

Newtown Board of Education Virtual Meeting
CIP/Facilities/Finance Sub-Committee Minutes
October 13, 2020, 5:00 p.m.

Call to Order: The BOE CIP Sub Committee meeting was called to order at 5:06 by Mr. Delia.

Participants: Dan Delia, Chair, Sub-Committee, Tanja Vadas, Director of Business, Dr. Michelle Ku, Chair, Board of Education, Robert Gerbert, Director of Operations, Deb Zukowski, Sub-Committee Member, Debbie Leidlein, Sub-Committee Member, Dr. Lorrie Rodrigue, Superintendent, Allen Adriani, Sustainable Energy Committee, Kathy Quinn, Sustainable Energy Committee

Pledge of Allegiance

**Item 1 Item 1 Approval of June 23, 2020 BOE CIP Sub Committee Minutes
Approval of August 18, 2020 BOE CIP Sub Committee Minutes**

Ms. Zukowski moved to approve the minutes of June 23, 2020 and August 18, 2020. Mrs. Leidlein seconds the motion. All in favor. Motion passes.

Item 2 Discussion of BOE CIP

Mr. Delia began discussing the Hawley project and bringing in Allen Adriani and Kathy Quinn from the Sustainable Energy Committee. Mr. Adriani is the Chair of the Hawley project for the Public Building and Site Commission. The Board of Finance has asked numerous questions about Hawley and he wanted to discuss the timeline of the project. Mr. Delia stated when we talked about this project at the beginning we had a schedule put forward in July and he wanted to be sure we were staying on the timeline.

Mr. Adriani stated he had a schedule he received in August from the architect, the indoor quality air control consultant and the consulting engineer. His concerns were that we would not have bids back for the project until April. He believes we should have bids back before then or some kind of good estimate for the Board of Finance going forward. He also feels the Board of Finance will push back on this project.

Ms. Zukowski asked if we do not get the bids back before April then when would we need to cut checks to pay for the effort and would that be before or after July 1st.

Mr. Adriani stated this needs to go to referendum because of the dollar amount and you have to have an actual number before you can go to vote.

Mrs Leidlein stated plus you have to walk it back to get all the paperwork printed. There is more to it than just having a number for a referendum date.

Dr. Rodrigue stated her concern is the timeline and we knew in advance when this issue would arise. The other piece is the air quality study that put us back because they needed to look at the building when we had students in them. When we went into hybrid model to start the year there was only 50% or less of occupancy. She thought the concern is with the timeline and with the bids. Mr. Adriani said if you play out the scenario when school started in September, you probably could have bids back in February or early March if you pushed hard enough.

Mr. Delia stated his understanding of that prior meeting was they would still get it done and stick to the timeline. He understands that we said October would be the construction estimate but if we pushed the estimate back until November wouldn't that still allow us to keep the CIP in place? Mr. Adriani said he recalled dates where he thought they would not have the bid packets available until April.

Mr. Gerbert said we were looking to have the construction documents by March 1s, and put the bids out on the street by April 1st.

Mr. Delia stated then we should be able to stick with this timeline and we should still be able to put a fair estimate in place for the referendum.

Dr. Rodrigue said they were not be able to do the study in the summer as there were no students. So she accepted the fact that we should push back a little bit but she was also under the impression that when we knew we were going to hybrid that the project was still going to move forward.

Ms. Zukowski stated she was of the understanding that the engineering study would have a reasonable estimate for the work and then bids would be sent out to actual construction companies who would then come in hopefully at or below that reasonable estimate.

Mr. Adriani stated we have a spread of 50% just on the HVAC project. You then have to factor in your hazardous work such as lead and asbestos. So to feel comfortable on going forward on the estimate he would refer to Mr. Gerbert to see if he is comfortable with the number. Mr. Adriani stated he would rather see the bids to know exactly what we are dealing with.

Mr. Gerbert said the number we are working off of is the number RZ Design provided us 18 months ago. They came to one of the Board of Finance meetings to talk about the two options. We had \$3.9M as the number and with discussion we then asked the question if they included any hazmat etc., which they said no. So we added more money to the account which got us to the \$4.199M. He said he did speak with the architect today to ask what he felt about providing an estimate. The response from the architect was they could provide an estimate in the line of a square foot unit type of estimate. Mr. Gerbert said that could get us in the ball park but it is not a tight estimate as if we had the full set put together.

Ms. Zukowski asked would that be the estimate on March 1st or would there be more to the estimate. She also asked what is the practice of the Board of Finance and if they need the actual number or, do they get the engineering study estimates and then work from that on the actual CIP and on the request for the appropriation.

Mr. Gerbert said a square foot or unit cost estimate is going to be very rough. If they have a full design set we could get a very tight number or close to 5% of the bid. The number they could put forward now would be very loose. The degree of confidence would not be very high compared to a full set. He said our best estimate is the full set put together when you have your units specked out which would be around March 1st.

Mrs. Leidlein stated her experience has been that there hasn't been a consistent process. Different projects call for different levels of numbers in order to have the Board of Finance approve. She has seen projects where we have come in with more detailed estimates and under budget, and projects where there is less detailed estimates and over budget. She asked in past consideration when putting numbers on the CIP where do those numbers come from and how do we arrive at those numbers based on information that we have from experts? We have discussed how that would look along with the price of going further for the estimates before deciding on the project and when the project would be done or not. She also asked how do you escalate that price without understanding and looking at the cost of waiting a longer time before you do that project and how do you escalate that cost in the CIP if you extend it another year? Some projects have gone so far down the road and resulted in a much higher cost. We have had to chunk the prices down in order to make the cost more tolerable. As long as she has been on the board this project has been on the CIP.

Ms. Zukowski asked if this was the case where we go out to bid prior to having the money? Mr. Delia stated we have to have the money if we put it out to bid and if we put it on the CIP at \$4.2M and it comes out to \$6M that could be a big problem.

