

Pre-K Through 5 And Eagle Academy School Pre-Referendum Building Committee
Meeting Minutes
October 8, 2025

The Pre-K Through 5 and Eagle Academy School Pre-Referendum Building Committee held a meeting on October 8, 2025 at Enfield Town Hall, 820 Enfield Street, Enfield, CT.

1. CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM by Randy Daigle

2. ROLL CALL
MEMBERS PRESENT

Randy Daigle, Tina LeBlanc (6:44), Christine DeBonee, Lauren Andrews, Gina Cekala, Bob Cressotti, Janet Cushman (6:10), John Dague, Kate Flanagan, Jim Nasuta, Amanda Pickett, Charlotte Riley (6:44), Jeff Rousseau, Scott Ryder (6:44), Jaclyn Valley (6:48), Jeff Wyszynski, Justin Hopkins, Antonia Ciaverella, Chris Cykley

MEMBERS ABSENT
Steven Moccio

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Motion made by Amanda Pickett to Approve Meeting Minutes of August 27, 2025
Seconded by Bob Cressotti
Motion passes by a show of hands

4. ARCHITECTS PRESENTATION

Randy states this meeting is being recorded and will be available on YouTube. Randy states this is an important meeting and I was informed some town council and board of education members will be a little late. Tonight you will see the extensive work Tecton and the entire team has been doing.

Jeff screen shares presentation. I wanted to go over some of the meetings that we've had. The first one as about the Pre-Kindergarten/kindergarten program. The second was about the Eagle Academy Program review. The third was a specialized education discussion, we got into a lot of the programmatic requirements. Lastly was EPS Review. We will go over the preferred options. Tonight we will go over the framework of the options. All of the sites are at the same scale. We will summarize the discussion to the benefits and challenges of the 3 or 4 schools. We have boards up in all the schools, the handouts for the community conversation on October 22nd. We will explain the existing conditions and what we've explored so far. We will give them the background of what we were charged to do, and the next steps. Slide of proposed milestone schedule shown. Tonight is an important meeting as we want to start honing in on where we are going to head. Please mark your calendar that we are going to have the demographer MP Planning come in November 19th. They will be far enough in on their work to give us a better read on the enrollment projections. If you have questions, please send them to Randy. Next slide is Understanding your existing schools buildings. It shows date of original construction, roof replacements, existing grade level configuration, existing current enrollment and GSF/size of the building. The summary of the PreK discussion has given a good handle of what is needed. One of the options is keeping Stowe and developing a PreK building. Also discussed was what is great about a PreK-5 building. We had good conversations.

Amada states it's not just the pre-k program at Stowe, there is town-wide program that needs space. Whatever decision we make impacts the town partners. We can also talk about special legislation.

Jeff states we've given a lot of thought of what happens to the sites we may not use. I think we have a decent start to a resolution to those program challenges. Eagle Academy – we understand that each program is different but we understand the challenges and opportunities that exist within Eagle Academy. Looking at it comprehensively is an

important piece. A conversation was had about how do we adequately plan for the future for this program. Next slide is the existing conditions and the challenges that exist.

Randy states when they are talking about the size of the classrooms based on the program, he is using the projected numbers not the current ones. We are trying to get a grasp of what the new enrollment will be in 2-5 years when these get built. With all the development going on it's really hard. That's why the meeting with the consultants are going to be important. We don't want to build a building that is suitable for today, we want to build for the future.

Amanda asks we can build projecting to 5 years? Can we do the same for PreK and project enrollment?

Randy states every program has that.

Jeff states in regard to Eagle the location is an important piece. We then had a focused discussion on special education. We went over both scenarios of 3 and 4 schools. What would be needed for support spaces. We want to make sure we size these buildings appropriately for all the capacity concerns and specialty programs. This is all relevant when it comes to reimbursement.

Randy states the 15% reimbursement for PreK, that is not going to be a forever offer from the State. Right now it's not required but it will be, that is why they are laying the groundwork or incentive to start doing it. In 2 to 3 years it is going to be required. It also plays into how we go for our grant. Do we go in for all the construction for the next 8 years and we lock in that reimbursement rate? As long as they approve it they can appropriate the funds, then when we do it the funds will be there. If we stagger and do 3 schools in one referendum and then the next 3 schools, it's going to be total different costs. You will have escalation. You're not going to have 15% reimbursement for the Pre-K. This is a multi-million dollar deal. We have to think about how we package this to submit to the State.

