

The Regional School District 13 Board of Education held a special work session on Tuesday, August 29, 2023 at 5:00 PM in the library at Coginchaug Regional High School.

Board members present: Ms. Betty (by phone), Mrs. Caramanello (by phone), Mrs. Dahlheimer, Dr. Darcy (by phone), Mr. Mennone, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Petrella and Mrs. Roy (by phone)

Board members absent: Mr. Roraback and Mr. Stone

Building Committee members present: Mr. Cross, Mr. Faiella (by phone), Mr. Giammatteo, Mr. Overton and Mr. Weissberg (by phone)

Administration present: Dr. Schuch, Superintendent of Schools, Mrs. Neubig, Director of Finance, Mr. Proia, Supervisor of Facilities and Grounds, Mrs. Smith, Operations Manager, Mrs. Keane, Director of Student Services and Special Education and Mr. Pietrasko, Director of Infrastructure and Security Technology

Mrs. Dahlheimer called the special work session to order at 5:09 PM.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Approval of Agenda

Mr. Mennone made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Petrella, to approve the agenda, as presented.

In favor of approving the agenda, as presented: Ms. Betty, Mrs. Caramanello, Mrs. Dahlheimer, Dr. Darcy, Mr. Mennone, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Petrella and Mrs. Roy. Motion carried.

Joint Work Session with Building Committee

A. QA+M Presentation on Long Range Facility Planning and Potential Grade Configurations - Rusty Malik and Carson Collier

Mr. Malik began by noting that when they looked at the projects, they looked for what would provide the maximum reimbursement. He felt that the district would be best off by doing a project that is renovate-as-new because that provides reimbursement for everything that is touched. He urged everyone to look at the net cost to the district rather than the gross project cost. Some of the proposed options include mainly code and ADA updates.

Mr. Malik noted that they will talk about grade configurations but wanted to note that they have not yet defined what “repurposing” a school means. That could mean demolition, sale of the property or repurposing it for another community function. As a regional district, they would be limited to the educational components. He did not feel it would make sense to demolish a building as the property would still remain but felt that that should be discussed today so that they can create a budget. Their current numbers were put together as a demolition project as a place to start.

They also reviewed the list of capital needs and found that it was not a small number, being at \$25 million-plus. Very little of that is eligible for reimbursement, so it would be done over time and escalation would have to be factored in. They also looked at the cost savings from closing a school and used a 10-year number. Operational costs will also vary, depending on the option chosen, as will energy costs. With updated buildings, energy and operational costs will come down.

Mr. Malik explained that he included the net cost to the district as well as the capital and operational cost savings provided by each option. He further explained that once updates are completed, capital needs go away. As an example, the \$4.5 million needed for basic capital needs would be included in the \$8.3 million project and major systems would begin a new life cycle. Mr. Malik added that capital needs will just maintain what is currently present, not update. Most major equipment has a 10- to 15-year life. It was also mentioned that the bond to demolish a building would cost almost as much over time as it would to have the building just sit there.

Mr. Cross noted that when buildings get to be 15, 20, 25 years, they are past the point of no return and any money on maintenance would be wasted. The district would be far better off getting reimbursement on new projects. He noted that the district has several buildings in that category presently.

Mrs. Dahlheimer asked to go through options 7, 10 and 10A. Mr. Malik began with option 10, repurposing Lyman and Brewster, having preK-5 at Memorial, while maintaining Strong and Coginchaug in their current configurations. Looking at the budget side, the numbers included for Lyman and Brewster are to demolish the buildings but keep the property. Strong and Coginchaug numbers are primarily for ADA and code compliance which would be reimbursable. Other educational items could be added as well as major capital needs. The bulk of the work in this option is at Memorial with a major addition to the building. Total project cost there would be \$59.63 million, with an estimated reimbursement rate of \$26.8 million and a net cost of about \$32.79 million. The challenge with this project will be doing the work while the kids are in the school. Mr. Malik noted that, over time, parents are less tolerant of the impact of a project on the kids' education. If this option was selected, they would start the work at Memorial first and look to minimize disruption by possibly reviving portables temporarily.

Mr. Weissberg felt that they need to take a step back and decide what type of criteria they want to use to evaluate these options. He would like to take a more global look and figure out what's important for everyone. Mr. Weissberg mentioned a few criteria, including travel distance, build quality, expansion potential, and asked what everyone felt were the important things to consider. He would like to see six or seven key criteria so that everyone can evaluate each option on their merits.

