

CIAC - Capital Improvement Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
March 4, 2026  
6:08 PM - 8:15 PM  
Zoom Meeting

Committee Members Present: Ark Pang (AP); Matt Dallas (MD), Tom Travers (TT), Lisa Saklad (LS), Susan Asbedian-Ciaffi (SAC), Pete Iovenella (PI)

Others Present: Sandra Duran (SD) - Combined Facilities Director, Victor Garofalo (VG) Sudbury Assistant Town Manager

Chair Matt Dallas expressed concern that this was the second meeting which had a delayed start due to an issue with the assigned host for the Zoom meeting.

Chair Matt Dallas, after confirmation of a quorum, called the meeting to order at 6:08pm

The committee discussed and decided to wait to approve the meeting minutes for the 2/23/26 and 3/4/26 meetings until the next meeting on 3/18/26.

SD let the committee know she would need to leave the meeting at 7:00 to attend another virtual meeting for the town. The committee agreed to review SD's articles first.

Article# 32: DPW Garage Concrete Floor Replacement Project Number: CIP\_FY27-FAC-1 \$2,200,000

Direct Construction Costs	\$1,530,372.00
Design contingency (10% of DCC)	\$158,727.78
Construction contingency (13.5% of DCC)	\$206,600.22
Designer Oversight	\$133,000.00
OPM	\$80,000.00
Escallation (6%)	\$91,300.00
<b>Total projected cost of construction and oversight</b>	<b>\$2,200,000.00</b>

SD confirmed that the estimate is based on the schematic.

MD asked if this number that will go to Town Meeting or is it expected to change. SD: No, not expected to change. SD is confident that the number is solid.

TT stated the town has known about this project for years. We may expect it to change in today's bidding environment.

PI asked what is the square footage and why is there a design contingency in the cost estimate. SD stated she does not know the square footage, but she will look it up. The design contingency is standard because the project has not been fully designed and there may be changes.

MD noted that the Design contingency (10%) + Construction contingency (13.5%)+ Escalation (6%) totaled approximately 30% total contingency for the project.

SD confirmed this was appropriate and needed for this project. She said that she needs to have an adequate cost estimate approved to prevent running out of funds in the middle of the project. She is hoping to have a bid by the Town meeting.

VG stated that any unused funding at the end of the project would be returned to the town.

TT asked SD how far into the bid package is this project?

SD replied just finished the schematic. SD noted that during the schematic it was determined that during the previous construction of the concrete slab the rebar bars were placed too high. Although the thickness of the slab will be the same, the consultant will determine the concrete formulation, position of the rebar and if epoxy coating of the slab surface is needed. It is recommended and planned that the original slab thickness and rebar placement will be used.

TT asked the estimated construction time. PI stated that it would probably be demo and one big pour. SD stated that it would be approximately 2 months to complete.

TT questioned, is it necessary to have a Design Oversight of \$133,000 for a 2-month project. SD replied yes, the critical experts including plumbing, hazmat, engineering will meet weekly.

SAC asked if the OPM and the Designer Oversight work together. SD replied yes and discussed the roles and purpose of the OPM and the Designer oversight. She emphasized that they will be coordinating with all parties.

SD confirmed that the structural engineer does not have concerns about what is under the concrete slab. He did express concern about the depth of the current slab.

PI questioned if the project is currently in design. SD confirmed yes. She further explained that the Design contingency would be used to pay for design changes if needed.

MD asked why the design contingency was based on the construction costs and not on the cost of the design. The Contingency is higher than the original 100,000 cost of design.

SD and VG confirmed that the contingency leave room for the unknown. If the cost of the project is less than funds approved then it will be returned to the town. The Atkinson Pool project was used as a recent example. VG further stated that judgement is used at each step. If it is determined that a task does not need to be done, it will not. During the Atkinson pool project that amount of tile work required was less than originally expected. Thus, allocated funds will be returned to the town.

SD confirmed that the cost estimate was calculated using a professional estimator. Project has been estimated carefully as it not possible to stop in the middle of tasks and request additional funds from the town.

