

PA13-243

SB0876

Education	93-99, 187-190, 348-349	13
House	10537-10588	52
Senate	5163-5168	6
		71

H - 1180

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VETO
SESSION**

**VOL.56
PART 31
10451 - 10795**

Calendar 693.

THE CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Calendar Number 693, Favorable Report of the joint standing Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding, Substitute Senate Bill Number 876, AN ACT CONCERNING AUTHORIZATION OF STATE GRANT COMMITMENTS FOR SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECTS AND ROOF PITCH REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL BUILDINGS.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Distinguished Chairman of the Education Committee, Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move acceptance of the joint committee's Favorable Report and acceptance of the bill -- and passage of the bill in congruence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The question is on acceptance, passage, and concurrence. Would you explain the bill, please, sir?

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is, indeed, our annual school construction bill. The bill that is now before us includes 27

local school construction projects, both authorizations and reauthorizations for grade school projects across the State of Connecticut, with reimbursement rates reflecting the formula that the state put in place, a couple of years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of Amendment LCO Number 8890, previously designated Senate "A." I ask that the Clerk please call and I be given permission to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The Clerk is in possession of LCO Number 88 -- Number 8890 previously designated Senate Amendment Schedule "A."

Mr. Clerk, please call the amendment.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 8890, designated Senate Amendment Schedule "A" and offered by Senator Stillman, and Representative Fleischmann.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The gentleman has asked leave of the Chamber to summarize. Is there objection?

Hearing none, Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Senate Amendment "A," first of all, strikes Section 2 of the bill that related to roof pitch; as those who were paying attention are aware, that issue was already dealt with in a Public Safety bill, earlier today.

So now what's left are additional school projects, 39 in all, again, all around the State of Connecticut. And these are projects that could not necessarily have been foreseen at the time that the State Department of Education submitted to us a school construction bill, schools where there was construction underway and they found PCBs, they found that there were challenges with remediation of their school site, that there were new efforts needed to fix roofs, other things of that nature.

So we've tried to be respectful of requests from both sides of the aisle, from both Chambers; I think we have good projects here.

I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The question is on adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "A." Will you remark on Senate Amendment Schedule "A?"

The Ranking Member of the Education Committee,

Representative Ackert -- sorry -- yes, Representative
Ackert. Proceed, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And just through you, a couple questions to the
proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You had mentioned and we had discussion earlier
about the roof pitch, and I know that became out of
this section, so that, and that bill did pass. I
think there was a discussion earlier about those
projects. Would they be under -- with this
legislation -- would they be under the new bill if it
gets signed -- through you, Mr. Speaker -- and the --
the new requirements?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann, do you --

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

-- care to respond?

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

-- Mr. Speaker.

If the bill that passed this Chamber earlier today is signed into law, that any school project in the State of Connecticut will now be subject to the State Building Code rather than the previous half-inch roof-pitch requirement.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you to the good, the good Chairman, and I appreciate that answer.

Another, projects that were coming up -- and I just had this, I've had it now for a minute, so I couldn't go through the 39 projects -- another question will come up; school safety. Some of the school safety provisions that may be in this legislation, given the fact that we passed a school safety, passed a school safety bill earlier that it asks some additional dollars that could be sought after for maybe vestibule changes, stronger windows, things like that.

If they're in that, would that fall under this, these projects; since they're new projects, that would fall into that too?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that you feel better.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Ditto.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

With -- with regard to that question, I'm not aware of any --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Just -- just a minute, sir.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann seems to be sharing the laryngitis and cold that's going around. He previously discussed this with, about Representative Giegler; I will not connect any dots, personally, but some people are having difficulty hearing the very

low-pitched tone of the distinguished Chairman, so if we could just be a little quiet.

Representative Fleischmann, let's try again.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, and I'll -- I'll try and speak a little louder.

Earlier this session we went and clarified the statute regarding the new competitive grant we've made available to all districts for upgrades for school security. And the clarification was that any project in this current calendar year, in other words, started post January 1st of this year would be eligible for that new competitive grant. So we believe that that should really be the -- the way that districts seek to make school security improvements.

And to my knowledge the various projects enumerated in Senate Amendment "A" are not in that category but rather in the other, in the other categories I've described earlier.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you to the good Chairman.

And final question on Senate Amendment "A." If, obviously with the new language that we required to have implemented the school safety, if you're going to have a new construction that school safety needs to be thought of in terms of your planning for new construction, as that would fall under these schools.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

To the extent that in Senate "A" or the underlying bill there are new schools that have features that are intended to ensure school safety and security, those costs aren't generally eligible pursuant to the bill that we passed in this Chamber on April 4th.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you to the good Chairman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentleman from the 66th, Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a -- a couple of questions, if I --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed, sir.

REP. MINER (66th):

-- might, through you, to the gentleman from the Education Committee.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm trying to, as I scan through the amendment, there appear to be a number of sections. And in some cases there's a square footage, a specific square footage designation which appears to be an authorization.

And if I could, through you, for instance, in Section 513, is that intended to provide a funding level that would be greater than what the project would have otherwise been eligible to receive, if the gentleman knows?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann, do you care to respond?

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe the answer is yes. Each of these sections pertains to a unique project, and if memory serves in the case of Section 513, there is a -- a school project where there was some element of the design that required more square feet than would typically be deemed eligible. Say there -- there was an auditorium that needed to be larger for certain reasons; maybe it's shared with a middle school. So for -- for reasons of that nature, in various sections of the bill, we did allow for more square feet, which does allow for more state support for the given project.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And -- and in those cases, trying to recall when

I was First Selectman, I think there are, there are pretty strict parameters around which the reimbursement rate is paid. And so even when there's additional square footage, through you, the municipality doesn't necessarily qualify for anything in terms of an additional rate that they would have already qualified for; it is instead a recognition that in some circumstances the square footage exceeds what might have at one point thought been appropriate. And so the funding level in terms of the percentage the state picks up versus the percentage the town picks up remain relatively the same.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is my understanding as well; the percentage of state share versus local share remains constant.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank -- thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And -- and in a couple of sections, again, where they're not specially talking about square footage but rather population, I know in the district that I serve in some cases the populations in certain schools seem to go down, so go up. And if you're caught kind of in the middle of a design phase of a school, are these attempts to make final adjustments, let's say, so that for instance if a -- a school in -- I'll pick the City of Boston -- even though that wouldn't come under this, but it's safer that way -- if a school within Boston were to have had a project approved and it was approved with a base population that was based on a projection, that by the time the project actually went to construction that number may have changed, is this season attempt to try and, let say hold municipalities harmless for those circumstances?

