous. Does that answer the question?

REP. RYBAK: I guess there's some of us who are still a little bit annoyed about the staging job around the Capitol.

SEN. SKELLEY: That's what we're trying to avoid.

REP. ABERCROMBIE: Legislative Management went through this and one of the reasons the recommendation was made for a construction manager was to avoid those same pitfalls.

MR. MORGANTI: You'll get every major company in the country today, and this is the system they use because they can keep the damn thing within budget. You might have to change, let's say for instance you go into a lobby and it's marble from floor to ceiling and we had a budget in there of \$150,000. All at once we get bids and they're \$200,000, and you say, whoops, we've got to do something then. What does the owner, the construction manager and the architect do? Well, they decide maybe we won't put the top four feet around or we'll take that stuff out and replace it with something else. This is nice, but not as expensive and now you've got it down to \$150,000. That's our job. That's what we tell you. There's no reason why the job should go over the budget. If you decide to cut that, that's the kind of a job you're going to get. We think through our experience that's what you should spend.

Now there are some contingencies because we don't know about that box yet. We've given your committee 17 items that we should go to work on immediately and  
(GAP IN CASSETTE)

Cass. 4

REP. RYBAK: (GAP) balistically for that passageway under the ramp.

MR. MORGANTI: Do we know about what?

REP. RYBAK: Ledge, possibility of ledge under that highway?

MR. MORGANTI: That's okay.

REP. RYBAK: Have you ever done tests for (inaudible)

MR. MORGANTI: That's okay. That's if we hit ledge. That's fine, we don't have to probably take the ledge out.

REP. RYBAK: Well \$800,000 is going to eat that up. Let me ask you this.

MR. MORGANTI: Yeah, but you might not --

REP. RYBAK: In terms of a construction schedule, there's two ways of doing this. One is to say, based upon what little evidence we have now, what little data we have now, we authorize the bond commission to issue general obligation bonds in the amount of \$51 million. That's one way of doing it.

REP. The other way of doing it is to say we authorize the bonds commission that if your planning and design monies and then we release bonding in the state. We've been doing that more recently lately, but I'm not sure if that's the best way to go, because a lot of time the project gets interrupted midstream and money gets wasted. But in terms of (inaudible) the visible project, what type of timing schedule are you looking at here with respect to the (inaudible).

MR. MORGANTI: We presented a schedule, a tentative schedule.

REP. RYBAK: I haven't seen it.

MR. MORGANTI: Well, your committee has seen a schedule of starting date, architectural time it takes to start you know, borings, to find out how long does it take examination of the ground and what's there and a survey. We've given that to him, we've given that to them, we presented that to them, a tentative schedule. It's something like 42 months from now that that this whole thing should be done.

REP. RYBAK: Is that schedule matched up with money that's needed to match the or is it just a time limit?

MR. MORGANTI: We will do that, but we can't do it now. We will do that, that's one of the things construction management will do, is tell you when you have to sell those bonds to bring that money in. A different period, like every three months, or every month or something like that. That's part of our job. That's part of our management expertise.

REP. RYBAK: Finally, does the parking in here consider an income proponent or is this going to be just brief parking for staff and legislators. (inaudible)

SEN. SKELLEY: That's really a management decision. There has been talk about making sure that first of all there should be parking accessible for the public and where they're going to park. Whether or not we're going to use that for people here that obviously spend a great deal of time there, so (inaudible) probably the legislators who may in fact not be allowed to be given free parking, and there are many incomes to be derived out of this (inaudible)

REP. SMOKO: Rep. Flynn.

REP. FLYNN: I resent that comment on tolls, but could you just go over again more specifically how you are compensated, how you anticipate being compensated, are you being paid on an hourly basis now, if so, what? If you're talking about a piece of a percentage, or incentives, what is that, and what are the standards for the industry, what are we paying (inaudible)

MR. GILMORE: At the moment, I don't think we're being paid. It's actually too early in the game. I think this is actually the second meeting we have had. We have had one prior meeting where we suggested three alternate schedules of construction, and another meeting (inaudible). So we're not even at work. We're really In terms of the reimbursement to Morganti, an arrangement that we would normally do is we would establish a budget during the design phase. During this design phase, of which, let's say it's six months. Once we're six months into design and construction (inaudible) In fact, it may be a lot sooner because (inaudible-not speaking into mike) We would design foundation, start construction of foundations. When the construction of foundation is under way, the design of the super-structure