Mr. Moore felt that an overriding criterion would be cost and Mr. Weissberg agreed, noting that typically cost is looked at at the end as more of a benefit cost. He felt that cost should not be the first thing to look at. Mr. Overton felt that an important thing is to upgrade all of the space that the kids will be learning in as well as mechanical equipment which will impact long-term costs and the value of the space that is created. He reviewed that capital needs would have the district invest \$25 million to maintain what is currently there with no upgrades. Mr. Overton did not feel that was a cost-effective option. He also asked if option 10 costs at Memorial were a phased approach to renovation while the kids are in the school which would extend the length of the project and add to the cost. Mr. Malik agreed that that would be the approach in this option and option 10A would be building a new school on the site, then demolishing the old one. Mr. Overton also felt that they could use the two schools planned for repurposing as swing space. Mr. Malik added that the two schools would not be able to accommodate all of the students and they may have to look at other options, such as space at the high school. Mr. Overton would ideally like to see the school closed and renovated without students there. Mr. Weissberg added that he had impact on operations as one of his criteria for evaluating the options. Mr. Malik explained that they had noted that as disruption to education.

Mr. Weissberg felt that travel distance and programming were important as well and should be factored into the discussions. Mr. Overton felt that the state reimbursement criteria for renovate-as-new or building a new school is that it will last for 20 years without a need for upgrade which is also important when comparing the options. Mr. Malik explained that most people tend to gravitate to the least expensive option, but when factored over 20 years, the net cost will be very telling. Mr. Moore felt that programming is the most critical issue and what the educational advantage would be of each option.

Dr. Schuch noted that the two renovation/building projects he was involved in resulted in schools that looked nothing like the others in the district. They took technology and the way that education is changing, with things being more collaborative, into account. The end result was a more beneficial educational experience which also included more natural lighting and more safety and security features. He also felt that if they are to go to the taxpayers for a significant investment, they will not want the Taj Mahal but would want to know that it's different than what was there. Mr. Malik felt that there is much more flexibility with space in these options and implementation of systems are a lot easier. It can be done with existing buildings, but it is more difficult.

Mr. Weissberg felt that there were four key categories: physical plant, educational experience, construction impacts and travel distance. Mr. Mennone felt that travel distance is a low impact. He noted that when families had a choice for educational style, half of Lyman's population was from Durham. Mrs. Dahlheimer felt that there would be cost savings on buses and time frames would be different. Dr. Schuch agreed that it may be a consideration but would not be a driving factor. Mr. Weissberg agreed but wanted to make sure it's considered for transparency purposes. Mrs. Neubig added that they may also not save a bus, but shorten time on the bus. Mr. Weissberg suggested having a category for transportation. Mr. Overton asked everyone to keep in mind that with a new or renovated-as-new school, there are a lot of intangible benefits that are hard to measure, such as natural light and air quality.

Mrs. Petrella felt that the two driving issues for this are improving the education of the students and the cost of operating the schools with declining enrollment. Mrs. Neubig felt that option 10, with a cost of \$71 million and a net of \$41 million, looks like a lot, but the estimated 10-year savings is almost \$30 million. That results in roughly \$11 million to do the project. She added that the district will need to ask the taxpayers to bond \$71 million but will not use it all. Mrs. Neubig added that they will still need to save 2 percent for capital, even with a new school, but there will be cost savings from the other buildings as well. Mrs. Dahlheimer also felt that they will need to look at the per pupil cost. Mrs. Neubig will provide best estimates once they narrow the options down to three or four.

A question was asked about how long it would take for Memorial to be done if they don't move the students out of the building. Mr. Malik felt the project could be done in 18 to 24 months if the school is empty. The challenge is hazmat and it is not advisable to abate a building while students are still in it. That will extend the time frame. Mr. Malik reiterated that they have certainly done projects with students in the building, but that could take 30 to 36 months.

Mr. Moore felt that the number of transitions needs to be considered as well. Option 4 is the cheapest option, but still has two transitions. He felt that option 4 has been on the table for a while and may be the least costly, but not meet other criteria. Mr. Weissberg felt that that would fall under educational experience. Dr. Schuch agreed that the longer the learner and their family can invest in a particular school, the more they become attached. Transitions can be traumatic for some kids and it is a lot harder to get parent volunteers if their kids are only there for a few years.