Is that correct, through you, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

For the City of Boston, Connecticut and other communities that may be in this bill, yes. There are instances where projected enrollment and current

enrollment didn't quite match up, and through this amendment, we are seeking to hold municipalities harmless for the differential.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

And in those cases, is there some kind of a review, let's say, from the State Department of Education of the population projections and those that actually exist to be sure that these -- these estimates first given and -- and the numbers that we would find here within the bill aren't wildly different, they're not just picked out of the sky?

Is that correct, through you, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

We -- we generally try to avoid pulling numbers from the sky, and in the instance of this bill, we met with representatives of the Bureau of School Construction, now located within the Department of -- of Construction Services and went over the

circumstances around each school and tried to make sure that, indeed, there were good reasons for the new enrollment numbers that are included in the amendment.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

And my last question, Mr. Speaker, is that it, that again, in a couple of the areas it appeared as though there might have either been some final action with regard to financing or some additional action with regard to financing.

And, again, I think my memory serves me correctly, those are all important in terms of bond authorizations. They're important in terms of reimbursement in, as far as the state's reimbursement portion is concerned. And so in each of the sections here where those might actually be laid out, it, I -- I don't want to say they're notwithstanding but my recollection is that in most cases you had to have the approval on the beforehand, but in some cases remembering that we went to a couple referenda about building a school or improvements to a school, and you may not have had all those approvals at the time

someone got started.

So are these more often, I guess -- and if I could, through you, Mr. Speaker -- are these specifically to recognize in the cases where there may be additional money needed and those approvals came after the initial project was approved, that they still comply with what we intend from the Legislature in terms of that relationship for funding between the state and the municipality.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

And through you, Mr. Speaker.

As I understand the question, the answer is yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do see that there are a number of schools here beyond those that are to be built in the Town of Boston, Connecticut, and it seems to me that it's a -- a very strong commitment on the part of state to continue the relationship that it has with

municipalities. Even in very difficult financial times, I think we're recognizing that they're not only difficult in Connecticut but they're difficult in Boston.

And so I thank the gentleman for his answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentlewoman from the 132nd, Representative Kupchick; Representative Kupchick, hello. You're up.

REP. KUPCHICK (132nd):

I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just rise in support and -- and wanted to actually thank the good Chairman of the Education Committee for including a school in our district that unfortunately had an issue with PCBs that were located in the gym, and the gym had to be closed off and the students couldn't use it for a long period of time. And it obviously was something that was unexpected for our community, and it, a very costly endeavor.

We in our town have ten elementary school -- eleven elementary schools, two high schools, and three middle schools, and we spend a considerable amount of money on education and on our building infrastructure,

so it is, I wanted to at least be on the record as noting a thanks to the Chairman and to the General Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, madam.

The gentleman from the 86th, Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. You know, every year I, we, I guess, are faced with this -- this issue that the assembly addresses, and I think in my town, we -- we had two issues, one relating to roof pitch and one relating to school size.

And I think while it was somewhat controversy over, controversial over what pitch of roof may have, it seems as if we continue to come back each year and -- and have carve-outs to address certain issues for schools that might be predating some of our laws and have to continue to get waivers and go through that process. And I wonder sometimes if we should look at legislation more similar to the one that we previously passed that sort of comprehensively addresses our

school construction statutes.

While the waiver process is certainly an important process to have, sometimes I think the waivers could end up swallowing up the rule, you know, waivers being the exception. And it might make at some point in time the necessity to start looking at the -- the rules overall.

And for years we've discussed whether or not to, I think, take a look at school construction, how maybe we can improve the way the statutes are written to help us save money in the long run under the budget. And of course I'm always supportive; I don't think I've ever voted against a school construction bill and I probably never will because there are so many different projects in it to help our districts.

But I might begin to just remind us here and to maybe take the effort to begin looking at a comprehensive review of maybe doing, looking at sort of boilerplate construction projects and things of that nature.

One of the projects that is being approved here today is -- is an interesting one, where we have to accept the space requirements for our campus in North Branford. And sometimes we have certain rules in our

statutes, which I think try to make us be cost effective, but at times it could end up in the long run, I think, costing the state money.

In particular, in that project we constructed an -- an auditorium, and in order to make sure that the auditorium was sized appropriately for the system, they connected it to two schools. And I think in the long run it was the most efficient way to build that auditorium and maximize the state reimbursement that you could obtain, which I think ended up being a very cost-effective measure for the community and was probably a win-win situation for both the state and the town, because now you only had to -- to construct one auditorium, servicing two schools.

But what we see happening is each time the school tries to do a renovation or, you know, do a roof repair, in this situation, they had done a comprehensive renovation of our intermediate school, it triggered the reimbursement requirements and the, because of that connection to the two schools. And so each and every time we do have to seek out a waiver.

And maybe, you know, in that circumstance when you can't deal with it comprehensively by creating a standard, maybe that would be like a cost-benefit

analysis for each town. But I think it probably at least serves as an example to point toward maybe needing to look at how we do school construction in -- in the State of Connecticut. Maybe there'll be opportunities for us to save money on a comprehensive level.

But I certainly stand in support of what we're doing here today, and maybe we could leave that question for another day. And I want to thank the Chairs and certainly the Ranking Members for putting this together. And I'm certainly thankful that this bill is not coming out at 11:55, as it has done sometimes in the evening. So it's great to see that we are addressing this legislation in a timely manner for the Governor to be able to sign it.

And thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentleman from the 69th, Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I'm looking at the file copy and the report of the Education Committee and the testimony that was

submitted to the Education Committee in connection
with the bill that is before us.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative, we're on Senate "A."

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

Okay; and I'll save my comments for when we
actually get past the Senate "A." Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Very good, sir.

The gentleman from the 50th, Representative
Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I too rise in support of the bill that's before
us, and I do want to thank the Chairman and I want to
thank the Ranking Member for their work and including
a project. As the previous speaker eluded to,
sometimes our communities stray in terms of going
through the process of meeting all of the
requirements, and I appreciate the flexibility of the
Chair and also the Ranking Member in making this
happen so that we can get back on board.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentleman from the 87th, Representative
Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good evening.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Good evening.

REP. YACCARINO (87th):

A question to the proponent of the, of the
amendment --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed.

REP. YACCARINO (87th):

-- through you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you Mr. Speaker, when you, when the
Construction Services get involved in pricing, do they
get involved with actual pricing per square foot with
the architects and the builders for those projects --
through you, Mr. Speaker -- or recommendations,
rather?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes and no.

The Bureau of Construction Services sets forth standards and guidelines that relate to appropriate costs for square foot and appropriate cost per pupil, those sorts of things. The -- the details of how it works out for each project are left to local control.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87th):

Thank you for that answer.