Motion to approve Article# 32: DPW Garage Concrete Floor Replacement by Tom Travers, seconded by Susan Asbedian-Ciaffi. MD stated to amend to approve Article# 32: DPW Garage Concrete Floor Replacement with the assumption that the estimate will not materially change. If not, CIAC should defer the vote on this article. The committee agreed to defer the vote.

VG explained that the 6 Facilities items would be grouped together and submitted together as 1 article to Town Meeting. The thought being that the town could vote on them as one article or separate items as desired. This approach will be used for each department.

Article #28, item 6: DPW Office and Attached Garage Fire Alarm Replacement \$132,000

<b>Direct Construction Costs</b>	<b>\$116,500.00</b>
<b>Construction Contingency (10% of DC)</b>	<b>\$11,650.00</b>
<b>Escallation (3%)</b>	<b>\$3,844.50</b>
<b><i>Total Estimate</i></b>	<b><i>\$131,994.50</i></b>
<b><i>Total CIP request</i></b>	<b><i>\$132,000.00</i></b>

TT question was this estimate based on a real bid. SD confirmed yes. It is from our current fire alarm vendor. However, it is not a competitive bid. It is a cost estimate from the current fire alarm vendor based on the knowledge they have of our town.

TT asked if there are multiple vendors that could replace the system. SD confirmed yes. It is not a proprietary system. The item would need an RFP to competitively bid.

Motion to approve Article #28, item 6: DPW Office and Attached Garage Fire Alarm Replacement by Tom Travers, seconded by Ark Pang.

AP-Yes, TT - Yes, PI-Yes, LS-Yes, SAC-Yes, MD - Yes

Article# 28, item 7 Fire Station 2 Roof Covering Asphalt Shingle Replacement \$119,200.00

## Scope of Work

- Demolition
- Chimney Repointing
- Deck replacement allowance
- New Gutters, Downspouts, Flashing
- Disconnection & Reconnection of Lightning Protection System

Direct Construction Cost	\$95,450.00
Design Contingency	\$5,500.00
Construction Contingency (10% of DCC)	\$9,545.00
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$100,950.00</i>
Bidding (5% of DCC)	\$4,772.50
Construction Administration (10% of DCC)	\$10,000.00
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$115,722.50</i>
1 year escalation @ 3%	\$3,471.68
<i>Total Estimate</i>	<i>\$119,194.18</i>
<b><i>Total CIP request</i></b>	<b><i>\$119,200.00</i></b>

TT questioned if there was any plan to expand Fire Station 2. He noted that previously, there had been a plan to further expand the building. Bidding at the time was too cost prohibitive. Is there a current plan to expand? SD confirmed there is not a currently planned expansion and there is not one included in the 15-year plan.

SAC suggested the CIAC should not wait to vote since the expansion is not currently planned.

SD stated this item was not competitively bid. This is a cost estimate.

MD noted the estimate provided does not foot. It is off by \$9,545.00 SD acknowledge the math error. She stated the estimate would remain \$119,200.00 as submitted.

PI requested the square footage. SD stated 4,260 square feet.

VG noted that the design of this item was funded at a previous town meeting.

Motion to approve Article# 28, item 7 Fire Station 2 Roof Covering Asphalt Shingle Replacement by Tom Travers, seconded by Susan Asbedian-Ciaffi.

AP-Yes, TT - Yes, PI-Yes, LS-Yes, SAC-Yes, MD - Yes

Article# 28, item #5 Flynn Building Hot Water Circulation Pumps and Boiler \$150,000.00

SD stated that she worked with the existing HVAC company to obtain the cost estimate. She reviewed the scope of work as stated below:

- Demolition & disposal of existing boiler and pumps
- For redundancy, replace the existing boiler with two 500 MBH High efficiency boilers with BACnet communication
- New boiler condensate piping and neutralizer kits
- New flue and combustion air piping as required
- New VFD system pumps

Motion to recommend Article# 28, item #5 Flynn Building Hot Water Circulation Pumps and Boiler by Ark Pang, seconded by Tom Travers.

