

REGION 9 BOARD OF EDUCATION
July 21, 2015
DISTRICT MEETING
Minutes

Attendance: Region 9 Board of Education members – D’Agostino, Gombos, Hancock, Hocker, King, Lewis

Administration: McMorran, Pin

Others: Approximately 10 members of the community and a representative of the local newspapers

Mr. Hocker called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m. in the Joel Barlow High School’s Media Center.

Motion: move to waive the reading of the notice of the meeting as published/posted in the CT Post and News-Times on July 16, 2015. Hancock, Gombos. Approved. Unanimous.

Motion: move to nominate Susanne Krivit as moderator of the meeting: Gombos, Hancock. Approved. Unanimous.

Ms. Krivit explained that the district meeting functions like a town meeting; every Easton/Redding resident in attendance has a right to vote and a right to discuss the issue. The meeting was called to appropriate funds for the roof project.

Motion: move - be it resolved that the reading of the resolution to be presented to this district meeting under Item 1 of the notice be waived and that the full text of the resolution as made available to all those in attendance at this meeting be incorporated into the minutes of the meeting. Gombos, Hancock. Unanimous.

(Resolution is attached to the minutes.)

Motion: move that the District meeting consider the resolution. Parkin, Hancock.

The moderator turned the discussion over to Mr. Hocker who explained that due to a series of errors notice of the referendum was not posted in either Easton or Redding local news publications. The bond counsel’s opinion was that it had to be treated as if the referendum had never taken place and he could not approve the process to move forward for issuing the bond for the roof project. His concern was that they are tax-exempt bonds. Two issues that the Board discussed at a previous special meeting were either to call a district meeting to authorize up to \$500,000 at which point the remaining \$540,000 would be placed on a referendum to be held on August 25th. Alternative would be to move entire amount to an August referendum that could occur approximately one week earlier, August 18th.

Board was concerned about how the contractor would react and felt a discussion should be held with the contractor prior to making a decision. The contractor has been informed of the situation and indicated that he is treating this as an unfortunate, technical glitch but nothing that would cause him to stop working. Work has continued, and the Board assumes the work will be completed around the time of the referendum.

C. Parkin, Redding: What is the cost of borrowing, two times vs. one time?

C. Hocker: Worse case, roughly \$10,000 per borrowing.

INSTR # 112015000585 RECD 07/23/2015 02:43:06 PM
CHRISTINE HALLORAN TOWN CLERK EASTON CT

D. Grey, Redding – Noted that the contractor has been notified of the administrative issue, question why we would ask the taxpayers to pay an additional \$10,000 for a second referendum. Noted that as of July 1st, we have a new operating budget. Commented that this situation happened last year; safeguards were supposed to be in place so that it wouldn't happen again. Questioned if anyone on the Board of Finance checked in? Noted that this situation should not have happened. Indicated that she would vote no for the resolution.

C. Gombos: The Board of Finance of either town does not have jurisdiction over the Region 9 budget for borrowing. Noted that information on safeguards for future referenda will be explored.

C. Hocker: Board intentionally set two balls in motion, pending receipt of information from contractor. This meeting was not called to ask you to vote for the resolution; it was to give everyone an opportunity to discuss the issues.

P. O'Donnell, Redding: Region 9 only requests money when they are ready to cut checks. Money sits in the two towns. Agree that you should have a referendum in August and do it all at once. My concern is that you do not want to borrow two times.

P. Bonfanti, Redding: Wanted to clarify that a yes vote would mean to spend \$10,000 more and a no vote would mean hold a referendum on the entire amount in August.

C. Hocker: There is a mechanism in place that if the contractor presents a bill for progress payment before the referendum, it would be allowable to take the money out of the capital account or the operating account. There would be a 60-day clock to essentially reimburse ourselves.

C. Parkin: Cited a recent vote in Redding on the police cell tower that went to two votes because they didn't have enough money. Situation created confusion among voters. Feels there should be one vote.

M. D'Agostino: I will be voting against the resolution. Cited that there would be some confusion on behalf of voters by seeing different amounts twice for the same project. Clarity is important. In the future, we need to discuss how not to be in this situation again. Minimizing impact on the taxpayer is important.