MR. GILMORE: (continued)

is under way. We'll be ordering structural steel, hoping that as soon as we finish construction of the foundation, structural steel arrives at the perfect day, and the structural steel starts. So it's a phasing of construction that we'll speed up, the project delivery, it saves time and it saves interest on bonds, all of that, so (inaudible)

In terms of the compensation for us, (inaudible) One is during that design phase before we get into construction, we would be basically reimbursed on a (inaudible) When people who are sitting at meetings make the recommendation (inaudible) That really tends to get melted into an (inaudible) which is a percentage, it really is negotiated, I should make that very clear. Is it negotiated when we know what the price is?

MR. MORGANTI: I have, Robert Morganti, I have asked the state committee to select an attorney so that we can negotiate an agreement so that we can come up with a fee structure, and until that is done we really can't really propose a fee structure. We don't know exactly what kind of a contract we want.

SEN. SKELLEY: Legislative Management has in fact, we are going to allocate on Thursday, correct me if I'm wrong, gentlemen, on Thursday, the recommendation was that we would go out and hire a lawyer to proceed in negotiations (inaudible)

REP. SMOKO: Additional questions? Rep. Goodwin.

REP. GOODWIN: I haven't had any contact with the inflation in construction costs for some years and I really have lost track of what it is now, and where it's trending.

MR. GILMORE: Last year it was approximately 6.7% according to (inaudible)

REP. GOODWIN: Six point seven.

REP. GOODWIN: That's labor and (inaudible) Where is it today?

REP. GOODWIN: I think it's quite low, 10?

MR. GILMORE: It's running at a current rate now of 3.8% (inaudible)

MR. GILMORE: (continued)

Now the 6.8 I talk about is pretty much 83/82 (inaudible)  
The anticipate inflation is 85%. That's a guess.

REP. SMOKO: Rep. Savage.

REP. SAVAGE: The first question (inaudible) you know, we're  
sitting here, and what is the figure that you're going  
to be asking us, or do we have a hard and fast figure yet.

SEN. SKELLEY: The reason that we brought a construction  
manager, I was very adamant about that, to have a  
construction manager on board, because basically, the  
Legislative Management Committee and this committee  
lack a certain amount of expertise in the construction  
field in putting those figures together. What we felt  
here, is we told them basically what our needs would be,  
what our problems were (inaudible) conduit, so the  
esthetics that have to go into the building, and I had  
related to my caucus earlier that I anticipated approx-  
imately \$45 million, an increase of over 30, and it was  
my position to pick a higher price rather than the bond  
package of lower, but the management decided to go with  
a \$30 million bond package and then to see basically what  
would happen.

I'm not terribly surprised what it would be, but on the  
other hand, it would be impossible for our committee,  
we lack the expertise to be able to put those types of  
figures together and see exactly what happens. You know,  
whatever the recommendation will be, I'm sure that we'll  
be discussing that Thursday, but I would say that if you're  
talking about a high ball figure here, as I say, we pro-  
bably won't have to spend, or we maybe able to save that  
kind of money, but I think (inaudible).

REP. SAVAGE: Okay, I think Rep. Rybak asked some of my  
questions, but the next one would be, if that's the case,  
and we were in a crystal ball stage, and we've got \$51  
million roughly down there as a crystal ball sketch,  
what's your track record in crystal ball sketch?

MR. GILMORE: Very good. Here's our crystal ball. (inaudible)

MR. TED CATINO: I am Ted Catino. I am the chief investigator  
for Morganti Construction Company. In all fairness, and I

MR. CATINO: (continued)

(inaudible) this is not only a crystal ball estimate. It's very unfair to say a crystal ball. The \$145 per square foot is (inaudible) realistic, developed to the State of Connecticut through different parts of the country. And also, I hate to say this, on some on some parameters spent about a day and we came up with a number of \$133.50 for this job, without any contingencies. That's what we came up with, with no contingencies at all. And we just went through it and said, okay. We tried to sketch in our minds and do something on paper and we tried to figure how much is just commission or cost.