And through, we just passed through the MORE Commission the other evening, the COG, the regionalization. Would they ever consider looking at having basically in each COG a building department for lower costs and more efficiency?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Actually, we have gone and developed at the state level some models for high schools, middle schools, elementary schools that localities can draw upon, so

that if a district does not want to start from -- from the ground up making a design but rather have some kind of a model to rely upon, that they can actually turn to the Bureau of Construction Services for some of those models. So that was intended to promote efficiency.

There's also regional cooperation in all the regional school districts. I'm not aware of whether the RESCs have also chosen to get involved. Certainly the -- the MORE Commission this year did not speak to that issue.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87th):

Thank you for that answer. And it makes quite a bit of sense, and I applaud you for that effort.

I -- I support this wholeheartedly. Our -- our town, North Haven, actually will need a middle school or renovations, and hopefully in the future we could utilize this. It's important for the state and it's important for our education and the safety, safeness and well-being for our students.

Thank you.

mhr/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

371
June 5, 2013

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentleman from the 2nd, Representative
Carter.

REP. CARTER (2nd):

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

One question, through you, to the proponent of
the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed sir.

REP. CARTER (2nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, I noticed that the schools are
reimbursed at different rates. How do they determine
that rate?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So the rates are determined by a ranking of all
of the different school districts by wealth, as
determined by grand list. And there's a sliding scale
that's either from 10 to 70 percent or 20 to 80

percent, depending on the type of project, whether it's a new project or a renovation project.

And those slide, the -- the 20-to-80 sliding scale has been in existence for decades. The 10-to-70 sliding scale was put in place just a couple years ago to ensure that the state is getting the most economic result. The 10-to-70 scale is applied if a district is using what is deemed to be a more expensive route, and the 20-to-80 scale, if the district has demonstrated it is using the most cost-effective route.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Carter.

REP. CARTER (2nd):

Yes, Mr. Speaker; thank you, very much, for the answer.

I was wondering, maybe, could you clarify just a little bit. I have a little hard time understanding how I get into, for instance, a 20-to-80 scale would work. Is that the schools on the lower end -- or I say lower-end of wealth -- would get 80 percent and the schools on the higher end would get the 20 percent reimbursement?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

A couple of examples that come to mind: The City of New London is one of the -- the districts in the State of Connecticut has the least property wealth due to so much land that is, that is not taxable, owned by nonprofits or -- or the state. So they have a reimbursement rate of roughly 79 percent from the state with a 21 percent local share. A district like of that of Greenwich would be at the opposite end of the spectrum with its large grand list, you know, closer to 20 percent state reimbursement to 80 percent local share.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Carter.

REP. CARTER (2nd):

And just to clarify. He -- he said in the institute or -- or in the instance of Greenwich it was 80 percent local share?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Carter.

REP. CARTER (2nd):

Thank you, very much.

And I -- I thank the good Chair for his answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The gentleman from the 74th, Representative
Noujaim.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Good afternoon.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Good -- good evening, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

(Inaudible.)

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

-- if I may, if I may recommend to you --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Of course.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

-- that every time you call on somebody, a new person to speak, you say look at me, I am Mr. Speaker. This way there'll be no confusion here.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Pay attention.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

I will not make this mistake, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

I'm gratified.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Mr. Speaker, I -- I rise in support of -- of this bill. Obviously education is very important to all of us in all of our city, especially in our cities, so that our youth will be helped, nurtured to grow to become really great citizens and support our community.

In Waterbury, Mr. Speaker, we have been very, very blessed. We have three, wonderful magnet schools that have been built within your city, and quite honestly they revitalized our neighborhood. The Arts Magnet School was -- was built downtown Waterbury and -- and support youth from throughout the district.

Also, the Maloney Magnet School was built in the

south end of Waterbury, and then we have the Rotella Magnet School which was built in my district, on the east end of Waterbury, all of those schools within the past 15 years or so.

And then we have some public schools that -- that were built, K through 8. One of them is Duggan School, and Mr. Speaker, Duggan School has, I have great memories for Duggan School. When I first came to this country, I used to -- and you will love this story -- I used to frequent Duggan School because there was this first-year, young lady who teaches at Duggan School. And I used to frequent the school, not because I loved education back then, because there was this young lady, Representative Fleischmann that eventually became my beautiful wife. And she was a first, first-year teacher at Duggan School.

And about five years ago -- three years ago, as a matter of fact, Duggan School was renovated. It was brought back to K through 8, and the good thing about it is that we retained the facade of the school, and it looks so beautiful and so, it adds so much to the community.

In addition to that, we have the Reed School. And in Lines 465 to 472 of this bill, we are allowed

some unfunded or -- I'm sorry -- unused funds to complete that school because they did such a great job, the City of Waterbury did a wonderful job insofar as building the school and staying under budget. But while they were under budget to complete the school, they found some contaminants and some wetlands in the north end of the city, and now with this bill they will be able to use those unexpended funds into cleaning up the contaminants and -- and allowing the school to reopen or to open, as a matter of fact.

We also have the Carrington School, which has been renovated, and we have the Career Academy School which will be open this fall. All of those are schools that have been a wonderful, wonderful addition to the City of Waterbury to help the youth of our city. And we are very, very pleased and -- and appreciative for the State of Connecticut and the Department of Education and for the Commissioner to approve those schools.

As a matter of fact, ladies and gentlemen, just back on May 15, we had, we had the students from the Children's Community School come before us and -- and sing for us before we opened the section on that day, and the Children's Community School have petitioned to

have a charter school. And Waterbury is the only city in the State of Connecticut that is not blessed to have a charter school, but that has changed as of yesterday, where the Board of Education of the State of Connecticut approved the charter school for the City of Waterbury. So hopefully one of these days we'll be coming in and asking for funds from the State of Connecticut to establish the charter school in the City of Waterbury.

In addition to that, we are right now looking into the possibility and searching for some pieces of property to build the East End School, where right now the east end of the City of Waterbury in my district does not have a new K through 8 school, and we have through the efforts of our mayor and our board of education, we have found, we are looking to pursue some possible pieces of land where we can rehabilitate some contaminated property to build a new K through 8 to take away all of the crowding in Chase Elementary School and -- and the Generali School, which both are in the east end of Waterbury.

So we are truly, truly blessed. We have had some great success building schools in the City of Waterbury, really thanking not only this

administration but also the previous administration of the City of Waterbury for having the vision to come to the state and to ask the State of Connecticut for funds to build our schools and putting in our own budget in too with the 20 percent that Representative Fleischmann just spoke about.

So we are blessed to have so many good schools in the City of Waterbury, and we look forward for the State of Connecticut to continue on this path to approve new schools so all of the old, antiquated, old buildings one of these days will be eliminated and we have some new schools throughout our State of Connecticut so that our students be served and into the future to make them, to make them strong advocate again for education themselves and to improve the State of Connecticut.