Mr. Moore also noted that, in the past, students have said that they like to be the boss of the school and help the younger students. Mr. Mennone thought that shutting Memorial and putting everyone in Brewster and Lyman for a while would accomplish that. He asked how short they were on space to be able to do that and Mr. Malik explained that he really hasn't done that analysis, but did know that there was not enough space. He noted that they could bring in portables as well.

Mr. Moore asked if universal preK was included in these options and Mr. Malik explained that one option included an expanded preK program (doubled the number of students). If the district is going with preK for everyone, they would have to look at that. Mr. Malik added that any option should include future expansion. Mrs. Dahlheimer asked if they went forward with the possible reconfiguration with four and five at Memorial, would that be enough space to accommodate the renovations. Mr. Malik agreed that that would free up space though he would ideally want all of the kids out of the school.

Dr. Schuch felt that the ability of the community to access the site and utilize it during non-school times should be a secondary criterion. He has seen a lot of projects where buildings are designed so that a part of the building can be easily used by community groups. Mr. Malik felt that they would ideally want public/community zones and academic zones because of security. He also mentioned that there would be limits on space configuration with a renovate-as-new project.

Mr. Moore asked if Mrs. Neubig had run the debt service numbers on \$30 or \$40 million. Mrs. Neubig explained that the district has debt service falling off at the end of 2024-2025. The district can bond roughly \$5 million starting with the 2025-2026 budget without increasing debt service at all. Based on \$40 million, debt service would peak in 2028-2029 and fall down again. Depending on the scenario, savings would either cover that completely or partially cover it. It may be possible that they would have to have an additional nurse or custodian if they choose to renovate Memorial. Mrs. Neubig added that it will be impossible to catch up on current needs in a budget cycle as there is roughly \$25 million needed and the district can only save 2 percent (roughly \$780,000). Bonding would be needed to finance that.

Mrs. Dahlheimer noted that option 11 was supposed to note the proposed interim configurations and Memorial should be listed as 4 and 5. Mr. Malik explained that that was a typo.

Mrs. Petrella asked if they were going to go through each option and compare it to the criteria to narrow the options down. Mr. Malik suggested that they start by eliminating options. Mr. Weissberg felt that made perfect sense and reviewed the criteria, including physical plant, educational experience, construction impact, transportation, cost and public benefit.

Mrs. Petrella felt that they should not consider 8-12 at the high school. Mr. Mennone agreed and felt that neither 7-12 nor 8-12 should be options. That eliminates options 6, 6A, 7, 8 and 9. Mrs. Petrella also leans more toward renovate-as-new. Mrs. Dahlheimer felt that they need to include the current configuration for comparison. Looking at having one K-5 school, options 1, 2, 2A and 3 would be eliminated. Mrs. Petrella asked about an option that included just closing Lyman to compare against closing both Lyman and Brewster that could show the additional savings for closing both schools. Mr. Moore noted that option 4 is what they have been discussing for the past few years. Mrs. Dahlheimer suggested keeping option 11 as opposed to option 4 as it portrays where they will possibly be as opposed to where they are now.

Mrs. Neubig asked if the board would be interested in an option 10B which includes universal preK. Mr. Cross reviewed that if they bond for too much money based on space, reimbursement will go down. Mrs. Neubig wondered if there might be a waiver for building for future preK. Mr. Malik felt that the challenge is that they need to build based on projections based on what is required which would impact the reimbursement rate. He did note that a waiver can be requested based on planning for the future. Dr. Schuch asked if a new school would provide the opportunity to plan for space for preK, but to use it in different ways if the mandate didn't come through. Mr. Malik explained that that space is pretty specialized and would also include drop-off space and playgrounds. Mrs. Dahlheimer reminded everyone that they had discussed holding preK at Coginchaug. Mrs. Neubig explained that adjustments would need to be made there as well. Mrs. Dahlheimer would like to look into that further and Mr. Malik stated that there are several high schools that have preK.

Mrs. Petrella asked for Mr. Malik's thoughts on building classrooms with partitions. He felt that it's great in some cases, but it does take away wall space from each room. It does provide flexibility and is done quite often. He felt that it could be done with one room per grade level. Dr. Darcy's experience is that it was really hard to teach if the classroom attached didn't have good classroom management. Mr. Cross didn't generally like the partitioned classrooms.