Mind you, I really don't know what the looks like. We have no information. I don't have that information so we take some assumptions, we try to put together some problems and we came up with some numbers.

We figured out the concrete foundation. We figure out the super structure. Then we look at the really, the big parameters that change, or two items, and one is the exterior skin, are we going to a glass skin, are we going to are we going to go with marble, are we going to go with or are we just going to throw some (inaudible) on it. There are different methods associated with the outside. And that can go anywhere on a dollar per square foot of (inaudible) of \$6 per square foot to \$18 per square foot, \$20 per square foot. What do I pick? All right, then let's pick \$12. Okay. \$12, what is it going to get you? It gives you a granite exterior, but it does not give you any gingerbread.

Now you want to start adding gingerbread outside, that \$145 will go up to \$275 per square foot. So, what we have tried to do, we have tried to give you what we feel, you say, a realist, I'm Italian. (laughter) I'll take a shot. This is a statement. This is a (inaudible) Before we go any further, what's gingerbread? (inaudible) Look around you, a lot of gingerbread. This building has a lot of gingerbread. (inaudible) of the building, but (inaudible) They do not serve a functional purpose, but they are (inaudible) that you might want to have. Those are things that somebody might say, we should have those. The committee that's renovating the Capitol building would say, you know, (inaudible) just a plain granite building, I want some

MR. CATINO: (continued)  
overhang and I want some sculptures and I want some stuff, oh, I don't have that money, and we might use up this \$4 million in contingencies pretty darn quick. Now you might want some fancy light fixtures. You might want some real sophisticated mechanical systems as you walk into the room the system goes on and you have this in the (inaudible) I don't have that money, but it can be done. Anything can be done. But this is, my feeling is with \$145 a square foot, it's really not really pie in the sky high, it's probably a realistic number that you're looking at.

The things that we really don't know it's this. We don't know about this. This could cost \$50,000. It could cost \$250 or \$300. I don't think it's going to be \$2.5 or \$3 million. This tunnel, \$800,000 is probably adequate unless somebody (inaudible) that I want a transportation system that's going to take the people from here to here in 30 seconds. Somebody might have that. I don't know. I can't read anybody's mind, and we don't have a committee to deal with and to find out exactly your needs.

The only other possibility is, it goes back to the 200,000 square feet. Do you (inaudible-talking overtones) If you're going to build 200,000 square feet of shell, and not do the interior, you might save maybe \$20 a square foot, but you're not going to save \$120 a square foot. That's an answer to your question before, okay? So, those are the things that you should think about, and I just wanted to (inaudible)

MR. MORGANTI: Call Danbury Hospital, Stamford Hospital, (inaudible) We've done all those and kept them all under the budget. As a matter of fact, I think Yale-New Haven Hospital came under \$6 million under budget, some of it.

SEN. SKELLEY: \$6 million under from this type of estimate.

MR. MORGANTI: From this type of estimate, yes. But you know, with the cooperation of the owner, it wasn't all affected by us. A lot of it was affected by the owner, by making changes we suggested, they said sure, go ahead.

SEN. SKELLEY: Well you won't have to worry about egos up here.

MR. MORGANTI: Danbury Hospital had \$16 million, we brought that in a million less.

REP. SMOKO: A few more questions. We have Rep. Ryan, then Rep. Rowland.

REP. RYAN: Okay, just one question Mike, this is all fine and on the table what I've seen in front of me, the question unanswered here is how much of the furniture (inaudible)

: Furniture?

: We're bringing our own desks over.  
Refrigerator.

: We can't through the description of furnishings.

REP. RYAN: (Inaudible) how much it's going to cost to build a building, I'm now asking you, we're going to have a building, we're not going to put any (inaudible)

: Chairs and tables?

REP. RYAN: Chairs and tables, rugs.

: We won't (inaudible - everyone talking at once)

SEN. SKELLEY: I think we should save it for another day. Hold it, the fact of the matter is when you include an architectural fee, the architect is basically going to lay out, we're not talking about a better building (inaudible) The whole thing would be included in this package, I assume.