C. Gombos: The reason we considered the vote or partial funding vote had to do with whether the school would be ready for students. My reason for at least having the option for voting for the \$500,000 was to minimize impact for students. Now that the contractor has stated that he is comfortable waiting for the payment due to this administrative error, I am comfortable with a single referendum vote.

V. Hancock: Now that I know how the contractor feels, I will not vote for this resolution.

D. Smith, Easton: Is there any benefit to splitting the two? It appears that there is not.

C. Hocker: What concerned me was if there would be a legal problem should the contractor present a progress billing.

M. Lewis: Single referendum is best. We don't have a bill yet. When a bill is presented, building committee approves it and sends it to the Board. Next Board meeting is toward the end of August. We would not call a special meeting for one bill. I will be voting no.

W. King: I will be voting no also. Now that the contractor's position is a given, it's a no-brainer. The most important thing is to address the situation that happened and prevent a recurrence of that situation ever happening again.

C. Parkin, Redding: Who is bearing the cost of this screw up?

D. Grey, Redding: I think Central Office should bear 100% of the cost. It should come out of the Central Office budget. They caused the error; they should pay for the error.

M. Lewis: It would not be the Central Office budget. It would be the Barlow budget. The Central Office is funded by three different school districts. It is not appropriate that Central Office pay for a Region 9 problem. It will come out of the town budget from contingency funds. It's not part of the educational budget.

C. Parkin, Redding: Questioned why the notice was not put in *The Redding Pilot* or the *Easton Courier* rather than the *CT Post*.

C. Hocker: Timing with publication schedules. Daily paper vs. weekly publication.

Motion: move to approve closing this discussion. Approved. Unanimous.

Motion: move to approve the resolution appropriating \$500,000 (Easton's share currently equal to 46.7% or \$233,500; and Redding's share currently equal to 53.3% or \$266,500) for a portion of the costs of roof replacement at Joel Barlow High School and authorize bonds and temporary notes in the same amount.

Ayes: 0; Nays: Unanimous

Mr. Hocker explained that the nay vote nullified the second resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Move to adjourn: Approved. Unanimous.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

Submitted by Catherine Gombos, Region 9 Board of Education Secretary

Recorded by Jackie Garvey.

WARNING
DISTRICT MEETING
REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT NUMBER 9
(TOWNS OF EASTON AND REDDING)

A meeting of the electors and citizens qualified to vote in District meetings of Regional School District Number 9 will be held in the Library Media Center at Joel Barlow High School in Redding, Connecticut, on Tuesday, July 21, 2015, at 7:00 p.m. for the following purposes:

1. To consider and act upon a resolution:

(a) to appropriate \$500,000 (Easton's share currently equal to 46.7% or \$233,500; and Redding's share currently equal to 53.3% or \$266,500) for a portion of the costs of roof replacement at Joel Barlow High School in the area of the auditorium and consisting of the removal of existing roof systems to the existing deck and the installation of a new 20-year modified built-up roof system of approximately 31,600 square feet;

(b) to authorize the issue and renewal of bonds or notes of the District in an amount not to exceed \$500,000 to finance said appropriation; to provide that the aggregate amount of bonds authorized to be issued to finance the project be reduced by the amount of grants received by the District for the project, if any; and to authorize the Chairman and the Treasurer of the Board of Education, or such officer or body delegated by the Board, to determine, the amounts, dates, interest rates, maturities, form, manner of issue and other details of the bonds or notes;

2. To hold a public hearing on the following recommendations of the Board of Education of Regional School District Number 9:

(a) That Regional School District Number 9 of the State of Connecticut appropriate \$540,647 (Easton's share currently equal to 46.7% or \$252,482; and Redding's share currently equal to 53.3% or \$288,165) for the portion of costs of roof replacement at Joel Barlow High School in the area of the auditorium not to be funded from the \$500,000 appropriation and borrowing authorization referenced above, said project consisting of the removal of existing roof systems to the existing deck and the installation of a new 20-year modified built-up roof system of approximately 31,600 square feet.

(b) That the appropriation and bond and temporary note authorization be submitted to referendum vote of the electors and citizens qualified to vote in the member towns of the District.

Dated at Easton, Connecticut this 15th day of July, 2015.

Christopher Hocker, Chairman
Board of Education
Regional School District Number 9