Ms. Zukowski stated this is our best estimate, but we know that around March 1st we could have a better estimate at which time that number would replace this one.

Mrs. Leidlein stated no, not necessarily, because that number could replace this one but it could extend the timeline of the project which would add another year or more to the project and then that would escalate the cost of the project because you have to add on the cost of inflation. She said we have gone through this process and used numbers to bring forward and we need to seek numbers that are more timely for the project as it stands for the moment and that is what we have always done. She said we continue the process as we know it and tell the Board of Finance that this is the information that we have and this is our expectation for the timeline going forward and we hope everyone will move forward with us.

Dr. Ku stated she believes once the Legislative Council passes the CIP in January she does not think they can change the number after that. That is her recollection from the charter.

Dr. Rodrigue stated she does not remember previous projects of bid packages in that way. The whole reason we went to RZ Design was because the Board of Finance wanted a better estimate. We put all that effort into bringing them in so they could share with the Board of Finance. She said she is not sure why we are even here again because even with the month of hybrid that still would not have made this timeline work if we needed bids. January is the date for Legislative Council and they would not have the actual number either. She does not remember needing the

bids first. She understands the rationale but is pretty certain there were town projects where you can only get such a good enough estimate as you can until the project moves forward and you get the bids.

Mr. Adriani stated if you wanted to move forward he would not say no and was just cautioning. Even without an engineering estimate you have an RZ Design dollar amount but are they taking into consideration the indoor air quality, and hazmat and is the design apples to apples? He said we do not know. He then asked the question is the \$4.2M a plus or minus of 20%? What happens if you do come over that number and you find that out in March or April?

Dr. Rodrigue stated at the time RZ Design was an issue and that is why we had to add additional funds because they were lacking the air quality study in part and numerous things we pointed out that we would much rather have to make the estimate more solid.

Mr. Adriani stated they did not have structural and electrical consideration in their number and all of this adds costs. He asked if the \$4.2M become \$5M until you get a good engineering estimate and design?

Mr. Delia stated that would put us back a year and then do costs escalate over the course of that next year? Mr. Adriani said you can have the contractors put in an escalation figure.

Ms. Zukowski stated she does not understand that if you go out to bid and you get these bids isn't the assumption you actually have the money to spend? You can't go out to actual bid until you have appropriated the money. It seems like there is a catch. You go with engineering studies on an estimate and then appropriate that money and cross your fingers and hope that bids come in at or below. We need the engineering study and we need that estimate and can we get something to make this number more reasonable by January 1st when the Legislative Council has to settle on a price?

Mr. Adriani asked Mr. Gerbert if we could get a number by January. Mr. Gerbert said yes. He does not think it would be a 99% confidence number but it could get us a 90% number. They will have the number of units back by then and a better idea of indoor air quality results. They will be much further along in the process in January.

Mrs. Leidlein asked Mr. Gerbert about historical data with air quality reports. He replied that he thought they were maybe 10-15 years old and stated they are doing an air quality report this week. He indicated as part of this we were able to get them to agree to do two of them with one this week and one in a month from now, and compare numbers to be sure there are no differences.

Mrs. Leidlein asked if you are talking about two different times for the air quality study will there be a difference from windows being opened now vs. in a month from now?

Mr. Gerbert said we are on the tip of the heating season. We have asked the school to keep the windows closed in order to get good data so that it does not have an adverse effect on the

numbers. Getting 100% cooperation could be difficult. We asked for the second one in November as at that time all the windows will be closed.

Mr Adriani said the infiltration rate will be different from October to November and that will impact the numbers.

Mr. Delia stated he thought we are good then where we are. We are going to push them to have an estimate by the end of December.

Mr. Gerbert said he talked with the architect today and would follow up at the end of the week based on the meetings tonight. We will be looking for a number and asking him to give us a square foot cost now and they can hone that number in over the next 8-10 weeks and we can see how that number changes.

Mr. Delia stated that the issue is resolved as far as he is concerned and asked if everyone else if they were comfortable with that. Everyone agreed.

Mr. Gerbert talked about the high school air conditioners and that everyone should be aware that there have been tours throughout the schools with Sustainable Energy members, Board of Education members, Fred Hurley and himself to view and get an understanding of what kind of equipment is at the buildings, areas of improvement, whether its HVAC, windows, plumbing, roof etc. He said as of now we have completed two schools; the High School and the Middle School. This week they will go through Hawley, and we will continue this process as we make our way through the rest of the schools. So far the process has been good. People have brought up some good observations of the two buildings we have been through. He said it's a good exercise to not only do now, but perpetually keep this moving. These projects will come and go and there will be new issues that develop over time and it is a good sign to show other town boards that we are working together and everyone is going in the same direction and agreeing on projects while moving forward and looking at the big picture.

Mr. Delia thanked Mr. Adriani and Ms Quinn for coming to this meeting and he said it is important that we work together. He also stated it's important that we look at the big picture and making decisions on the whole. He wants to make sure that we set up a system of reviewing projects, touring schools, looking at the whole and making sure we are rating projects appropriately.

Mr. Adriani said he sent Mr. Gerbert an excel spreadsheet of benchmarking tools. Mr. Gerbert presented the spreadsheet and stated this is a tool on how to rank your projects for importance. The spreadsheet is a ranking system and is something we can use as a template and build off of. It has different ratings such as 'risk of failure', energy savings, safety, etc., which by using these tools will help to rank and prioritize projects with a scoring. He went further to describe the spreadsheet.

Mr. Delia stated it's important to maintain a perspective as well and not to just dive in using these tools. We have not seen all of the schools so when we start to utilize this document we

need to have an overall picture and that is something we have to always keep in mind and that this is just the beginning.