(more than one talking at once)

MR. GILMORE: Carpet would be included

: The description of the building in a general sense is the office space, and that means petitioning, drop ceilings, it's finished space, and those are the finishings. Vinyl wallpaper is a finish. Okay, and it's the furnishing, perhaps. But furniture it's not.

REP. SMOKO: Rep. Rowland. Poor Rep. Rowland, he's been trying to get a word in edgewise for about an hour now. John, give it your best shot.

REP. ROWLAND: On the construction cost comparison, that were done in the various counties, the numbers that you put together on the various, for example, Hartford County was \$84 per square foot, did that include the professional fees built into that?

MR. GILMORE: No. These are construction costs.

REP. ROWLAND: Straight construction costs.

MR. GILMORE: It's been our experience. (inaudible)

REP. ROWLAND: No professional fees are included in that. It's a straight comparison to the \$145.

MR. GILMORE: Looking at those major systems that make up a building as close to the professional (inaudible)

REP. SMOKO: Any other questions? Going once, Sen. Streeter.

SEN. STREETER: Obviously, you have information (inaudible) Do you have any kind of a sheet delineating what sort of about the number of people that are occupying (inaudible)

MR. GILMORE: No we don't have anything, but there has been a study done much earlier as to the needs of space. I believe that has a copy of it. It's not out responsibility to convert, enlose, design in construction.

REP. EMMONS: But you should (inaudible) and needs.

MR. GILMORE: We used 200,000 square feet, it's not our number, that's a given. That's one of those few given.

REP. SMOKO: The needs now, I think it's better to address the Legislative Management and that committee's in charge of that.

: If we could provide some of those for the committee and a short presentation, maybe Thursday at 2:00 would be fine.

REP. SMOKO: Additional questions from Morganti Construction. Anybody else. Gentlemen, thank you very much. Okay, onward and upward. We will have a few brief words from some additional folks. First, Betty, Betty Gallo from Common Cause, followed by Anita Malabo. DBIA. Could I remind everybody the hearing is not over. Please conduct conversations in the hall. Excuse me, Betty. Could we have some order, please. Betty, if you would.

MS. BETTY GALLO: My name is Betty Gallo and I'm speaking for Common Cause Connecticut today.

Common Cause supports the authorization of bonds for a state office building.

It is important that public officials have office space that is conducive to carrying out the government's business. It inspires public respect for state government. It's also important that legislative offices encourage public access. Often the public finds it difficult to come to the Capitol to see their legislator, or to speak at a public hearing. First it's next to impossible to find a parking place. Legislators do not have an office where the constituents can speak to them in private. A citizen who comes to the Capitol to testify at a public hearing often finds room the hearing's being held in is too small to hold the number of people who have appeared.

We hope that an office building is being designed so that public access is a prime consideration. For example, my home state, North Carolina, has just built a new office building. When you go in, each legislator has their own offices, and also there are computers in the halls where you can find out where a bill is and what's happened to it. It's the same concept we have here, but it allows the public who just comes into the building to find out the progress of legislation on their own.

There are things like that, that could make government more accessible and we hope that you will build in to the building. There are many demands for state money, but Common Cause believes that providing the legislature with adequate space in which to conduct the state's business should be a priority. Thank you.

REP. SMOKO: Thank you, Betty, are there other questions from the Committee? Loren?

REP. DICKINSON: I heard you say you support the bonding for  
(inaudible)

MS. GALLO: Obviously, this was the first time we also saw,  
looked at the million dollars. We hoped that it was done  
in a way, the cheapest way possible, to provide adequate  
space, and I'm not an expert to decide the way that is  
done. I do think there has to be consideration to things,  
just for planning public parking that have to be considered,  
if you're going to make this place accessible.

REP. SMOKO: Thank you, Betty. Additional questions? Thank  
you again. Anita, followed by Maura Melley.

MS. ANITA LOVALBO: Good afternoon, my name is Anita Lovalbo,  
and I'm assistant counsel for the Connecticut Business  
and Industry Association. CBIA is here today on behalf  
of supporting the raised committee bill No. 32, which  
calls for the authorization of state bonds for new legis-  
lative office building. I'll try to be as brief as possible  
and I think that's possible, but I think there are three  
at least three major reasons why CBIA comes here to support  
the measure, including the long overdue proposal to build  
a new office space.