AP-Yes, TT - Yes, PI-Yes, LS-Yes, SAC-Yes, MD - Yes

Article# 28, item # 5 ADA Self Assessment and Transition Plan Implementation Funding \$200,000

SD reviewed the current status of the ADA Transition Plan as follows:

**Municipal**

- ✓ 203 of 442 barriers removed
- ✓ 2 out of 442 barrier removals in process

**Schools**

- ✓ 196 of 673 barriers removed
- ✓ 39 out of 63 barrier removals in process

**Parks**

- ✓ 13 of 307 barriers removed
- ✓ 16 of 307 barrier removals in process
- ✓ 30 of 307 barriers in planning/design

SD stated that the funding would be used to continue addressing items currently on the list and address urgent needs as they occur. The completed and outstanding items are on the ADA website. She further explained that some of the remaining items are more substantial. They may require design and bidding. An example of an urgent need would be an ADA modification needed for an individual that was not captured in the original plan.

MD noted that the title in the presentation of the article stated this was Plan I. Are there additional phases? SD confirmed there is 1 plan. The I was a type-o.

MD asked if there would be asks for funding for this project in the future? SD Yes, probably for ADA in general. Last year there were articles submitted that were specifically targeted for pathways.

TT asked if we should expect requests annually? SD replied potentially, however, she hoped to make significant progress with the requested item.

SAC asked the timeframes of when the barriers would be done. SD explained that she has a self-imposed target of 5 years. She is currently estimated to be halfway. She further stated the cost of the remaining items in the plan is to be determined. The current item of \$200,000 is funding to continue to work on additional open items but not expected to cover the entire cost.

TT questioned if there was capacity to handle these projects. SD confirmed that she will make sure there is capacity.

Motion to approve Article# 28, item # 5 ADA Self-Assessment and Transition Plan Implementation Funding by Tom Travers, seconded by Pete Iovenella.

AP-Yes, TT - Yes, PI-Yes, LS-Yes, SAC-Yes, MD - Yes

SD left the meeting briefly to attend another virtual Town meeting at 7:03. VG continued presenting the articles for discussion.

Article# 29 Self Contained Breathing Apparatus \$550,000.00

The committee agreed there was a good review at Capital Night, and it was not necessary to go through the details again.

TT stated the request covered 40-42 units. He questioned if that was enough to cover the Sudbury Fire department. VG confirmed yes, the request would cover all the current Fire Department employees plus a few spares.

Motion to approve Article# 29 Self Contained Breathing Apparatus by Tom Travers, seconded by Ark Pang.

AP-Yes, TT - Yes, PI-Yes, LS-Yes, SAC-Yes, MD - Yes

Article# 30 Lincoln- Sudbury - Waste Water Treatment Facility SBI Panel \$147,679

VC confirmed total article is Sudbury's portion only. He informed the CIAC that Susan Bottan (SB), L-S Director of Finance and Operations, sent an email on 2/25 with answers to questions from Capital Night.

TT questioned who provided the specification for the new system. Was it Weston and Sampson, the current vendor, an engineer, or current maintenance staff? Who gave the list of specifications and minimum requirements? VG will follow up with SB to determine the source and basis of the quote.

CIAC deferred voting on this Article to a future meeting.

Article# 27: Department of Public Works

- Item 4 Large Construction/ Excavation/ loader equipment \$300,000
- Item 2 6-Wheel 20,6000+ GVW Combo Body Dump Truck w/Plow and Spreader \$350,000
- Item 3 10-wheel 40,000+ GVW Dump Truck \$335,000
- Item 5 Light/ Medium Duty Pick Up truck with spreader and plow \$135,000

CIAC agreed to review all truck requests together.

SAC questioned if item 5 was less than the others because the truck was smaller. VG confirmed.

Motion to approve Article# 27: Department of Public Works items 2-5 by Susan Asbedian-Ciaffi, seconded by Ark Pang.

AP-Yes, TT - Yes, PI-Yes, LS-Yes, SAC-Yes, MD - Yes

Article#28, item #1 DPW: Roads, Culvert, Drainage, Consultant & Construction, Design & Drain Replacement \$950,000.00

MD noted this is the same request as last year. Does the request remain the same annually, but the culverts addressed change? VG confirmed.