Mr. Moore felt that if they were going to include option 11, they should also include an option closing Brewster and one closing Lyman to provide a good comparison. He noted that option 4 includes closing Lyman and option 7 includes closing Brewster and Lyman. He felt that the costs are pretty much comparable.

Dr. Schuch noted that he was all about saving money on the Memorial project, but added that option 7 feels like they would be funding two major projects. Mr. Mennone felt that Mr. Moore was giving everyone in the community the best options. Mrs. Neubig asked if the board would commit to doing code and ADA upgrades within the large project or put that off to another time. Mr. Mennone felt it would be whatever is more cost-effective and Mr. Overton wondered how long that would take. Mr. Moore mentioned that if they take out the improvements at Strong and Coginchaug, the numbers drop \$20 million. He felt it might be possible to hold off until the debt service drops but felt that the board would need to look at that. Mr. Malik reviewed that the projects would be done in phases.

Mr. Overton asked what the time frame for code and ADA upgrades at Coginchaug would be and Mr. Malik felt that it might be able to be done over two summers and is reimbursable. Mr. Moore asked if the state reimburses for athletic fields and Mr. Malik explained that they would for new fields in terms of programs. Reimbursement would include a new playground at Memorial.

Mrs. Dahlheimer asked to add option 10B which would put preK at the high school, but keep 10A as well. Mr. Overton asked about a new building at Memorial and Mr. Malik stated that the goal would be to keep the existing building operational while the new one is being constructed. That would not have a direct impact on education, but would impact playgrounds and athletic fields.

Mrs. Neubig asked if the board wanted her to post the various costs on the website tomorrow and Mrs. Dahlheimer felt that would be a good idea. Dr. Schuch asked Mr. Malik how many final options he would want to see and he hoped for two to three. Mrs. Dahlheimer reviewed that option 4 is closing one school, option 7 is closing two schools but asked if they really needed option 7 if option 10 is a repurpose. Mr. Moore agreed to delete option 7. Mrs. Dahlheimer felt they needed to include all option 10s and 11

as well. Mr. Malik suggested adding preK at Coginchaug to option 10A and reviewed the options as 4, 10, 10A with expanded preK and 11. Mrs. Dahlheimer felt that option 5 is still an option as well with one school closure. Several people were not in favor of that as it retains two separate elementary schools. Mrs. Petrella noted that they had one community who was not happy with losing their elementary school and wondered how the other community would deal with that. Dr. Schuch stated that his experience has been that everyone wants their kid at a new school.

Mrs. Dahlheimer felt that the district has the history on option 5 that can be used as comparison, if needed. Mr. Overton stated that if the majority wanted an elementary school in each town, he felt that the kids from that town should go to the school there. Dr. Schuch felt it would be very difficult for programming as one school would be smaller than the other, based on the population.

Mrs. Dahlheimer reviewed that the board would like options 4, 10, 10A with preK at CRHS and option 11 analyzed. Dr. Schuch asked what the timeline would be for this and Mr. Malik reviewed that 10 and 10A is a renovation vs. new. New is a little simpler for them to evaluate, but they will get the analyses done. Mr. Mennone reminded everyone that there is a lot of talent in the room from the Building committee. He added that while it will be a disruption for a couple of years, they are doing what's best for the kids by having them all in the same schools. That will provide future money to work on Strong and Coginchaug and the athletic fields once they consolidate and get rid of two buildings.

Mrs. Petrella reminded everyone that capital projects total \$25 million now, just to keep all of the schools open, which does nothing for the educational program. Mr. Mennone felt that this moves in the direction of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Malik will address each option against each of the criteria that were listed and give their opinion.

Ms. Betty was in agreement with the options that were chosen. Mrs. Neubig asked if the board wanted to discuss the buildings that will be demolished or repurposed and Mr. Malik added that they would need to know exactly what would be done. Mr. Overton felt that they needed to carry the demolition numbers. Mr. Moore added that they need to look at the legal requirements with Brewster and whether it can be demolished or not. Mrs. Neubig also noted that if there is any remaining municipal bonding money (which is on Brewster), that restricts the use of the building for educational purposes only on any areas touched by the bonding. Lyman did not have that.