Thank you, so much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentleman from the 59th, Representative Kiner.

REP. KINER (59th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good evening.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this

amendment and ultimately the underlying bill. I also stand to publicly thank the Chairman of the Education Committee, Representative Fleischmann, along with his Co-chair, Senator Stillman, for all their hard work in getting this amendment together for the school construction bill.

The Town of Enfield overwhelmingly approved a referendum in November to consolidate their two high schools. Now this amendment will allow for the construction to start an entire year earlier than anticipated. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the students of Enfield being able to go to this consolidated high school which will become -- it -- it is a renovation, but for all intents and purposes will be a new high school. They'll be able to utilize new technologies and it -- it really will be a state-of-the-art facility.

So, again, I -- I stand in strong support and thank the Chairman of the Education Committee for bringing this bill out.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Remark further on Senate "A?" Will you remark further on Senate "A?"

If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Opposed, Nay.

The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Will you remark on the bill as amended?

Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Sorry about jumping the gun a little earlier on the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

It happens.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

But I am looking at this file copy and the testimony and the joint Favorable Report on this bill, calling for the change of the pitch of the roof from the requirement for educational buildings at one-half-of-an-inch per foot, changing the pitch to a quarter-of-an-inch per foot, bringing it back to the pitch level that was called for under the Building Code and which, in fact, was the pitch that was called for up

to 2003, when a piece of legislation was passed in -- in that year that changed it.

And I -- I think that it's important and I'm -- I'm taking some time here today, because I don't think in the 25 years that I have been in the General Assembly, I have seen a clearer example of a case study of -- of an actually unnatural experiment showing some problems with the process that we have here in the Legislature about public policy making, about the consequences of making decisions and -- and how much they cost the taxpayers and ultimately the -- the students across the State of Connecticut.

So if I might just take a moment. Back in 2003, there was a -- a concern about mold in public schools. At that time, there was testimony offered in front of the Education Committee that one part of the solution to a mold problem in a public school or any school was to increase the pitch of the roof because flat roofs or at least roofs that didn't have a sufficient amount of pitch were prone to leakage; leakage led to water infiltration and ultimately mold growth, which in turn can be very serious as a problem for children, especially those that have asthma or other respiratory problems, and even the staff that might suffer from

those kinds of problems and even people who didn't suffer from those kinds of problems who might develop them because of their exposure to mold.

So we were very concerned that we were causing injury to the school children and to the school staffs across the State of Connecticut. That was ten years ago. And so our reaction was to pass a piece of legislation back in 2003, and it had an explanation and that's summarized in the J.F. report that it was necessary to do this in order to protect the children and the staff in the schools across Connecticut.

And there even were things like indoor air quality guidelines for occupied buildings under construction from, there was recited in the report various studies, something from the U.S. Government about ways to avoid air pollution and problems of mold in public buildings. And the support for this came from, among others -- this was not some sort of rush to judgment by a Chair of a committee who is carried away by some cause or trying to make a name for him or herself.

I mean the people that supported this were Theodore Sergi, the head of the Department of Education thought that this was a good idea; Elizabeth

Brown, the Commission on Children thought that this was a good and necessary idea. Many students came and testified, as well as teachers; the head of the AFLCIO came -- not the head but a -- a high-ranking officer; and, a lady from the, I guess the Northeast District Department of Health came and supported this legislation. CAPSS came and supported it. The CEA came out in support of it. CABE came out in support of it, and, in fact, the Connecticut Business and Industry Association came out in support of this legislation.

There was no opposition, whatsoever, expressed by anyone to the 2003 legislation. So not surprisingly, the Legislature, concerned about children's health and safety and the staffs of the schools, decided to increase the pitch requirements for roofs.

I was here in the Legislature at this time. I voted for that 2003 piece of legislation and, in part, based on the testimony of the various individuals, the report that came to the Education Committee and the consensus that that was what was necessary in order to improve the health and safety of the school children of the State of Connecticut.

It passed every committee that it went through,

and in the Finance Committee, where I served at that time, it drew only two negative votes; one was from former-Representative Ferrari, and the other one was from past-Representative Richard Belden. They were the only two who, in effect, stood up to the consensus that this was necessary in order to protect school children.

Now, at the time I do not recollect a fiscal note or an explanation as to how much this was going to cost. But in the legislation that is before us today and in the report that was produced by the Education Committee, those costs were indicated. The cost is basically, according to one piece of testimony, about a 50 percent increase in the cost of every roof. There was one letter from someone in Fairfield indicating that the cost for the, replacing a high school roof in Fairfield was, because of the extra pitch required by the half-inch instead of the quarter-inch pitch requirement, was over \$5 million -- \$5 million -- \$5 million.

Now, one of the people testifying today and in this bill that is before us today indicated that this will save, going forward, hundreds of millions of dollars by not having the increased pitch on the roof.

And there was further testimony by the people who came to, this year to talk about it that there has been absolutely no scientific evidence whatsoever that increasing the pitch of a roof provides any safeguard against mold; none. Witness after witness after witness testified, people with backgrounds in architecture and various other scientific fields stated that there was no scientific evidence whatsoever that increasing the pitch of the roof would provide any safeguard against mold.

Now the thing that's important and the reason why I'm bringing this up is that in the last ten years, we have reroofed or built new schools to a huge extent. In fact, I think I would -- since I don't know the answer, perhaps the Chair of the Education Committee might be able to help me out here, so through you, Mr. Speaker, a question for the Chair of the Education Committee.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

Oh, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, can the Chair of the Education Committee give me an approximate number of new schools

or substantially renovated schools that involved roofs that have been built in the last ten years?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I don't have such a figure available to me right now. I also would observe that Senate Amendment "A" struck Section 2 of the bill that spoke to roof pitch; it was dealt with in a previous piece of legislation before this assembly this afternoon. It is not in the bill as amended by Senate "A."

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

Maybe I wasn't jumping the gun after all.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Perhaps you're right.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

But if we, if the Chair will indulge me, my point is this: The legislation must have been, the number of schools just in the list that's in front of us today runs into the dozens, and new schools, renovated schools. We must have spent hundreds of millions of

dollars in the last ten years extra for roofs on schools across the State of Connecticut in an attempt to improve air quality, in an attempt to protect the children of the State of Connecticut and apparently, based on the best evidence we have, that was produced in front of the Education Committee and without any scientific basis, whatsoever, for attempting to do that.

And so I'd like everyone in the Chamber to keep that in mind as we go forward with other legislation this year and in the next session that we have, that we are often asked to do things based on someone coming to tell us we need to safeguard the children or we need to safeguard public health or we need to do something else that is going to cost potentially hundreds of millions of dollars over the course of years. And here we are a decade later with no proof that those changes made any difference in terms of air quality, and we required every school in the State of Connecticut to be roofed in that higher-pitched level.