TT asked if this was to fund items not covered by Chapter 90 funding or to supplement it. VG confirmed that chapter 90 is for roads and does not fund culverts. The title of this article includes the word roads because roads go over culverts.

AP asked is there an accounting of last year's \$950,000 funding. VG confirmed there is an accounting of everything. Some of last year's items are outstanding but still scheduled.

TT asked if this funding request was for future projects that are usually completed in the summer. VG confirmed yes. This will allow for bidding over the winter so that projects are ready to begin in the spring.

Motion to approve Article #28, item #1 DPW: Roads, Culvert, Drainage, Consultant & Construction, Design & Drain Replacement by Tom Travers, seconded by Ark Pang.

AP-Yes, TT - Yes, PI-Yes, LS-Yes, SAC-Yes, MD - Yes

Article #28, item# 2 Town Owned Parking Lots – Pavement Project \$100,000

VG noted that there will be a \$100,000 request each year for 4 years for this project.

TT asked if this was to repair lots not replace? VG confirmed it is to repair. He noted the cost of replacing the asphalt for a parking lot the size of the Flynn building alone would be \$60,000. It would be more if drainage issues were identified.

SAC asked which parking lots would be repaired. Did they grade the derogation? VG stated the conditions of the town owned lots would be evaluated and then addressed. Yes, in the pavement management assessment.

SAC stated previously a plan was discussed to redesign the town center parking lot. Is that in the plan? If so, should that be considered with this request? VG stated no. It would require a design with curb age. A redesign of the town center parking lot would be a higher cost. It would have to be submitted at Town Meeting. VG would bring this to Tina Rivard, Director of Public Works, attention.

Motion to approve Article #28, item# 2 Town Owned Parking Lots – Pavement Project by Susan Asbedian-Ciaffi, seconded by Lisa Saklad.

AP-No, TT - Yes, PI-Yes, LS-Yes, SAC-Yes, but requests additional information, MD - Yes

Article# 31, item#2 SPS: School Safety All Buildings \$450,000.00

<b>CIP-FY27-SPS 7 - School Safety</b>		
<b>Item</b>	<b>Unit (ea)</b>	<b>Cost</b>
<b>Access Control</b>		
- Curtis - interior door access control		\$20,655.00
- Nixon - exterior door access control		\$18,290.00
- Haynes - interior door access control		\$30,407.00
- Loring - interior door access control		\$26,540.00
- Noyes - interior access control		\$40,000.00
<b>Automated Badge Control</b>		
		\$15,000.00
<b>Curtis Parking Lots School Safety Improvements</b>		
- Gates - Curtis ( 2 areas at 28LF width)	2	\$14,000.00
- Bollards 63 LF placed 4.5 feet apart (materials)	14	\$3,864.00
- Bollards 14 each install	14	\$4,200.00
<b>Noyes Interior Renovation</b>		
- Two Window Wall/Door Assemblies	2	\$200,000.00
- Misc. Electrical, Fire Alarm upgrades/relocations		\$35,000.00
<b>Noyes Parking Lot School Safety Improvements</b>		
- Sphere Bollard Material Cost	15	\$15,600.00
- Sphere Bollard Install and Relocation	20	\$16,000.00
- Pathway removeable bollards material cost	3	\$1,500.00
- Pathway removable bollards install cost	2	\$900.00
- Paint existing sphere bollards	5	\$1,000.00
- New Pathway install (75 LF x 10' wide/grading included)	1	\$6,000.00
<b>Signage (No trespassing/closed during school hours, etc)</b>		
	allowance	\$1,000.00
<b>Total School Safety CIP request</b>		<b>\$449,956.00</b>

SAC questioned the parking lot safety plan for Curtis. Please explain what is being proposed. The committee discussed the plan's proposed barriers and gates to direct the traffic away from the play areas.

MD asked where the numbers for the Noyes- interior access control are based on? SD stated Noyes was based on an architect's opinion but not a design.

MD asked when work would be done. SD if approved, plans to address all but Noyes over the Summer. Noyes would be completed during a school break. It will depend on the design and availability of materials.