Mrs. Leidlein asked about how affordability plays into this and if we have the ability to adjust a larger project to another year and what can we afford to spend based on what the town projects are. She also asked where we are to larger projects and is there flexibility that comes into play with regards to availability of dollars.

Mr. Adriani said it ranks in priority to how you should move forward with projects. There is a tab called capital improvement plan and we can modify this to a 10-15 year plan. You can go through the priority list and pick and choose your high ranked projects and make it fit into the dollar amount.

Mr. Gerbert said this is a template and a first pass. We can add other criteria into the spreadsheet. We can change or add criteria and get it to a place where everyone is comfortable and to use this to help us in making further decisions on projects.

Mr. Adriani asked the question how do we prioritize the Hawley HVAC over other projects?

Mr. Gerbert said we have 5 buildings we need to do a walk through.

Mr. Adriani stated the only school he has not walked is Reed.

Mr Delia asked if it is fair to make that call if we have not walked through all of the buildings.

Mr. Adriani is afraid someone will ask which is the higher priority, if we have older units in other schools. He then asked should we be paying attention to those vs. putting in HVAC into a school that doesn't already have it.

Ms. Leidlein stated we talked about this project for a long time. She thinks the criteria on this spreadsheet isn't the entire criteria that has been discussed over time as to why this is an important project. Part of it is the indoor air quality which has been discussed and the data looked at. She said a lot of the importance of this project has been the fact that there is an inability in the school particularly in certain areas of the school to allow for ventilation in the same way that you might allow in other schools because of the proximity to a main road and because of sound, exhaust, and the fact that it does impact student learning. The impact to the students who are particularly in that front area of the school are impacted because of the fact there is no allowance for ventilation and you have the multiple floors which impacts the heat. That has always been part of this discussion with this project.

Ms.Zukowski asked how extensive is the Middle School HVAC that exists right now. Mr. Gerbert says it is spotty. There are 6 rooftop units, a number of split systems like the cafeteria, main office, health suite, library, a bank of classrooms behind the a-wing gym.

Ms. Zukowski then asked how much HVAC is there in Hawley.

Mr. Gerbert said only the 97 wing has HVAC coverage. In terms of the Middle School, they only have 3 or 4 classroom that have air conditioning. In all of the other classrooms you have nothing. In terms of Hawley it's the same thing only its older.

Dr. Rodrigue stated she loved the idea of being able to quantify and prioritize but she thought the spreadsheet was missing some things, one being the learning environment. She indicated she doesn't know if any of the criteria captures that. She said she is nervous that we have already put this information into this format and if this goes forward to other boards they might determine that our projects are not in the right priority. This is the first time she has seen this.

Mr. Delia stated he agreed. This is the very beginning of this process.

Mrs. Leidlein stated she agrees this is a great tool. We need to consider this and with the fact that the Board of Education is in the business of teaching and learning, we need to make sure we have the best optimal environment possible for student learning.

Mr. Delia stated one criteria we would want to add to this spreadsheet is the impact on learning.

Mr. Adriani stated we can add any criteria we want to this spreadsheet.

Mr. Delia stated we need to discuss this more. Mr. Gerbert said this is a first pass and this is a template we can modify it into a more organized format.

Mr. Delia stated we would add this to the next agenda and continue this discussion.

Ms. Quinn stated we should look at modifying this sheet where it needs to be and adding the various criteria, but to get through the rest of the tours as soon as possible so we can input that information as well, which will then give us a total and a picture of where we are at with all of the buildings.

Mr. Delia stated we are grateful for the Sustainable Energy Committee's support and the input that their Board is offering to us to help us make the best decisions.

Ms Quinn stated we want to make sure we are working on the same page and heading for the same goals, and doing what we should be doing in the order it should be done. There are other things that we are doing that hopefully will help to bring down your expenses which would require you to not have to do that much.

Mr. Adriani and Ms. Quinn left the meeting at 6:15.

Item 2 Budget vs Actual Projected Expenses

Mrs. Vadas presented a 2020-2021 COVID expense sheet (attached). She stated she added an anticipated encumbrance and expense column to the spreadsheet which was a great way to capture all of these costs. Currently our bottom line of costs to date is \$1.7M but she also wanted to point out that there were other areas that we are seeing also. In the facilities area we are somewhat stabilizing as we have a lot of the PPE (Personal Protective Equipment) costs in. She further said areas that are increasing that are not on this sheet are support staff hours, teachers covering other teachers that are out, increases in certified staff, and increases in SpEd services such as BTs, one-to-ones, and on-line speech services. These are areas that will be evolving as we go. Other areas that she has not been able to capture is unemployment costs. This is something to think about. We have budgeted \$30K for unemployment costs but she indicated she has a feeling that number will skyrocket.

Mrs. Vadas also talked about the continuation of the Seamless Summer option that is going on at the high school. That number has not been included yet as she is still getting estimates from Whitsons. This number is where the high school students receive a free breakfast and free lunch.

Dr. Rodrigue said there was a little bit more of a cost for that since Whitsons had to pay a bit more for the high school vs K-6 because the high school is not on the NSLP program. She said this free lunch was for every student and we had to pay more to allow all of our students K-12 to have the free lunch option because you could not say the high school could not be on it. She further said the Seamless Summer Program is paying Whitsons the dedicated amount so they would not be losing money. We had to pay for that time period. She indicated that you can't just say some of our students are receiving a free lunch and some are not.

Mrs. Vadas stated the Seamless Summer program is a state funded program and is a COVID related cost but it is not on the expense sheet right now.

Mr. Delia asked if the \$256K is where we are at now.

Ms. Vadas stated that this sheet was printed a few days ago and is now at \$316K and going up daily. She indicated we are still looking at costs as far as teachers and support staff that we are anticipating now but not in the beginning.

Ms. Zukowksi wanted to understand what is meant by anticipated. She asked if it means we say we have this problem that we know of today and that we know we will have to cover in the next small amount of time.