Jeff shows next slide, Options Planning. We looked at all kinds of options and discussed the benefits and challenges of each. We looked at Option A which is consolidate and renew. Then we looked at a 3 school scenario, and a 4 school scenario. We look at the size of the building, what could fit. If we're going to look at option B or C, it doesn't make sense to try to use the existing buildings because the population has changed, the needs change. We can investigate it more but it proves out in the dollars for reimbursement. We need to communicate that to the community. B and C we looked at and all the alternatives with that. There is also the option of doing nothing and fix it as we go, but you will have a lot more ineligibles. It will cost the community more in the long run. We started focusing on the 3 school scenario, whether it be a Pre-K through 5 or a 3 building scenario with K-5. Next slide show B Three School Scenario. B1 is 3 Pre-K through 5. B2 is 3 K-5 and 1 Pre-K. B2 and C2 are more costly because you lose that 15% on Pre-K. That's why B2 and C2 quickly came off the table.

Amanda states we've already made the decision we are not doing a Pre-K stand alone.

Jeff states where we landed at the last meeting was we ruled out A, and are focusing on B1, B2 and C1.

Amanda asks is that conversation over or are we still entertaining some conversation about it?

Justin states the cost disparities when you start attacking 4 elementary schools and a stand alone Pre-K, it became so significant.

Amanda asks B2 is still something we're talking about?

Justin states yes.

Jeff states nothing is set in stone but as a group we decided to migrate towards these 3. The State updated the reimbursement rates. The reimbursement rate for Renovate as New is 70% and the reimbursement rate for New Construction is 68.33%.

Randy states the reimbursement rate of 70% or 68% is very high.

Jeff asks how long do we lock in these rates?

Randy states if the referendum passes, then we apply to the Secretary of the State. That is when the rates get locked. That is why I said packaging this is important, to get everything locked in.

Amanda asks about the 15% for special education and for early childhood care, does that cover ECDC?

Jeff states there is a paragraph that this is all tied to that I've shared in previous presentations and that is the description I have to go off of. Once we fold in some of the town related programs that has been a conversation with some of the representatives to get a meeting with the State to have a more detailed conversation about it. What we are basing it off of is that one paragraph that was passed last year.

Amanda states I think we could build Pre-K in our K5 and get 15% reimbursement and renovate a brand new early childhood hub for ECDC and HeadStart. And get a dedicated new building for Pre-K space to put in the remaining Pre-K programming with that 15% on all the buildings.

Jeff states my only hesitation is this is for public school construction grants. When the town functions come into play, I don't want to guide you with incorrect directions.

Christine asks do we have to go for special legislation for that?

Jeff states I have not been involved in town funded programs that go through a school construction grant reimbursement.

Amanda states I am under the impression that the state is going to build out a preschool endowment through public schools opening more school readiness spots and that is going to be the phasing in plan. So having the space for them and the dollars will be coming through education. My guess is when we think about that paragraph, what constitutes as early childhood. My guess is that it is loosely defined and towns will start building space for preschoolers.

Jeff states we can dig in a little deeper.

Amanda states when you're talking about projecting enrollment thinking about phasing in that plan and getting the school readiness seats is it easier to put them in the schools or a separate location.

Jeff states all of the enrollment numbers, student projections, for the time being, I used the 10% increase to the current population, until we get the numbers from MP Planning, the demographer.

Justin states the delta between FY25 and FY26 the renovate as new percentage went down 1.79% for Enfield to 70%, new construction went up 6.5% to 68.33%.

Jeff shows a map of existing attendance zones and a map of density zones. If you start thinking about where the housing projects are going to be they are more north than they are south. It's something to consider when looking at the options. Slide is shown of the three school scenario. We could build a new building of 110,000 SF behind the side of Crandall for PreK-5 for somewhere around 785-825 students. The total project cost is about \$120 million, CTE means cost to Enfield. Take out all the reimbursements and it's \$21 million. The timeline on the bottom right hand side of the slide shows design time and construction time. Every project will take about 4-5 years to

complete. If you're going to submit a grant application this June you won't get a shovel in the ground until about 2028. You won't be sending students through the door until Fall of 2030. The idea is you would build one on the north side and one on the south side of your community. Then you could look at Hazardville Memorial which is the 3rd site. All these buildings are 2 story and age appropriate play areas and outdoor education spaces. Three schools are obviously bigger schools, we chose the 3 sites of Stowe, Crandall and Memorial. Jeff continues to review planning options and what is possible.

Jeff shows slide of C1, four school scenario. We should flush out what happens with Alcorn.

John states social services is in there and it's a great location for them although they have space constraints.

Jeff states discussion needs to be held about when do we do this, when do we file. When do we build? It makes sense to stagger them.

Gina asks stagger the work? Or the referendum?