AP asked what is driving the town to do this project? SD stated that SISA toured the town with Sudbury Police Chief Nix. These requests are based on SISA's recommendations.

AP asked if these are mandatory. SD stated they are recommendations from Homeland Security to protect or schools and most vulnerable.

AP asked if these will impact insurance premiums. VG confirmed no.

Motion to approve Article# 31, item#2 SPS: School Safety All Buildings by Susan Asbedian-Ciaffi, seconded by Ark Pang.

AP-Yes, TT - Yes, PI-Yes, LS-Yes, SAC, MD - Yes

Article #31, item #1 SPS - Fire Alarm and Emergency Lighting System Enhancements/BDA Installations – Phased Approach \$660,500.00

<b>Phase I</b>	
Josia Haynes Elementary School	\$429,346.00
General John Nixon Elementary School	\$103,229.00
Construction Contingency	\$53,257.50
Bidding/Negotiation	\$21,303.00
Construction Administration	\$53,257.50
<b>Total Estimated Phase I Costs</b>	<b>\$660,393.00</b>
<b>Total CIP Request</b>	<b>\$660,500.00</b>

Phase II - Peter Noyes Elementary School  
Israel Loring Elementary School

Phase III – Ephraim Curtis Middle School

Current Phase II & III cost estimate approximately \$2.4 mil

SD stated the cost is NV5 cost at schematic design. It is not a fully flushed out construction design. Phase I will include Hayes and Nixon to coordinate with roof projects to minimize disruption.

TT asked if this item is for the NV5 contract for Phase I? SD confirmed yes it will be bid.

Motion to approve Article #31, item #1 SPS - Fire Alarm and Emergency Lighting System Enhancements/BDA Installations – Phased Approach by Ark Pang, seconded by Susan Asbedian-Ciaffi.

AP-Yes, TT - Yes, PI-Yes, LS-Yes, SAC, MD - Yes

Article#31, item 1 SPS – Building Management System Capital Repairs - \$110,000

SD explained this article is for capital repairs to try and keep up with the maintenance/repairs to elongate the life of the systems to keep the temperature at appropriate levels in all 5 schools. This cost covers all 5 schools.

TT questioned if these repairs should be an ongoing operating expense of the schools? SD stated that this is not just catching up with maintenance that has been performed. The systems are aging and there are a lot of repairs necessary.

AP asked if this cost estimate was based on a list of known items that need to be fixed? SD stated it is based on a partial list and an estimate of additional repairs needed as indicated by complaints received.

TT asked if SD expects to submit this request again next year. Sd stated TBD when she has more data. Some more data will be received from HVAC project.

VG agreed he would look to see if this item could be included in the operating budget in the future. However, there is a projected deficit for FY28 so he believes it is unlikely.

Motion to approve Article#31, item 1 SPS – Building Management System Capital Repairs by Susan Asbedian-Ciaffi, seconded by Ark Pang.

AP-Yes, TT - Yes, PI-Yes, LS-Yes, SAC, MD – Yes TT emphasize this should be part of the operating budget in the future.

Article#31, item 3 SPS – Classroom Instructional Equipment Replacement \$100,000

CIAC agreed this is not a capital item. It is equipment for a classroom. It is not necessary to run the building. CIAC deferred voting on this item. It is not a capital item however, CIAC does agree it needs to be funded.

MD asked the committee if there was any other business.

- CIAC agreed the meeting on 3/11/26 would be cancelled due to significant progress tonight. Next meeting will be 3/18/26, when we will review the remaining articles.
- TT asked that the CPC articles be presented at the net CIAC meeting as they were not presented at Capital Night. VG agreed to present them at the CIAC meeting on 3/18/26.
- New member of the CIAC is expected to join the meeting on 3/18/26.

Motion to adjourn made by Tom Travers and seconded by Ark Pang.

AP-Yes, TT - Yes, PI-Yes, LS-Yes, SAC-Yes, MD - Yes

Meeting adjourned at 8:15pm

Respectfully submitted,  
Lisa Saklad  
CIAC, Clerk