Mrs. Vadas said that is correct and these costs are all encumbered so they are either on a purchase order or encumbered through the salaries except for the custodial overtime and that she has put together another spreadsheet based on the last salary run and adjusts that when needed.

Ms. Zukowski asked if it was possible to add possible exposures like things that are not on the list that could come back.

Mrs. Vadas said that is what she is trying to do. She said she can add something to the sheet as to what they are looking at or thinking about for future needs.

Dr. Rodrigue stated there are things that are COVID related for this year and may turn into something that we need in the future anyway. For example, there are some personnel costs that we are looking at because of the student apps and in order to support those students above and beyond what we currently have in the system. This does not mean it is over at the end of the year, this could continue and need to be budgeted for in the following year as well.

Mrs. Vadas stated the grant was submitted for the \$380K and has been approved. We have identified all of those costs and the accounts they are in and are ready to move that over to the grant. The \$400K is also ready for us to use. The next step would be to move the \$380K out of the General Fund and into the grant and then start identifying where we want to use the \$400K. She stated we are not ready yet to use the \$400K as we cannot use it for personnel. We want to

make sure once we use the \$380K we see where we are. We have more costs coming in and the next round will give us a better picture of where to spend the \$400K.

Mrs. Vadas said the chromebooks are going to be the big expense. We can see where we are at with other items and hold onto that until we incur more costs.

Mr. Delia stated at the next board meeting we will bring forward to move the grant money over. All agreed.

Dr. Rodrigue left the meeting at 6:28.

Item 3 Discussion of Virtual Net Metering

Mrs. Vadas presented a spreadsheet of credit and billing for the virtual net metering (attached). She stated this is one of those sustainable energy projects where we did nothing and we are receiving credits.

Mr. Delia stated they are big credits and Mrs. Vadas said there offsets. She stated there is a lot of catch-up going on right now. The credits are from January through September and we have two hosting meters. The offsets to these credits is a developer fee which she has one bill currently for one of the set of credits. The bill is \$81K. The second bill is estimated and is still to come in for \$91K. Right now we will have a net credit of \$125K. The other piece to this puzzle is the investment (developer) fee to invest in this project. Right now as of September we owe them \$61K after all of the debits and credits go through. From September to January/February 2021, she estimated in about 4 or 5 months we will be back in the credit state against our Eversource bill. It's a lot of catch-up right now and by the end of January or February we will break even. She is working on estimating what our credits would be in the future. The bottom line is she is estimating an average of \$10-15K credit on our high school electrical bill every month. And again we did not have to do anything for that. What we know now is on this sheet.

Mr. Delia said presenting this to the full board has been a positive and a good for the schools and community.

Mr. Gerbert stated there is more to come as there will be another spike coming on-line that will pick up other schools so this is just the first wave.

Mr. Delia said we would review this in a few months and Mrs. Vadas indicated she would include this in the electrical costs.

Item 4 Waste Water Testing Discussion

Ms. Zukowski stated this all started with an article about the University of Arizona where they were doing waste water testing for COVID. They were able to identify the presence of COVID in a dorm and from there they tested everyone in the dorm and found two asymptomatic students. They were then able to isolate the two students and keep the dorm open. She said there is a certain amount of interest in whether or not it might make sense for other organizations such as Yale working with New Haven and Univ. of CT. They are looking at their dorms and the question would be whether or not it would be feasible to actually add it on a per school basis.

What is it that we would need to have or exist to make this waste water testing possible. In Az and at Uconn they are doing dorm by dorm.

Ms. Zukowski asked two questions: Do we have buildings that we could have actual sample waste water effectively from, and if we could, what would it cost to retrofit those buildings with that type of a pump.

Mrs. Leidlein stated the question is then, if these are universities and they have positive results come back from the sewage water tests then are they able to test the population of whatever building or scope that is? She also asked are we able to test our population or do we count on the parent body to test the population and if that is the case what does that look like? We could make a recommendation but there is no guarantee that it would play itself out.

Ms. Zukowski stated she contacted Donna Culbert who found it intriguing and that she would be talking with Yale. Ms. Zukowski also asked if it is even feasible that our buildings would be able to do this based on cost and functionality. From a public health standard is it feasible from a testing perspective to actually be able to leverage the results you might get from a system?

Mrs. Leidlein stated she does not see how as a school district we could test everyone in a school and if we did what would be the next step.

Ms. Zukowski stated the next step would be to quarantine the school.

Ms. Leidlein asked if we know what the accuracy of these tests are.

Ms. Zukowski said those questions would be answered better by the Dept of Public Health. She further asked if we could look into it and if public health comes in and says this could really help the virus from spreading that we are ready to go or we know ahead of time if we can do it functionally or if we can't afford to do it.

Mr. Delia asked if we should be discussing this with Donna Culbert and the Health Dept.

Ms. Zukowski asked Mr. Gerbert if it was possible to test waste water from each of the schools. If the answer is no then there is no going forward. The second question is how much would it cost to retrofit for those tests and an estimate of an overall cost of testing once a week or so.

Mrs. Vadas said once you have the data how would you go about testing the school and how would you collect the data?

Ms. Zukowski said the minimum you could do is shut the school down for two weeks to stop the spread.

Mrs. Vadas did not think we should go that route.

Mrs. Leidlein stated we need more information before we can go further with this conversation. We need more information and do more research into the accuracy of the tests and the outcomes of levels and know what the potential ramification is, etc. If this needs to be the road we go down, we need more of a collaborative committee that includes public health, school district, and any other committees within the system.

Ms. Zukowski said that maybe as a committee we could bring this up as an option at our next board meeting.

Mr. Gerbert said yes, we can make it accessible to collect but his thoughts are that this would have to come from the Dept. of Health in coordination with the state, and parents would have to be on board with this happening.