First of all, I think we need to meet the needs of our  
State Legislature by providing additional space, and not  
only for the state legislative process, but for the public  
in general to come here. There's been a growing participa-  
tion over the years so that the public, and general public  
in the legislative process in the space that's provided in  
this building is not presently adequate to meet those needs.  
I think Father Devine's statements about the building's  
inadequacy for a public hearing process is well taken.

Secondly, I think, more importantly than even the adequate  
office space is the fire and safety considerations that  
were brought out by Father Devine. I was interested to  
note that this particular hearing room is totally inadequate  
in terms of fire and safety. Being a person that frequents  
this hearing room, (gap in tape) we are not adequately  
protected both in terms of fire and safety hazards.

And thirdly, and I think very importantly, this building  
is not adequate to provide for the needs of the handicapped.  
This particular room, the education room, are not accessible

50  
kpt

FINANCE

February 14, 1984

MS. LOVALBO: (continued)  
to those people at all right now, presently. A new building would hopefully add to that accessibility. And, on those three points, I think it's essential that we encourage the legislature to support this proposal.

SEN. SKOBEY: Thank you, Anita. Any questions? Thank you very much. Maura Melley.

MR. MAURA MELLEY: Good afternoon, my name is Maura Melley. I'm vice-president of the Insurance Association of Connecticut and am here to testify in favor of raised committee bill 32. Our support for this bill for this construction of the new office building is for two basic reasons.

Number one, we believe that in order to have an efficient operation of government, you have to perform it in less congested, less crowded, less noisy, more private conditions than what we are seeing here at the Capitol. Government has become more and more complex. As government becomes more complex, legislators need more space, more staff, more time in order to do their work. The confines of this building have restricted the legislators in their pursuit of fulfilling their needs to the constituents that they represent.

In my experience also as Secretary of the State and in the Secretary of State's office, I had to annually fight bills that wanted to expand the legislative office space into the Secretary of State's office. And for my old hat reason I'm here in favor of this new office building and to keep the Secretary of State's office here in the Capitol.

The second major reason, which is very important to us as insurers are the fire and safety code violations. God forbid that Connecticut have some type of emergency or crisis and we did have a preview of what it could be back in 1980 as Father Devine mentioned. Fire and safety considerations are very, very important considerations especially when you're looking at the premier building in the state, the State Capitol.

Finally, I'd just like to say that 106 years ago was the last time that the legislature decided to expand and to move from the Old State House to this hill in Hartford and in 106

MS. MELLEY: (continued)

we've changed a lot and we've grown a lot and I think it's time to make another change and to move into new space. Thank you.

SEN. SKELLEY: Thank you, Maura. Questions? Thank you very much. Charles Mokriski.

MR. CHARLES MOKRISKI: Senator, members of the Committee, my name is Charles Mokriski. I am speaking as a citizen today, although one who spends a considerable period of time up here. Back in the late 50s, John Kenneth Galbraith perhaps that's a person now out of favor with Reaganomics reigning, but spoke of private affluence and public squalor and I think all one has to do is to look around at 1 State Street, the Steam Boiler Building or City Place and walk inside those buildings and see the facilities there and then walk around our State Office Building over on Capitol Avenue or walk up on the catwalk that goes to the Energy and Public Utilities Committee Meeting in this building right here to make those observations somewhat compelling irrelevant to the modern day.

I think that whether it's the Judicial functions in the courts, or the Legislative functions in these halls right here, the governmental prophecies need to take place in an atmosphere of dignity and in an environment of efficiency. I would submit we don't have either here. I think to the degree that it's important, encouraged in our citizens, our taxpayers, our businesses, respect for the legislative process, to in fact, dispel the thought that what goes on here is totally chaotic and at times bordering on a circus, we have to have some physical facilities adequate and appropriate to the purpose.