It's a case study, Mr. Speaker, of something that I think we should pay attention to, and that is to get truly scientific evidence before we make these kinds of decisions. If people wonder why our budgets are so

high, why it seems like we never have enough money to pay for the things that we think we ought to be doing, whether people believe we are, should be doing, whether even we want to do, this is the kind of example of spending money we didn't need to spend to try to solve a problem we could not solve in the means, the methods that we were choosing.

I wonder how many others. This is a perfect example, because we have it, we have the proof of what happened ten years ago. We have the testimony of what was before us earlier today, and we are committed to or we're looking at this evidence. It's evident that we don't have any scientific proof that did anything to save public health but we have plenty of evidence that we spent millions and hundreds of millions of dollars over the last decade.

And not only that, but when a roof is set up at as a pitch of a half-an-inch, sooner or later, that roof is going to need to be replaced. Now you have a choice. You can put up, you're going to have to spend more money, I assume, on reroofing or repairing in a substantial way that higher-pitched roof. So we've committed ourselves across the State of Connecticut to a much larger level of expenditure to do the roofs on

the schools across the State of Connecticut.

I just wonder how many other examples there are where we have committed ourselves to a more expensive way of doing things in Connecticut in the well-meaning but misguided belief that we are protecting public health or safety.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentleman from the 57th, Representative Davis.

REP. C. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand in strong support of this bill as amended. I have the privilege of representing two of the fastest-growing towns in Connecticut, both East Windsor and Ellington, and this bill contains three very, very important projects to our community. We have aging elementary schools, and as our population has grown, the need for these elementary schools to be improved upon, be renovated has grown with it.

And we saw just recently in the Town of East Windsor, that they adopted having the -- the trailers on the front lawn of the school in order to have

multiple classes serve in them. What this project does is makes necessary renovations so that we can permanent structures on the property so our students don't have to be in these movable trailers but rather in an actual structure that's updated and brought up to modern codes in the Broad Brook Elementary School. And I have the pleasure of serving on the Broad Brook Elementary School Governance Council, and -- and see firsthand, month after month what these improvements will do to the school's culture and the school's environment that will help our students achieve even greater things in the future.

In Ellington, we have one of the fastest-growing populations, and in the Crystal Lake area of town, we saw that the school which formerly housed about one-to-two classrooms per grade just simply couldn't handle the number of students that were coming in. So the project that's listed in Section 1 of this bill will do great things for our community and that we'll be able to expand that school, increase the grounds of that school as well, so our students have even greater opportunities moving forward.

And with the Windermere School Project, our largest elementary school in the Town of Ellington,

it's going to do a tremendous amount of help so that we can have better facilities, upgraded facilities for our growing population.

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand in very strong support of this bill and I ask my colleagues to support it as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Gentleman from the 122nd, Representative Larry Miller.

REP. L. MILLER (122nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I just have some comments.

I probably will support the bill, but if you, if you were flying across the country and you looked down, I would say that 90 percent of the commercial buildings all have flat roofs. And the reason they have no problems with them, it's because of maintenance. We expect our janitors to go up on the roof during the fall and get those leaves out of the corners of the roof where they plug up the drain; that's the main problem.

And getting mold from the water on the roof, you

might get some in, into the building, but generally there's a leak someplace in the building, maybe a broken pipe in the wall. And once water is there in a dark area, you're going to have mold grow. So the roof is not really a -- a major source of -- of mold in any school.

Again, maintenance is a key, and if you don't have good people in the schools or allow for a crew to go around in the fall to clean the drains on the roof, you're going to get water backing up.

But, again, 90 percent of the -- or more -- of the roofs across this country are flat-roofed. But generally the commercial units and industrial plants all have maintenance men that go up there on their regular basis to make sure those drains are clean. If you don't do that then you're going to have a problem.

But, again, mold comes from water leaking someplace in the building. It may be a broken pipe. It could be all, it may in their locker room behind the showers there's a leak. But that's up to the maintenance people to find that leak. And if you don't have qualified people -- I'm not saying that you have to a, you know, a -- a mechanical engineer clean up your schools, but you have some people that will

make a good observation as to where there might be some standing water and why it's there.

So, you know, the roof is not, it's -- it's getting a bad name for itself because it's flat, but they -- they should check further into the school building to find out where it may be leaking, maybe a radiator, all sorts of places where this mold can grow.

So, again, I kind of agree with Representative O'Neill. I think he hit the nail on the head, and, again, I'll support the bill but there's got to be a -- a little more observation on the part of the people that clean our school buildings.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Gentleman from the 8th, Representative Ackert.
Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

I hear you; thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And just to comment. I do want to thank Representative Fleischmann and -- and Senator Stillman for their effort in putting this -- this together. And I'm, we, I understand a little more about the

process now and why we wait until the end, just in case we need a school or project put on at the, before the summer starts.

But one thing I wanted to keep in mind is that -- and others to keep in mind -- is that we went through a process this spring about school safety and want to make sure that some of the provisions that we discussed are in these projects going forward and as we stand in strong support of their efforts and this process.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I -- I encourage everybody to support it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?
Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

If not, staff and guests please come to the --
whoops.

Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, no; no.
Representative Mushinsky, you were, you were looking for recognition before I --

REP. MUSHINSKY (85th):

I was.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

-- finished the announcement.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85th):

Yes, I was. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I've already, I've already expressed my concerns that we are sacrificing children and teachers' health, potentially, to save money. When I did look at the transcript of the hearing on this bill -- and I know we've stripped out, the Senate has stripped out the section on roofs; we already voted it earlier today.

But the testimony was all about the dollars and cents of the roof business, folks, business managers of the Connecticut Association of School Business Officials, the Mansfield School Director of Finance, the Garland Company Roofing, and the Lawrence Associates Architects; there are no microbiologists here. There is no science here talking about the impact on children's health directly, so I don't think we have the answer either way. But we certainly have testimony that changing the requirement will save money. It's really about saving money; that's really the main argument here. The science was not at the hearing.

And I have to vote for this bill anyway, because my school, one of my schools is in here and I need to

mhr/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

397
June 5, 2013

support my town, but -- and I will -- but I -- I hope we don't regret this decision today, changing the pitch. I hope we don't create ponding on the schools, and I hope we're not back here a few years from now reassessing our decision.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, madam.

Now will you remark further on the bill as amended?

If not, staff and guests please come to the Well of the House, members take your seat. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll
call; members to the Chamber, please. The House of Representatives is voting by roll call; members to the Chamber, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If so, the machine will be locked.

The Clerk will take a tally.

And, Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Mr. Speaker, in concurrence with the Senate,
Substitute Senate Bill 876, as amended by Senate "A."

Total Number Voting	142
Necessary for Passage	72
Those voting Yea	142
Those voting Nay	0
Absent and not voting	8

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The bill as amended is passed, in concurrence
with the Senate.

House will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The House will come back to order.

Distinguished Majority Leader, Representative
Aresimowicz.

REP. ARESIMOWICZ (30th):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an
announcement, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Please proceed, sir.

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VETO
SESSION**

**VOL. 56
PART 17
5161 - 5482**

To be followed, Madam President, by the third item of business, Calendar page 6, Calendar 554, House Bill 5277.

And then to be followed, Madam President, as the fourth item, Calendar page 14, Calendar 694, House Bill Number 6360.

Thank you, Madam President.

If the Clerk would begin the call of those items.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 3, Calendar 432, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 876, AN ACT CONCERNING AUTHORIZATION OF STATE GRANT COMMITMENTS FOR SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECTS AND ROOF PITCH REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL BUILDINGS, favorable report of the Committee on Education, and there's an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon. Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Good afternoon, Madam President. How are you today?

THE CHAIR:

Fine, and yourself, ma'am?

SENATOR STILLMAN:

I'm fine, thank you.

I move the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage.

Will you remark, ma'am?

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President.

This is our annual school construction bill, which will now incorporate an amendment when I call for it. It is -- a bill was -- excuse me -- was sent out of committee with some approved projects by the department that were already -- that are now being approved for the pipeline. They met their necessary requirements to move forward.

With that, we have some more projects to add, so I'd like to ask the Clerk to please call LCO Number 8890.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 8890, Senate "A," offered by Senators Stillman and Representative Fleischmann.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on adoption.

Will you remark, ma'am?

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

This amendment deletes section 2 because we already took care of the roof pitch issue in another bill in the -- through -- the other the Public Safety Committee having to do with building standards. So we're striking section 2, we're adding a variety of projects that are ready to go, possibly a little earlier, some that have asked for some consideration from the department because of space needs and reimbursement, and again, I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Will you remark on the amendment?

If not, we'll try your minds.

All in favor of the amendment, please say aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed.

The amendment passes.

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

With that, we have a very comprehensive bill on school construction. I would venture to say that most members of this Circle have a project in there as do some -- most members in the House, because we know how important school construction is to our districts. So with that, if there are -- thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I, of course, rise to support this particular bill now that it has been amended with the proper changes with regards to the roof pitch issue which probably was the only real controversial piece in there. It is, of course, one of those special and unique bills that has language from all districts, both House and Senate, Republican districts, Democratic districts, and so on, that is done in a bipartisan way and, of course, is supported by all.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark? Will you remark?

I'm going to call for a roll call vote on this?

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Yes. With that, Madam President, I thank Senator Boucher for her comments and again urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll call vote and the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Senators return to the chamber. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

The first vote of the last day.

Senator LeBeau, would you like to join us in voting?
I thought you might want to join us, you know, the
first vote of the last day.

Senator Kelly. Senator Kelly, would you like to join
us in a vote today? Thank you.

All members have voted? All members have voted, the
machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk, will you please call a tally.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 876, as amended

Total Number Voting	35
Those voting Yea	35
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

The bill has passed.

Mr. Clerk.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

I'm sorry.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, Madam President, I move immediate transmittal of
Senate Bill 876, as amended, to the House of
Representatives.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 19, Calendar 243, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 1043, AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTICUT STATE-WIDE PORT AUTHORITY, favorable report of the Committee on Transportation, and there's an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maynard, good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR MAYNARD:

Good afternoon. Madam President. Thank you.

I move the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on acceptance and passage.

Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR MAYNARD:

Yes, Madam President.

The Clerk is in possession of Amendment LCO Number 8697. I'd ask that the amendment be called.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CHAIR:

LCO Number 8697, Senate "A," offered by Senator Maynard, Williams, et al.

THE CHAIR:

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**EDUCATION
PART 1
1 – 357**

**2013
INDEX**

DR. JEFFREY TRAWICK-SMITH: Of course.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you very much for your time.

DR. JEFFREY TRAWICK-SMITH: Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: We go now to Richard Lawrence to be followed by Roberto Fernandez.

RICHARD LAWRENCE: That's going to be a tough act to follow. Senator Stillman, Representative Fleischmann, Members of the Education Committee, my testimony today is on maybe a little more of a mundane subject than some of the previous ones. It's going to be centered on Senate Bill 876 and House Bill 6079 regarding roof pitches.

I am Richard S. Lawrence, AIA, President of the Lawrence Associates Architects Planners P.C., a 66-year-old architectural and planning firm located in Manchester since its establishment by my father in 1947.

Municipal school buildings have always represented a significant portion of our project portfolio with an even greater emphasis during my 43 years in practice.

We have designed several hundred school buildings, including new buildings, additions, alterations, code corrections and roof replacements.

For the past five or six years I have volunteered to serve as one of two Connecticut architects on the Connecticut School Construction Coalition, a group composed of a diverse range of individuals representing municipal officials, contractors and design professionals, all involved in the school construction process.

We have been meeting for the purpose of seeking ways to improve the review, construction and reporting process so as to reduce the cost of school construction in Connecticut.

Today I would like to speak about SB 876 and also House Bill 6079. You should have already received a letter from Diane Harp Jones, CEO and Executive Vice-President of AI Connecticut, with a copy of my January 8, 2013 letter with two attachments.

After reading the letter from Mr. Herbert B. Fishman, you will understand the extensive list of items that might affect, that might be affected by the current minimum roof slope requirement of one-half inch per foot when replacing an existing school roof, all with potential significant increases in cost.

I intend to supplement those documents with some additional information in support of HB 6079 AN ACT CONCERNING MINIMUM ROOF PITCH REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECTS.

I submit this information in an effort to convince you to approve HB 6079 and disapprove Senate Bill 876.

I do not feel that there is any need to spend additional taxpayers' money for another study and have another year pass when the state and municipalities are wasting tens of millions of dollars with no direct benefits or documented improvement to indoor air quality.

It is my understanding that the steeper roof pitch requirement was proposed as a result of a school that discovered mold above suspended ceilings and it was partially based on the assumption the mold was the result of a leaking roof.

Perhaps there may have been a primary reason for the mold formation but there could have been other contributing factors, such as a leaky water pipe, condensation formed by inadequate insulation or ventilation, moisture leaking from ducts and so forth.

Partially as a result of this condition and other air quality concerns, Public Act 03-220 AN ACT CONCERNING INDOOR AIR QUALITY IN SCHOOLS was passed, presumably to prevent the same condition from occurring in other schools.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Excuse me. We know you have written testimony. If you could please summarize.