Mrs. Leidlein stated maybe the next step with this before we even determine we need to bring before the board is for the Superintendent and the Director of Public Health and possibly the Director of Facilities to see if this is a path we want to go down. Because there are so many protocols in current place with testing, and contact tracing, she indicated she would want to better understand all that works together with this idea.

Ms. Zukowski said she would see if she could engage the Superintendent in this conversation and do a follow up with Donna Culbert.

Mrs. Leidlein asked if there is any additional information with doing research on the topic. It would be helpful for us to see a variety of statistics and different studies and types of information to look at.

Public Comment: No public comments

Adjournment:

Mrs. Leidlein moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Zukowski seconds the motion. All in favor. Motion passes and meeting was adjourned at 6:59pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Joanne Morris

THESE ARE DRAFT MINUTES AND ARE SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE BOE
CIP/FACILITIES/FINANCE SUB COMMITTEE

Newtown Board of Education Virtual Meeting
CIP/Facilities/Finance Sub-Committee Minutes
June 23, 2020, 6:00 p.m.

Call to Order: The BOE CIP Sub Committee meeting was called to order at 6:01 by Mr. Delia.

Participants: Dan Delia, Chair, Sub-Committee, Ron Bienkowski, Director of Business, Dr. Michelle Ku, Chair, Board of Education, Robert Gerbert, Director of Operations, Deb Zukowski, Sub-Committee, Debbie Leidlein, Sub-Committee, Matthew Ritter, Shipman & Goodwin

Pledge of Allegiance

Item 1 Discussion of Non-Lapsing Fund and Regulation

Mr. Delia invited Matt Ritter, with Shipman and Goodwin, who is one of the Board of Education's Attorneys to discuss the legal issues and language of the Non-Lapsing Fund proposed regulation.

Mr. Ritter gave a quick outline of his practice and what he does as an Attorney for Boards and Town Municipalities. He stated the best advice he can give regarding General Statute 10-248a is it is meant to be a mutually cooperative relationship. The Statue involves Board and Town powers and it relies on cooperation between the two sides. Mr. Ritter then reviewed questions that were presented to him from Ms. Zukowski (attached) and discussed the language within the General Statute 10-248a to give the sub-committee a better understanding. Due to a technical issue with the video portion of this discussion, this section is in audio only and can be accessed by clicking the following link:

<https://viewer.earthchannel.com/PlayerController.aspx?PGD=newtownct&eID=467>

The discussion turned to the draft of the regulation that Mr. Bienkowski developed. Mr. Bienkowski stated he tried to make it comprehensive in addressing a number of issues and asked Mr. Ritter to review it and give us some advice and responses. Mr. Ritter will review the draft regulation and clean up the language and make comments to reflect the policy that was recently approved and will forward the regulation back to the sub-committee for their review.

Item 2 Discussion and Possible Recommendation of the CIP

Mr. Bienkowski reviewed the CIP. The Head O'Meadow project numbers were adjusted to reflect a better number on the boilers and lighting project at \$850K. Mr. Bienkowski also stated he took the Hawley property off the first 5 years. Everything else is the way the sub-committee discussed the CIP plan over the last meeting.

Mr. Gerbert discussed the projects of the HOM boilers and lighting project and separating out the costs. He stated during the budget season he counted the lighting fixtures at 713. At an allowance of \$500 per fixture and with adding lighting controls and exterior lighting it would bring the cost to \$400-\$425K range. With the boilers, the cost per boiler is \$100K, adding in the pumps, a small boiler for water heating, electrical, controls etc., the cost would run to about \$350-\$400k.

Mr. Delia stated that was a savings of about \$200K from the original cost on the CIP. Mr. Gerbert said he is not accounting for any rebates. He said there are a couple of avenues for rebates in the lighting.

Ms. Zukowski asked what would be the loss or gain in separating the lighting and boilers from HOM in Year 3 to identify them.

Mr. Bienkowski stated that by separating them it could be a flag for debates with the possibility of pushing one of the projects into another year.

Mr. Delia stated as an energy project he felt more comfortable leaving them together.

Mrs. Leidlein stated with energy projects we have typically left them together. She indicated she felt better to leave it as is.

The Sub-Committee recommended to bring the CIP as it now stands to the Board at their next meeting.

Item 3 Budget Transfers for 2020-2021 (for salary adjustments)

Mr. Bienkowski talked about the budget transfers that are necessary to re-align the budget lines with the salary adjustments that were approved at the last Board of Education meeting. Since he put this together he has had further thoughts to do this as a budget adjustment. The advantage would be to re-align the budget numbers so that when we work on next year's budget we don't have to be concerned with the transfer column. This schedule would be reformatted with budget line numbers with pluses and minuses to show what the original budget is, what the adjusted budget is and the amended budget will end up being. We will always have this detail as a separate schedule instead of the transfer it will be an adjustment schedule.

Mr. Delia stated he was in full support of this and the Sub-Committee agreed.

Item 4 Information Only – HAW Engineering

As of June 19th the town awarded the project of the Hawley Air Quality Improvements Project to Christopher William Architects out of the five companies as being the most comprehensive which they displayed how they are going to deal with the environmental and climate control aspects.

Item 5 Approval of May 27, 2020 BOE CIP Sub Committee Minutes

Mrs. Leidlein moved to approve the minutes of May 27, 2020. Ms. Zukowski seconds the motion. All in favor. Motion passes.

Public Comment: No public comments

Adjournment:

Mr. Delia asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mrs. Zukowski moved to adjourn the meeting. Mrs. Leidlein seconds the motion. All in favor. Motion passes and meeting was adjourned at 7:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Joanne Morris

THESE ARE DRAFT MINUTES AND ARE SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE BOE CIP/FACILITIES/FINANCE
SUB COMMITTEE

Newtown Board of Education Virtual Meeting
CIP/Facilities/Finance Sub-Committee Minutes
August 18, 2020, 7:00 p.m.