I urge the committee to support the bonding for this building. Having said that as a citizen interested in governmental process, let me just add a few remarks as a neighbor. You're proposing this building in my front yard. I live in Bushnell Tower Condominium and I look out at the State Capitol, the Aetna and St. Joseph's Cathedral being the three most prominent landmarks, and I would hope that the Legislative Management Committee and the Finance Committee to the degree it retains jurisdiction, will go about this project with a great deal of taste and discretion, consult very closely with city agencies city planning agencies, with private entities such as the

MR. MOKRISKI: (continued)

Hartford Architecture Conservancy, with your own Capitol District Commission and make sure that the design of the building itself as well as the inter-relationship with this building with all of the other Capitol District facilities, such as 30 and 18 Trinity Street, or the State Office Building on Capitol Avenue, or the Health Department Building. All of these are approached in a comprehensive planning point of view. There may be, in fact, some possibilities for renovating some of the other existing buildings if 200,000 square feet of office space is more than the legislature needs right now, you might be able to pool some functions from some of the other existing buildings and renovate and maybe even consider converting the 18 to 30 Trinity Street to housing of some sort. Hartford desperately needs housing. I wouldn't mind having neighbors adjoining the park.

I think these are all things you ought to let your imaginations and your creativity run riot, but don't approach it piecemeal, you're not just building one building out there. I think you're attacking the whole problem of a governmental center and what can be done, and I'd urge close operation and consultation with all interested parties on the state and local and private sector as well.

REP. SMOKO: Thank you, Chuck. Questions? Thank you very much. Bob Franklin. Followed by Betty Tianti.

MR. ROBERT FRANKLIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm Robert Franklin, President of the Connecticut Public Expenditure Council and I'm here to support on behalf of the Council, this project. As others have said, we've lived 100 years in the State Capitol in the legislative process and with the coming one man, one vote and annual sessions, why the whole process has changed substantially, and I think that there is need for a new and better planned facility than what the legislature has now. The Council over the years has always been supportive of a strong legislative process. My own personal feeling is that the legislature is the last line of defense against a bureaucracy.

I think that you need facilities to be able to function adequately. I have been encouraged by the cost consciousness that's been expressed here. Connecticut has a, what I feel, a less illustrious process when, cost consciousness when you

MR. FRANKLIN: (continued)

look at the Health Center and you consider the Central Naugatuck Valley Higher Educational Center and so I think that this is encouraging from the point of view from people who are concerned about the taxpayers dollars.

I remind you of the reaction of the federal taxpayer to the experience with the Rayburn Building down in Washington and I think we all want to avoid something like that.

Two or three points. I think that the whole planning process for this project needs to be sure that it takes into account the future developments in the legislative process. I know that the Committee has Legislative Management Committee has done some work in this area. I think that perhaps it needs to be exposed to the legislature more. We need to take a look at projections of the legislative process.

I wasn't clear from the description of the role of the Morganti firm just how close the architects plans and specifications were going to be reviewed from the owner's point of view. There are engineering firms in the business, who do as a business, give a second opinion on plans and specifications who will come back and say on a considered valid engineering and construction judgment, well if you design this a little different, you lose these kind of material, it will be less costly to build and it will be less costly to maintain, and I think that that's a kind of protection that the General Assembly needs to have because it will go a long way towards avoiding that.

Whether you have it with the present firm, or whether that is built into it, and then one final thing is, we learned years ago when we were building school buildings, that you didn't have to build the entire facility at once. You could build a core with the opportunity to expand in five or ten years at a much less costly cost of construction, but I wish you well on what is really a very challenging project.

REP. SMOKO: Thank you very much. Are there any questions? Seeing none, Betty Tianti, followed by Carroll Hughes. Welcome, Betty.

MS. BETTY TIANTI: Mr. Chairman, Sen. Skelley, members of the committee, my name is Betty Tianti and I'm the Secretary-Treasure of the Connecticut State AF of L CIO, and I think it's a historic occasion today, I think this is the first

MS. TIANTI: (continued)

time that I've followed Bob Franklin in testimony and support his position. Bob's left, so keep my record pristine insofar as you will as far as Bob's concerned.

I think it is certainly clear to people who come here to the General Assembly on any basis, regular or infrequent that there is a real need for additional space and I think that is to, other than to consider and to go ahead and construct, adequate facilities for the legislators and the staff is to do a disservice to the State of Connecticut.

