

**Special Meeting Minutes
Fairfield BoE, February 8, 2018**

NOTICE: A full meeting recording can be obtained from Fairfield Public Schools. Please call 203-255-8371 for more information and/or see the FPS website (under Board Meeting Minutes) for a link to FAIRTV.

Call to order of the Special Meeting of the Board of Education and Roll Call

Acting Chair Jennifer Jacobsen called the Special meeting to order at 7:30PM. Present were members Jennifer Leeper, Trisha Pytko, Christine Vitale, Jessica Gerber, Jennifer Jacobsen, Jennifer Maxon-Kennelly, Nick Aysseh and Jeff Peterson. Mr. Dwyer was not present. Others present were Superintendent Dr. Toni Jones, members of the central office leadership team, and 10 members of the public.

Mrs. Gerber moved, Ms. Pytko seconded that the Board of Education hereby moves into Executive Session to discuss records, reports and statements of strategy or negotiations with respect to collective bargaining and to invite Attorney Sedor and Attorney Deasy, in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes CGS§ 1-210(b)(9).

Motion Passed: 7-0

(Mr. Aysseh was not present for the vote.)

The Board returned to Public Session.

First Reading of Sherman Educational Specifications

Mr. Cullen and Mr. Morabito reviewed the ed specs, FEMA regulation packet and project timeline. Even if the contingency amount is used, the project remains below the FEMA threshold. The Sherman lockers are an existing item and should be considered maintenance. The mechanical means of fresh air is already in place, so it may also be possible to factor in air conditioning as maintenance. Jim Wendt, Fairfield Planning Director, agreed with the \$795K in excluded items, adding a high level of confidence to the numbers.

Mr. Peterson wanted to know the potential impact if the project actually went over the 50% FEMA threshold. Mr. Cullen said the building committee would then review the need for another phase, but the \$200K buffer should be sufficient.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly confirmed that there is a priority list in the event the project nears the 50% limit.

Mrs. Gerber felt the Special Projects Building Committee did a good job on phases 1 and 2 and would be very knowledgeable if chosen to work on Phase III.

Mr. Cullen said the Sherman project timeline does not include reimbursement from the CSDE Office of School Construction Grants. Mr. Morabito added that it is possible to file for reimbursement later than June 30, but the project would then move farther down the CSDE priority list. It is also possible to withdraw from filing, avoiding any limitations that process would impose.

First Reading of Mill Hill Educational Specifications

Mr. Morabito confirmed that the project could be filed with CSDE after June 30, 2019, risking a change to the reimbursement rate. There are critical steps, as noted in the timeline, that must be taken prior to filing. The filing for Mill Hill is expected to take place prior to June 2019. The Waterfall shows the seed money has a different process. The ed spec approval is part of the timely filing process, but there is some wiggle room in the design phase if this is delayed. Mrs. Gerber added that she believed that June 30 2018 is the bonding resolution deadline for both Mill Hill and Sherman.

Mr. Aysseh expressed concern over justifying a 504 enrollment over what he felt was a short period of time, and preferred to have more complete information to make a decision. Dr. Jones added that the Board of Selectmen requested the ed specs to move the project forward. Mrs. Gerber said flexibility exists even after the ed specs are approved; it would be possible to approve for a 504 now, and then amend later if needed, prior to the funding request. She expressed some concern over the tight March timeline, with approval needed by BOS, BOF and RTM, during a very busy month of budget hearings. Mr. Cullen said the BOS offered to have a special meeting to help move the process forward, including the formation of a building committee.

Mrs. Gerber asked that the reference to 'Board update' be removed from the ed specs, as it was Central Office staff who updated the facilities plan; the BoE hasn't actually approved an updated long-range plan since 2015. She also requested a change to the capacity number. Over the years, Mill Hill capacity has been referenced as 483 with portables, and 378 without, and those numbers should be reflected here as well. The capacity of 273, while a helpful number, is not consistent with what has been presented in the past. Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly and Mrs. Vitale agreed.

Mr. Cullen said the MGT study used functional capacity, for example, disregarding whether Art was on a cart. Milone & MacBroom views enrollment from an operational standpoint; they studied previously used ed specs to get a true idea of needed space. Dr. Jones stressed the importance of referencing the true capacity number of 273 in order to maintain clarity within the ed spec. Experience from previous projects is an important factor as well.

The Board discussed school spaces and capacity, and asked if Principal Chase could address that at the next meeting; specifically speaking to accommodating smaller work spaces for occupational therapy or social work sessions. How would those spaces be accommodated if enrollment increased?

Ms. Pytko moved, Mr. Aysseh seconded to adjourn the meeting.

Motion Passed: 8-0

*Respectfully Submitted,
Jessica Gerber
Fairfield Board of Education
Secretary*