Call to Order: The BOE CIP Sub Committee meeting was called to order at 7:00 by Mr. Delia.

Participants: Dan Delia, Chair, Sub-Committee, Ron Bienkowski, Director of Business, Dr. Michelle Ku, Chair, Board of Education, Robert Gerbert, Director of Operations, Deb Zukowski, Sub-Committee Member, Dr. Lorrie Rodrigue, Superintendent

Pledge of Allegiance

Item 1 Review of Anticipated Expenses Related To COVID

Mr. Bienkowski stated that the list (attached) are the items we have discussed over the last couple of months which are necessary to open school in September and there are things still happening that we don't know about that could be added to this list. Additional hand sanitizer has not been included in the total at this point. He indicated this list will not stop and there will be additional needs.

Dr. Rodrigue stated the staffing area could be an issue with adding hours for paraeducators that we have not anticipated. If we add a Kindergarten section we would need an additional paraeducator. Overall, we think everything is good right now and the list is very fluid. She indicated that we keep examining our PPE (Personal Protective Equipment) and making sure we have enough to get us through a good portion of the beginning of the year and we are making sure every base is covered but, things will pop up and it is the nature of the game right now.

Ms. Zukowski stated she had heard talk of the bus monitors, instead of being on for two weeks was going to be for only two days. Dr. Rodrigue stated we have posted looking for volunteers and it was originally for two weeks in the plan. She said we want to make sure we are covered at least the first two days, and we have asked for two weeks. We have 55 buses. We cannot use staff because they would be late for school, or Paraeducators that are one to one as they would also be late for school. Dr. Rodrigue stated she is reaching out and getting requests from the community wanting to help. Other districts are having the same issue of finding people and we are doing the best we can. Ms. Zukowski asked if the goal is still 10 days for monitors.

Dr. Rodrigue said that was the intent when we were going to have full buses. Right now buses are half and could be less than half because a lot of parents are choosing to drive their children. We want students riding buses to know that they have to wear masks and stay seated. We might need more than 55 people if some don't want to do morning and afternoon runs due to schedules. Dr. Rodrigue will be sending another plea out to community to fill the need for volunteers.

Mr. Delia asked if we need to put anything on the list with potential expenses for more security or, anything else since we will have more traffic as parents will be dropping off their children?

Dr. Rodrigue said she has our Director of Security on alert and all of Newtown Police. Principals have figured out and adjusted their schedules and created a time lag for pickup and dropping off. This could be another thing we will have to adjust along the way.

Mr. Delia asked Mr. Gerbert if there was anything else to add to this list besides the hand sanitizer?

Mr. Gerbert stated he thought the list was pretty comprehensive. There will still be incidentals such as hand sanitizer and wipes which are popular at this time. We have plenty of soap, cleaning supplies and disinfectant. We don't know about hand sanitizer and wipes until we see what we are consuming.

Mr. Delia asked if we should increase the number.

Mr. Gerbert stated he does not have anything in regards to extra expenses for PPE, hand sanitizer etc. Presently, we may be in the neighborhood of \$50-60k more which we are committed to for purchasing materials depending on how fast we use them up, that cost could also get up to \$100K easily.

Dr. Rodrigue stated the expenses are close to or match what was submitted to the state. She also said some of the things we were able to capture early were sight licenses for some apps that we had and worked into this year's budget, along with technology, devices, and hotspots. The amount of \$1.5M was given to the State at the time when they asked for potential expenses.

Mr. Delia said he would put a bigger number up for the hand sanitizer as we will go through this very fast. Ms. Zukowski agreed.

Dr. Rodrigue said when we assessed, we wanted to be very careful and not to underestimate these costs.

Mr. Delia was comfortable with adding another 50% to the cost of the hand sanitizer.

Mr. Bienkowski stated he would increase the hand sanitizer expense to the list.

Dr. Rodrigue said when we meet these tweaks and go to Board of Finance closer to the \$1.5M we will utilize these figures. We are looking at the \$1.5M as being a realistic number.

Item 2 Discussion and Acceptance of the Non-Lapsing Account Regulation

Mr. Bienkowski stated we had Matt Ritter, our attorney, answer a lot of questions that the sub-committee had regarding a draft of the Non-Lapsing Fund regulation and he took what we were

looking at and put into a regulation that would address everything he heard at the CIP Sub-Committee's previous meeting. This draft is a result of his work. This draft cuts to the chase and lists the salient points of our discussion and he suggested the committee adopt this as the appropriate regulation of the non-lapsing fund because we are going to be asking for funds to be deposit into that account at the Board of Finance meeting and it would be good to have this draft in-place as an approved regulation.

Ms. Zukowski asked Mr. Bienkowski if he was satisfied with everything.

Mr. Bienkowski stated he thought it is a good summary that we can work with.

Dr. Ku stated the regulation will not be approved by the Board of Education because it has to go through Administration. The sub-committee can bring this forward to the Board of Education for informational purposes.

The Sub-Committee agreed to bring this to the Board of Education to support this regulation.