Mrs. Neubig added that there is a solar lease on Lyman and the new owner would have to take ownership of that or the district would have to buy that out. It was a twenty-five-year lease signed in 2010.

Mr. Malik asked if all of preK would be at the high school in option 10A and how many students that would include. Mrs. Dahlheimer felt it would be all of preK. Dr. Schuch added that once they make space at the high school for preK, it will be almost unusable for anything else. Mrs. Keane added that there would be ways to get it done and it wouldn't be an exact number of rooms. At this point, she would think four classrooms would work. They will work on that number and get it to Mr. Malik.

Mrs. Neubig thanked Mr. Malik and Mr. Collier for all of their work on this.

Public Comment

A. In-person public comment

Samantha Eiding, from Middlefield, has two children, one of whom just started his second year at John Lyman. She appreciates the board's efforts to bring the two towns together. She sees the goals of the board and is encouraged by the vision, however she is an advocate for maintaining John Lyman and is profoundly concerned about the interim configuration plan. There are too many pieces missing from how it would be done. She felt that stability plays a role in the children's lives and they desire a stable educational environment. It is disheartening to see this decision that disregards their fundamental needs. The children have faced unprecedented challenges caused by the pandemic and the importance of stability and consistency cannot be overstated. Ms. Eiding has heard board members call these proposed changes not ideal and she felt that stability is not a luxury, but a necessity. Consistent routines benefit their learning and their mental and physical health. Studies have indicated that frequent school moves were associated with lower academic achievement, behavioral problems and even an increased risk for obesity and associated health concerns. She offered to send those studies to the board. Consistency also allows students to fully dedicate their cognitive energy to learning and creating, instead of adjusting and adapting. For families with more than one child, this will make daily transportation exponentially more complicated and for children with special needs, this repeated disruption will be undue stress to all involved. In the August 9th Building committee meeting, Dr. Schuch described the reconfiguration as having an adverse impact on the budget and added that moving kids every two years will also impact family engagement and volunteering. Ms. Eiding attended a K-6 elementary school and that still holds a sizeable place in her heart. One of the first questions asked at the 8/9/23 presentation was what path forward would be the most cost effective. She understands that, but was heartened to hear the response of "sometimes the right thing costs more." The children are the most important stakeholders. Ms. Eiding stated that given that the students are still recovering from the disruption of the pandemic and will be for some time and given the current increase in construction costs and end-of-life equipment at Lyman, she truly doesn't understand. She asked that the board reconsider, with the priority of stability and consistency for the children.

Mike Cherkovsky, from Durham, hoped that this is the first step in a very long process and more of an effort is made to inform the public. He just recently found out about this plan and felt that something this disruptive and expensive really needs more community input and more community outreach. It is incredibly disruptive to move a kid from a school and have construction. Mr. Cherkovsky has lived in Durham for 11 years and he can always count on Durham Fair traffic and someone trying to close Lyman School. Lyman has not been able to be closed because it is a great school and is one of the best things in the community. He has seen his son growing in the school and feels it is regrettable that they are trying to ruin the community that Lyman has made, trying to take away the place that has been built up and hoped that they could take a look at other options. He would like to keep what there is that's so great. A great building would be awesome, but the biggest thing is to make a connection with the kids and Lyman has that. Mr. Cherkovsky has been a teacher for 19 years and hoped that this isn't pushed through without more community outreach. He asked that the board inform everyone of how long this could take, how expensive it could be and if they could possibly keep what they have.

Mark Simmons, from Durham, has two children in the district. He thanked Mr. Malik and Mr. Collier for their hard work. He felt it was important to lean on the professionals and listen to them. Mr. Simmons felt great work was done tonight by narrowing down the options and appreciated the board's work on that. He felt that option 10A, with a new Memorial School with K-5, is a great option. He did not feel that option 11, with the interim plan, should be included in the discussions as it hasn't been approved and

there hasn't been a lot of community involvement. He suggested that the current configuration be included as a comparison. Something that wasn't mentioned is that having a brand-new building could make Durham a destination. Mr. Simmons looks forward to seeing the budgetary numbers. He added that if there is an option 11, he would like to see the board give the same care and thought that Mr. Malik and Mr. Collier applied to their options, including budget impact, all various options, impact on the students and the towns and presenting those options to the town. Mr. Simmons encouraged the board to put any vote on changing the current grade configurations on hold and revisit the decision to end school choice until there is a better understanding of both an interim and long-term plan.