RICHARD LAWRENCE: Okay. As can be documented in two studies that were attached to the letter that I sent on January 8th, we have been finding that the added costs for the steeper roof pitch to be approximately 50 percent more than if the slope of a quarter of an inch per foot was used.

I would like to thank you for this opportunity to address this issue and provide testimony that I feel should support passage of HB 6079 with its resulting savings of millions of dollars on an annual basis.

Allowing the industry standard of a quarter of an inch per foot should be also allowed for both new and replacement school projects.

I have copies of my testimony and there's additional information and I am certainly willing to make myself available for additional questions.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you very much. The change in roof pitch occurred before I joined this Committee and it's always been a bit of a

mystery to me where the figure that's in current statute came from and so we appreciate your weighing in on that. And if you do have extra copies of your testimony, you should get it over to the folks who are the Clerks and Assistant Clerks of the Committee and they'll get it distributed.

Are there questions from Members of the Committee? Representative Ackert to be followed by Senator Boucher.

REP. ACKERT: Thank you for your testimony and is the, you did mention a little bit about where the bill may have come from and on the pitch and trying to increase the pitch and I'm still at a loss as to why that such small grade of increase would make a substantial difference.

Is there a standard criteria for weight requirements that is more, because I think of all the snow levels that we have heard about in past, and I was on four roofs and one of them we got moved off because the weight was not.

Is there a standard for more of that reasoning, to hold the snow weight? Because I think, I don't know if this was generated from, or just from a mold situation with water leaking. If you could just quickly answer that.

RICHARD LAWRENCE: Yes. Actually, I think there are two separate issues here. The structural support requirements is required by the Connecticut Building Code. It is in there. So that the roof and its structure has to be designed to support the snow load and rain and so forth.

The slope of the roof is a different issue, and as you can imagine, there are roofs that are pitched six and twelve, similar to most of our houses, let's say, with shingles. Those shed

both snow and rain quicker than a roof with a lower pitch.

But the industry standard, if you want to call it, and in my testimony I have referenced the International Building Code, which is the basis for the Connecticut Building Code, one quarter of an inch per foot across almost the entire United States is acceptable. It is fine. Roofs drain well. They don't pond. So the structure and that is a separate issue.

We're talking about the slope. And the key problem here is the half of an inch per foot starts to create in huge amounts of extra insulation, or you add in additional roof drains. Now you have to have more plumbing.

When you're re-roofing a building and you have a pitch that's coming up at a quarter of an inch and all of a sudden it's a half of an inch, where a low slope, or a low roof meets the vertical roof, if it's properly designed, that wall has internal drainage that lets water and moisture come out onto the roof. Now that's hidden behind the roof and it creates even more damage or problems, so it has to.

This is why the cost to us and the taxpayers at the whole state for the last almost ten years has been at least 50 percent more because of this.

And there's, you're right that this was, in my understanding originally proposed because a school or schools had some indoor air quality and mold problems and they essentially, I think said, one shoe fits all.

But you can have a roof as I mentioned, that's pitched six and twelve and have it leak just as much as a flat roof. That's not the key reason

why you have indoor air quality and mold forming.

But I have to say that in my experience, the state is wasting millions of dollars on year after year after year. I suggest and I would request that this Committee contact the school facilities unit and ask them if they have any indication as to the millions of dollars per year that schools are being re-roofed and I would say that 50 percent of that now is money that could be saved and used for other purposes.

REP. ACKERT: Thank you for your testimony. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you. Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank you for your testimony. This may not be a real exciting topic for a lot of people but it certainly piques my interest having been on the school board as well, as my colleague, and being on building facilities committees quite a number of times, and I believe that we do encounter substantial problems in our schools with flat roofs on the many things that you just mentioned.

Whether it has to do with leakage, with mold, with ponding and these days in our unusual weather patterns that we're having where it seems to be much more typical that we're getting large snowstorms, the weight of snow on flat roofs and the potential of losing a roof could be substantially expensive given the changing in roof pitch.

And so I think that there has probably been some thought given as to why those regulations were changing, particularly for new construction and so I just would say that I

appreciate the various comments that you made but there's still some concern I think locally in many of our schools with regard to the issue of flat roofs.

And you did point to the effect of cost being a major, major factor and of course, that is always a big factor in our schools, our school boards. But the long-term costs are maybe the damage that could potentially offset some of the original higher costs of putting in a higher pitched roof. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RICHARD LAWRENCE: I would like to respectfully disagree, though, that the difference between the quarter of an inch and a half of an inch per foot pitch, if the structure is designed correctly to meet the current snow loads, you would not have structural issues and it should not make any difference whatsoever in the long term maintenance of the building.

In fact, it could be higher, because now you have to have more roof drains with the half of an inch foot pitch and there are also roof systems that now are precluded because the half of an inch per foot will cause them to, in the hot summer, just start to slip and you have to nail them. I have to say as a Connecticut taxpayer almost my whole life, it is a waste of our money.

SENATOR BOUCHER: Thank you for that comment because that's the kind of dialogue we appreciate. We want to have differences of opinion to learn more about the topic and so forth, and having an expert in the area is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your testimony.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Other questions? If not, thank you very much.

RICHARD LAWRENCE: Thank you.

182
pat/gbr

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

February 15, 2013
11:00 A.M.

TIM MULCAHEY: Good afternoon, Senator Stillman, and other Members of the Committee.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Mulcahey, welcome first of all. Secondly, did you submit any testimony?

TIM MULCAHEY: I have it with me in the folder.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Oh, okay. If you'd leave it with the Clerk when you're done. Thank you.

TIM MULCAHEY: Very good. Okay. First, thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Tim Mulcahey. I am a territory manager for the Garland Company. Garland is a manufacturer and supplier of high performance roofing systems and related components.

SB 876

I have over 13 years of experience in the roofing industry and have been involved in many school roof projects over those years.

I sit before you today to respectfully request that legislation be passed to repeal the half inch per foot slope requirement that exists for school roof projects. This requirement is costing the taxpayers of Connecticut millions of dollars in additional funds compared to a roof system with a traditional quarter inch per foot slope with no proven or documented benefit.

It is my understanding that this legislation was introduced years ago to improve the indoor air quality and lessen the chance for mold growth in school buildings. To date, I have not seen any documented proof that the half inch per foot slope requirement has any direct effect on indoor air quality or mold.

While standing water can have a detrimental effect on the performance of roofing systems,

positive drainage can be achieved with lesser slopes than half inch per foot.

As a manufacturer, our biggest liability is warranty claims or adjustments. An improperly designed roof can lead to premature failure, which can be very costly for a manufacturer.