Public Comment: No public comments

Adjournment:

Mr. Delia moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Zukowski seconds the motion. All in favor. Motion passes and meeting was adjourned at 7:26pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Joanne Morris

THESE ARE DRAFT MINUTES AND ARE SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE BOE
CIP/FACILITIES/FINANCE SUB COMMITTEE

**NEWTOWN BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUMMARY - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
2021/22 TO 2025/26**

Approved by the Board of Education
on 7/7/2020

INITIAL FIVE YEARS

CIP Item #	Location	Description of Project	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	NO BONDING Year 4	Year 5	TOTALS
			2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	
1	Hawley Elem.	Ventilation, HVAC Renovations	\$4,199,720	\$0				
8	Hawley Elem.	Generator - 80KW <i>(whole school reduced to essential components only)</i>				\$0	\$250,000	\$4,449,720
9	Middle Gate Elem	Energy Project window modifications				\$0	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
6	Head O'Meadow	Boilers, water heater, VFD & pump replacements with LED lighting			\$850,000	\$0		\$850,000
3	Reed Intermediate	Install high efficiency gas boilers & LED lighting conversion		\$1,539,894	\$0			\$1,539,894
4	Middle School	Engineering for ventilation and A/C renovations		\$300,000	\$0			
5	Middle School	Ventilation, HVAC, Auditorium, Media center, replace rooftop units '98			\$3,782,228	\$0		\$4,082,228
2	High School	Replace/restore stadium turf field & track <i>(11th year)</i>	\$795,000	\$0				
7	High School	Create turf practice field rear of school					\$1,100,000	
-	High School	Rear Practice fields facilities and storage <i>(moved back one year)</i>					\$0	
TOTAL COSTS OF ALL PROJECTS			\$4,994,720	\$1,839,894	\$4,632,229	\$0	\$2,350,000	\$13,816,843
TOTAL TO BE BONDED			\$4,994,720	\$1,839,894	\$4,632,229	\$0	\$2,350,000	\$13,816,843

Previous BOE approved CIP amounts (November 6, 2019)	\$4,712,000	\$1,752,730	\$4,565,812	\$2,000,000	\$2,504,000	\$15,534,542
Difference to previously approved plan	\$282,720	\$87,164	\$66,417	-\$2,000,000	-\$154,000	-\$1,717,699

Eligibility for project inclusion on the CIP is that the cost must exceed \$200,000.
2017-18 Reimbursement rate 36.43%

Construction inflation estimate 6.0%

**NEWTOWN BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUMMARY - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
2026/27 TO 2030/31**

Approved by the Board of Education
on 7/7/2020

SECOND FIVE YEARS

CIP Item #	Location	Description of Project	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	NO BONDING Year 9	Year 10	TOTALS
			2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	
	Hawley Elem.	Classroom renovations '21 section (ceilings, lighting, floors, etc.) Repave entire parking lot, curbing, sidewalks Elevator to café	\$318,000	\$1,011,240 \$0	\$0 \$1,378,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,707,240
	Sandy Hook							\$0
	Middle Gate Elem	Repave entire parking lot, curbing, sidewalks Complete kitchen renovation Ventilation, HVAC Renovations		\$1,378,000	\$0 \$397,500	\$0	\$300,000	\$2,075,500
	Head O'Meadow	Replace/update A/C Re roofing/restoration		\$2,696,640	\$6,179,800 \$0	\$0		\$8,876,440
	Reed Intermediate	Repave entire parking lot, curbing, sidewalks Re roof entire building (solar remove & reinstall \$225K)	\$3,710,000	\$2,120,000 \$0	\$0			\$5,830,000
	Middle School	Repave entire parking lot, curbing, sidewalks Window replacements (front of building) Library and science lab renovations Complete kitchen renovation	\$795,000	\$3,710,000 \$0	\$1,685,400 \$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$7,190,400
	High School	Re roofing/restoration HVAC equipment replacements Athletic/Stadium field house and storage Rear Practice fields facilities and storage <i>(moved back one year)</i>	\$2,921,360 \$954,000 \$0	\$0 \$1,685,400	\$0	\$0	\$5,300,000	\$10,860,760
TOTAL COSTS OF ALL PROJECTS			\$8,698,360	\$12,601,280	\$9,640,700	\$0	\$6,600,000	\$37,540,340
TOTAL TO BE BONDED			\$8,698,360	\$12,601,280	\$9,640,700	\$0	\$6,600,000	\$37,540,340

2020-2021 COVID Expenses

				DRAFT	Expensed	Anticipated/ Encumbered	Total	CRF
Personnel Expenses								
Nurses - increase 7 hour day to 8 hours			\$97,500	\$87,539		\$87,539		
.8 Nurse addition			\$49,800	\$23,305		\$23,305		
Additional Building Substitutes			\$117,000	\$128,180		\$128,180		
Behavior Interventionist HOM			\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Additional Para hours - Kdg, reading & math			\$17,124	\$24,435		\$24,435		
Bus monitors, 6 hrs. per day for 10 days			\$50,300	\$46,850		\$46,850		
Custodians, additional bathroom cleaning			\$225,634	\$8,637	\$164,094	\$172,731		
BT services					\$62,562	\$62,562		
Psychology Coverage, additional guidance hours				\$57,992		\$57,992		
Physics Coverage				\$28,577		\$28,577		
						\$0		
Certified Staff 1.0 HOM, 0.2 HS Sped	1.2		\$74,353	\$32,158		\$32,158	Increased .5 HOM reading (now 1.0)	
Sub Total Personnel Costs			\$651,711	\$437,673	\$226,656	\$664,329		\$664,329
Facilities Expenses								
1 Tables	300	\$116.25	\$34,875	\$34,875		\$34,875		
2 Desk shields, students, offices, café			\$144,878	\$105,284	\$4,598	\$109,882		\$107,239
3 Tents for HS additional eating space	5	\$8,770	\$43,850	\$43,850		\$43,850		
4 Storage containers			\$14,940	\$9,231	\$5,709	\$14,940		
5 HVAC Higher rated filters			\$16,051	\$333	\$15,718	\$16,051		\$16,052
6 Ventilation Purge Programming (all schools)			\$25,840	\$25,840		\$25,840		\$25,840
7 Air Purifiers			\$46,446	\$46,446		\$46,446		\$46,396
8 PPE Hand sanitizer			\$100,000					
PPE (shields, masks)				\$4,997	\$13,373	\$18,370		\$2,536
Sanitizer & Disinfectant				\$75,780	\$30,599	\$106,379		\$97,430
Storage & Signage				\$32,645	\$5,311	\$37,955		\$4,433
Misc Items (purchased at school level)				\$3,613	\$10,453	\$14,066		
				\$382,893	\$85,760	\$468,654		
Sub Total Facilities Costs			\$426,880			\$468,654		\$299,926
Other Items								
1 Distance Learning Technology items			\$382,698	\$74,744	\$513,762	\$588,506		\$40,235
2 Disposable Face masks			\$8,200 ?			\$0		
3 Face shields	750	\$2.79	\$2,079	\$2,093		\$2,093		\$2,250
4 Thermometers	10	\$134	\$1,340	\$1,340		\$1,340		
5 Office Dividers			\$41,932	\$43,172		\$43,172		\$38,430
Legal Fees				\$3,060		\$3,060		
				\$124,409	\$513,762	\$638,171		
Subtotal Other Costs			\$436,249			\$638,171		\$80,915
Total Potential Estimated Additional Costs			\$1,514,840			\$1,771,154		\$380,841
							<i>Above Estimate</i>	\$256,314