B. Remote public comment

Jennifer Simmons, from Durham, is a parent to a kindergartner and a fourth grader at John Lyman. She is also a certified school counselor and a licensed professional counselor with a practice in Durham. She has concerns about the proposed interim reconfiguration plan for the 2014-2015 school year. She is concerned about the timeline of how the plan was developed and the lack of public input on it before the board members vote on it. She is concerned that during the 8/19/23 meeting, a board member stated that they could have voted on it the prior week. Mrs. Simmons recognizes the board's authority to make this decision, but there is a distinct difference between can and should. It is deeply concerning that the board would consider voting on such an important matter with so little time spent investigating the pros and cons as well as allowing for public input. Many parents were unaware of this plan and that is not okay. Had the board taken the time to evaluate the plan with more thoughtfulness, they would have quickly found ample research on the subject highlighting why this plan would not be in the best interest of the learners or the community. She summarized that schools with fewer grade levels create more transitions which can negatively impact student academic and social/emotional outcomes. Transitions would decrease academic achievement and increase negative students' behaviors and fewer positive teacher-student relationships. Significant achievement loss is associated with each transition year. Transition between schools compounds whatever development changes a student is experiencing. Studies suggest that gaps in educational outcomes result from the fact that students making transitions to new schools must simultaneously cope with development change and school change and are more likely to experience negative academic outcomes. Middle childhood, ages 7-11, experience a number of psychological and physical changes that pose challenges, making additional transitions more difficult and stressful. Transitions disrupt student and parent positive social connections with teachers and staff. Children receiving special education services are more negatively impacted by multiple school transitions. Schools with frequent student turnover see adverse effects on school identity and sense of community. When part of a longer, continuous stay at a single school, families may be more comfortable with grade-to-grade transitions and better able to anticipate the particulars of the following grade. Educators can come to know students better and plan to proactively meet students' needs. Close communication between educators at different grade levels is more likely when teams teach in proximity and individual teachers are better able to consult with colleagues. Mrs. Simmons stated that the board noted that they had the choice between students being together or transitions and she asked if the board believed that it is impossible to provide an equitable education in multiple schools. She noted that Wallingford, Branford, East Haddam, Madison, Region 6, Region 12, Region 18 all have multiple elementary schools servicing the same grade levels. She asked that the board paused any vote on this matter until they receive more community input and more thorough research is conducted.

Emma Quick, from Durham, thanked the board for all of their hard work. She knows that this decision will not make everyone happy and they will hear many different perspectives. The connection was lost at this point.

Jill Sobolewski, from Durham, is an RSD alumna and has two daughters currently at John Lyman. She too thanked the board but expressed her sincere opposition to the proposal for the temporarily reconfiguration of the district. It was stated at an earlier board meeting that this proposal is budget-neutral, but she felt it would create severe disruption for the elementary-aged learners and their teachers and staff. Given that, she wondered what the benefit would be. She strongly felt that leaving the configuration as it is until they can get to the final goal is a much better option for all of the learners. Forcing elementary students to move schools every two years is both academically and socially destructive. She cannot imagine that anyone can see this proposed plan as a plan that would benefit the learners or educators. It is their obligation to set the children up for success and this proposed plan does not do that. It creates more social/emotional obstacles and takes away any academic consistency. The students deserve consistency and what is being proposed is not offering them what they need to be successful. Learners of this district deserve better than this proposal and Ms. Sobolewski asked that the board listen to the community and keep the configuration as is while focusing on the end goal so that all learners will be set up for success.

Nick Faiella noted that, for years, the majority of kids in the district went from K-2 at Brewster, 3-4 at Korn, 5-6 at Memorial, 7-8 at Strong and 9-12 at the high school. He never had any issues with his kids being able to participate in the real world, in college or wherever. He noted that that is not a study, but real-life information.

Mrs. Dahlheimer asked Emma Quick to email any information she had to the board.

Adjournment

Mr. Mennone made a motion, seconded by Mr. Moore, to adjourn the special work session.

In favor of adjourning the special work session: Ms. Betty, Mrs. Caramanello, Mrs. Dahlheimer, Dr. Darcy, Mr. Mennone, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Petrella and Mrs. Roy. Meeting was adjourned at 7:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Debi Waz

Debi Waz
Alwaz First