I was here earlier and the presentation on the potential projected costs, and of course, it does tend to make you gulp, but in what is occurred in the past, if you delay, you can usually anticipate that the costs are often going to go up. I don't have any confidence in construction costs going down, I don't suppose anybody, even the most optimistic person would assume that that could occur. Therefore, I would urge that you move expeditiously. I've served on a number of boards and commissions that do deal with some of the aspects of capital construction for the state, and I think that's one of the most frustrating things, is the length of time from the initiation of a construction project to the completion that makes it so very, very difficult to really get a handle on the cost and to think in terms of being able to plan a facility of the magnitude of this proposed building, and to anticipate having it come in under four years from start to finish, I think speaks well for the planning process and it might be that the Executive Branch could take a leaf from the book of the legislature if in fact you are successful, but I do believe that there is a need for preservation of this building, and not to, you do if you walk around here, get to understand the hazards that are here, and I guess familiarity breeds contempt.

You don't realize it, and I would just assume that this could be done before we do face a real tragic situation here because of the safety hazards of this building. So I think it is important that there be adequate space for the legislators, for the staff, to do the job that is necessary, and I would totally support the bonding authorization and move expeditiously towards the finalization of plans along the line that has been proposed here today.

SEN. SKELLEY: Thank you, Betty. Any questions? Carroll Hughes.

MR. CARROLL HUGHES: Since there have been no citizens here, I would like to take off my badge and for the first time, representing myself at the Connecticut General Assembly.

I also, I'm a resident of Cheshire, but I also own property in the neighborhood, probably closest to the Capitol at 16-18 Hungerford Street which is residential and I like keeping it that way. I think that the office building will help stabilize that neighborhood. I feel that the more people you put on the street at a given time, day or night, helps insure the stability and the safety of that particular neighborhood and I think it would be an asset.

The problems in this building are obvious to anyone. The, I think the political aspects of this bill, a few years ago you probably would have had it instead of waiting until now, but the very ambitious plans back in the late sixties here when they proposed the Capitol Center Complex which would have taken just about everything in the neighborhood here from the whole Russ Street area, Hungerford Street, Oak Street and going down the other way for all the buildings and the ambitious plans in the multi-multi millions, ten times what you're talking about here today if they had ever built it. I think it soured a lot of people to the idea of a new complex around the area.

If they had taken the realistic aspect and looked at the State Capitol and offices to house the people that are here, better than the ones that came in 1887, I think they would have realized that they should have built an office building of this type a few years ago, so I think it's long overdue. People come up to this building, hundreds of directors over the years, and organizations that I've been involved with, and it's really an embarrassment. The most difficult moments here are not when you get your bill tanked downstairs for recommitment, it, well, that gets very traumatic sometimes too, but it's when you show up here and you have people that are here, and you really don't know what to do with them. You're trying to make them feel at home, it's a very uncomfortable feeling. They're into the hearing room. You're not sure if they can get a seat. If they get here early, you can't even promise them that. They can't hear. It's gotten better over the years as your rules have changed with

MR. HUGHES: (continued)

allocations of time, no smoking, getting sets out of college bowl here that we can see all of you very easily in the audience, and I think the people almost feel that nobody listens to them simply because of the conditions that are around them. The foreground intrusions really spoil their day when they come up here. They are impressed by the building, but sometimes the process as good as you can make it, the hardware and mortar still has a very serious detrimental affect on them. After they ride around and if they don't get towed by the end of the day, they still go away with the bad feelings, so it is very difficult.

I think that safetywise there are some places in this building that it's surprising that something has never happened before. If there ever was a fire in this building, there's some location, I can think of Public Health or Energy, the only way to get out of there safely is to on the side of the building. A lot of people I know couldn't do that, so I think it's one of the factors you have to take into consideration and do the investment now and the conditions for legislators, and I always think of downstairs, the freshmen and the Republican and Democratic rooms. You go in there to talk to somebody, it's like a Peter Sellers movie. You ask a question, and about eight heads can pop up anywhere around and answer the question for you, not sure who it's being asked to.

So I think we've got to advance this thing a little bit and move the building. Thanks very much.

SEN. SKELLEY: Thank you Carroll. Any questions? That ends our speaker list. Is there anyone else who would like to testify? If not, the hearing is adjourned.