Virtual Net Metering Credit & Billing 2020

Acct# 5181- 521-9084	Current Credit	# Days	Kw	kWh Credit	kWh Credit	T&D	Other Charges	Net Credit
Jan 16-17	-\$6,250.50	1	36,000	-0.15478	-\$5,572.08	\$53.59		-\$5,518.49
2/14-3/16	-\$21,864.73	31	141,600	-0.15478	-\$21,916.85	\$52.12		-\$21,864.73
3/16-4/15	-\$15,549.70	30	100,800	-0.15478	-\$15,601.82	\$52.12		-\$15,549.70
4/15-5/15	-\$22,521.22	30	144,000	-0.15676	-\$22,573.44	\$52.22		-\$22,521.22
5/15-6/15	-\$30,045.58	32	192,000	-0.15676	-\$30,097.92	\$52.34		-\$30,045.58
6/16-7/17	-\$22,229.14	31	156,000	-0.14283	-\$22,281.48	\$52.34		-\$22,229.14
7/17-8/17	-\$17,110.76	31	127,200	-0.13493	-\$17,163.10	\$52.34		-\$17,110.76
8/17-9/16	-\$12,190.44	30	132,048	-0.13493	-\$17,817.24	\$54.72	\$5,572.08	-\$12,190.44
	-\$147,762.07		1,029,648		-\$153,023.92	\$421.79	\$5,572.08	-\$147,030.05

Sherman Project - Total Credit Acct 5181-521-9084 **-\$153,023.92**

Jackson-Sherman Bill	kWh	kWh Credit	Fee	Net Credit
<i>Estimated (not yet billed)</i>			\$0.089	
1/16-3/16	36,000	-\$5,572.08	\$3,204.00	-\$2,368.08
2/14-3/16	141,600	-\$21,916.85	\$12,602.40	-\$9,314.45
3/16-4/15	100,800	-\$15,601.82	\$8,971.20	-\$6,630.62
4/15-5/15	144,000	-\$22,573.44	\$12,816.00	-\$9,757.44
5/15-6/15	192,000	-\$30,097.92	\$17,088.00	-\$13,009.92
6/16-7/17	156,000	-\$22,281.48	\$13,884.00	-\$8,397.48
7/17-8/17	127,200	-\$17,163.10	\$11,320.80	-\$5,842.30
8/17-9/16	132,048	-\$17,817.24	\$11,752.27	-\$6,064.96
Total Invoice Due	1,029,648	-\$153,023.92	\$91,638.67	-\$61,385.25

Average net credit **-\$7,673.16**

Acct# 5154- 821-9039	Current Credit	# Days	Kw	kWh Credit	kWh Credit	T&D	Other Charges	Net Credit
1/15-1/16	-\$33,473.50	1	213,600	-0.15478	-\$33,061.01	\$105.71	\$518.20	-\$32,437.10
2/14-3/16	-\$15,870.12	31	-	-0.15478	\$0.00		-\$518.20	-\$518.20
3/16-4/15	-\$21,016.32	30	103,200	-0.15478	-\$15,973.30	\$103.18		-\$15,870.12
4/15-5/15	-\$28,916.91	30	134,400	-0.15676	-\$21,068.54	\$52.22		-\$21,016.32
5/15-6/16	-\$24,285.89	32	184,800	-0.15676	-\$28,969.25	\$52.34		-\$28,916.91
6/16-7/17	-\$14,520.10	31	170,400	-0.14283	-\$24,338.23	\$52.34		-\$24,285.89
7/17-8/17		31	108,000	-0.13493	-\$14,572.44	\$52.34		-\$14,520.10
8/17-9/16*	-\$21,049.08	30	156,000	-0.13493	-\$21,049.09	\$52.34		-\$20,996.75
	-\$159,131.92		1,070,400		-\$159,031.86	\$418.13	\$0.00	-\$137,564.64

*8/17-9/16 on Ever source bill, missing copy from host meter (est kWh)

Jackson Project - Total Credit Acct 5154-821-9039 **-\$159,031.86**

Jackson-Sherman Bill	kWh	kWh Credit	Fee	Net Credit
			\$0.089	
1/16-3/16	213,600	-\$33,061.01	\$19,010.40	-\$14,050.61
3/16-4/15	103,200	-\$15,973.30	\$9,184.80	-\$6,788.50
4/15-5/15	134,400	-\$21,068.54	\$11,961.60	-\$9,106.94
5/15-6/16	184,800	-\$28,969.25	\$16,447.20	-\$12,522.05
6/16-7/17	170,400	-\$24,338.23	\$15,165.60	-\$9,172.63
7/17-8/17	108,000	-\$14,572.44	\$9,612.00	-\$4,960.44
Total Invoice Due	914,400	-\$137,982.77	\$81,381.60	-\$56,601.17
8/17-9/16*	156,000	-\$21,049.09	\$13,884.00	-\$7,165.09

* not yet billed

Average net credit **-\$9,433.53**