We presently provide warranties of 20 to 30 years on roof projects with a slope as low as eighth inch per foot. Our typical assemblies require quarter inch per foot slope, which is generally required by building code.

I am quite certain that if there was any documented evidence that half inch per foot slope limited water intrusion into a building or provided better indoor air quality standards it would not only be adopted by us as a manufacturer but would more than likely become an industry standard.

To provide some historical perspective, when setting budgets for roof replacements prior to this legislation, we were using figures of \$14 to \$16 per square foot. In today's market we are now using numbers in the range of \$28 to \$30 per foot.

While some of those cost increases are the result of increased material and labor costs, the driving force behind the cost increase is the half inch per foot slope requirement.

While the additional cost of the insulation material is one factor, it is the additional building modification and related labor and materials that are required to accommodate the half inch per foot slope on the roof surfaces.

Items such as additional primary drains and piping, overflow drains and piping, overflow scuppers and leaders, wood blocking around

perimeter, raising up counter flashing, raising the mechanical units in ductwork, interior modification such as ceilings and structural improvements, and finally, decreased contractor production resulting in longer project completion time and increased labor costs.

In closing, I sit here in a unique position in this debate. As a manufacturer of roofing materials, we generate our revenue and income through material sales.

In most instances the half inch per foot requires additional materials to be sold.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Excuse me. If you would kindly wrap up.

TIM MULCAHEY: I'm just wrapping up here.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you.

TIM MULCAHEY: With that being said, it is difficult to justify the additional sales knowing that millions of dollars of taxpayer money is being unnecessarily spent for these roof projects.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you very much. We appreciate your testimony. The language in the bill just calls to ask for the department to study the issue of roof pitch so that we can determine what is an appropriate pitch that we should be recommending and paying for, as you pointed out in terms of its expense.

So, certainly if you want to, if this particular section of the bill passes, I don't understand why it wouldn't, you might want to share your concerns and opinion with the Department of Construction Services. Okay?

TIM MULCAHEY: Is there another bill that's being considered that would immediately repeal the half inch per foot slope?

SENATOR STILLMAN: Not that I know of. Not on the hearing today, although we do have a study within the bill you referenced, 876, so we will, there will be a hearing on that. Has that bill been heard? That bill has not been heard. It will probably be on our next public hearing agenda, so if you see it come around again just know you've already testified and we have your comments and we'll make sure it's referenced to the appropriate bill.

TIM MULCAHEY: Very good. Thank you for your time.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Okay. Thank you. Any questions for the gentleman? Thank you, sir.

TIM MULCAHEY: Thank you.

SENATOR STILLMAN: For purpose of the Committee Members, we will be hearing this issue again for those folks who have not gotten here to testify. Dr. Karissa Niehoff, to be followed by Galit Sharma and then Bill Phillips. Welcome.

DR. KARISSA NIEHOFF: Good afternoon, Senator Stillman and esteemed Members of the Committee, and thank you for the opportunity to testify.

I'm Dr. Karissa Niehoff, Executive Director of the Connecticut Association of Schools and the Connecticut Interscholastic Athletic Conference. Prior to that, I was a collegiate athlete. I've been a teacher, coach, AD, a principal and now I'm here as Executive Director so a number of these bills are near and dear to my heart and to the work of our association.

We provide professional development to about 1,000 member school principals and assistant principals, and we also govern interscholastic athletics and student activities.

HB6358
HB6359
SB877
HB6383
HB6385



COTT SHANLEY, GENERAL MANAGER

Town of Manchester

41 Center Street · P.O. Box 191
Manchester, CT 06045-0191
www.townofmanchester.org

LEO V. DIANA, MAYOR
JAY MORAN, DEPUTY MAYOR
LISA P. O'NEILL, SECRETARY

DIRECTORS
STEVE GATES
SUSAN M. HOMES
RUDY C. KISSMANN
CHERI A. PELLETIER
JOHN D. TOPPING
MARK D. TWEEDIE

February 15, 2013

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Representative Andrew M. Fleischmann, Co-Chair
Representative Andrea L. Stillman, Co-Chair

RE: SB # 876 AN ACT CONCERNING AUTHORIZATION OF STATE GRANT COMMITMENTS FOR SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECTS AND A STUDY OF ROOF PITCH REQUIREMENTS ON SCHOOL BUILDINGS.

HB #6079 AN ACT CONCERNING MINIMUM ROOF PITCH REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECTS

Dear Co-Chairs Fleischmann and Stillman:

I am writing to recommend the repeal of a portion of P.A. 03-220 and change the minimum roof pitch requirements for existing school building re-roofing projects from one-half inch per foot to one-quarter inch per foot.

I understand that P.A. 03-220 was introduced to improve indoor air quality in public schools by reducing the potential for mold growth caused by leaking roofs. The argument in favor of this requirement was that a minimum 1/2" per foot slope would reduce the potential for roof leaks where industry standards for decades have allowed slopes between 1/8" to 1/4" per foot and still receive a twenty year manufacturer's warranty.

In new construction, the requirement for the steeper 1/2" per foot slope can be easily accommodated with little to no extra cost when incorporated during the design and planning phases.

For the re-roofing of older existing school buildings that were designed with 1/8" to 1/4" per foot roof pitch, the minimum 1/2" per foot slope requirement can add hundreds of thousands of dollars in additional costs with no documented evidence resulting in less mold or improved indoor air quality.

The current legislation does provide a waiver procedure for special conditions but, these waivers can only be approved if an architect and structural can prove that the structure cannot safely accommodate the increased roof pitch.

The Town of Manchester currently has three school re-roofing projects in the design phase for planned construction during the Summer 2013. Jacunski Humes Architects has projected that the minimum additional cost is \$320,000 (\$2.50/s.f.) if a waiver of this minimum 1/2" per foot slope



requirement cannot be secured from the Bureau of School Facilities. The additional construction costs could approach more than \$1 million dollars if structural reinforcements are required to accommodate the increase in roof pitch.

I do not believe that this particular legislation requiring 1/2" per foot slope as a minimum has a direct correlation to improved indoor air quality as originally intended and it is costing taxpayers in Manchester and throughout the State millions of wasted dollars.

While the proposal to have the Department of Construction Services shall conduct a study regarding roof pitch requirements for school buildings is a step in the right direction, I ask that you consider adopting the language in the House Bill #6079 to change the minimum roof pitch requirements for existing school building re-roofing projects from one-half inch per foot to one-quarter inch per foot.

Sincerely,



Christopher Till, P.E.
Facilities Project Manager

CC: Representative Jason Rojas
Representative Geoff Luxenberg
Senator Steve Cassano
Scott Shanley, Manchester General Manager
Mark Carlino, Manchester Director of Public Works