Jeff states that is a discussion we need to have. You will never get that rate back. That is the conversation to have, if you do a 2 step process. If you go after all five you need to explain to the community why or do you stagger it and take the risk the 15% goes away.

Amanda states we have to talk about redistricting because it's 4 schools and we will have to be careful about messaging about the time line.

Jeff states keep in mind each would be a separate grant application. Each one would have it's own. The number of students and the size of the building are all going to change. It could go up or down. We will refine it with the final enrollment projections. That directly relates the size of the building and if we change the sequence of the projects. I have escalation for 4 and 5 up to 2030.

Randy states to keep in mind regarding the funding, whatever it comes out to be, we're not paying 77 million. We are paying a small percentage of each of these. It will be 10 years before we even starting paying. It will be gradual. We have to educate the public about this.

Chris states we will need to plug this in with the finance department.

Jeff states the next series of slides shows how it could be implemented, this is under the 4 school scenario. We want to future proof the buildings.

Randy states we will build a rapport with the neighbors. We have done it with all of the schools projects we have done. This is a community effort.

Jeff states the next series of slides show how the buildings could have adaptive reuse. What I haven't included is cost to renovate these buildings. I will show you what will get reimbursement from the State. Examples are Enfield Street school could house Enfield Adult Education, Central Office, Alternative Education, ETLA to the Eagle Academy. We have not gotten into detail about programming. Central Office would be 50% of your base reimbursement. We will look deeper into reimbursement for the programs.

Randy states they have dialed down to program requirements, specific usage.

Jeff states the next slide shows Stowe current use plan. The gymnasium could be returned as a gym. The front could have some expansion for infant/toddlers. You could put support offices out front for visibility control. In the middle portion are classrooms for ECDC expansion. This shows you what could happen in this building. The integrated PreK would move into the elementary schools.

Jeff shows slide of Eli Whitney reuse. If Eagle goes into the building, it shows the proposed plan if this option is explored. It is an idea at this point. From a planning perspective this just about quadruples the space.

Randy states this is a tough building with the parking, bus loop and addition.

Lauren states that is a lot of students of this profile in one building, even if staffed appropriately.

Randy states the State will allow us to build for our enrollment, not for the next 10 years. It's not realistic.

Jeff states the goal is to bring out of district placements back to Enfield. That is where we are with the options. If we missed anything, please ask through Randy and we will get the questions to me.

Randy states tonight we are trying to get ready for the Community Conversation on October 22nd. This is the direction we are headed based on all the work we have done to date from all the feedback and meetings we have held to date. We are not going to say to the public this is what we are doing. Unless there are major changes is everyone ok for them to continue. The next thing is to focus on community engagement. What is submitted tonight is not sketched in stone. We can do the required programming on the sites. We are still looking at swing space. Do we look at CREC?

Scott states there are about 500 students in the building on route 5.

Bob states they redid their entire programming.

Randy states can we give them okay to move ahead. We need a direction to go in.

Tina states I think this is great and I appreciate the work you have done with collaborating with Central Office.

Amanda states I love each site reutilized. It shows where we are at. The concept of the models make sense. There is a lot on the table. It is important to show the taxpayers where we are at.

Bob states what was presented here is what we should be going with. I like the C1 model. It's cost effective for the taxpayer. I would like to see that presented.

Jeff states the boards have been delivered and at the buildings.

Christine asks if there is anything we can share to Facebook about the community conversation.

Randy states I did, I showed the pamphlet. If you put anything on Facebook, do not get into a dialog. Ask them to come to a meeting, do not engage.

Antonia states we can make a flyer and something for social media.

Jeff shows a basic agenda on how we format these community conversations. We will talk about the conditions, why this committee is doing this and open it to dialog.

Randy states the PAC will deliver messages and presentations to the senior center, go to PTO meetings, stand outside of grocery stores, have a table at the 4th of July event.

Jeff states we will tune up our slide deck for the community conversation. We will be prepared and have material to push out. We prepped a survey via mentimeter, it starts a dialog.

Tina states I don't think people realize we're going back to the K-5 model and we're merging schools.

Randy states this is one of the biggest projects that has been done. This is the future. These buildings are falling apart. If this does not pass, these buildings are in bad shape. This is the best for the Town of Enfield. We are hoping to get this aired lived for the community.

Jeff states if you receive questions, send them to Randy and we can create a FAQ page. The demographer and will have the enrollment projections will be at the meeting of NOVEMBER 19TH.

Randy states our next meeting is October 29, 2025.

Jeff states at the community conversation can write questions and put them in the box on the stage.

5. COMMENTS
 - a. Committee Member Comments
 - b. Liaison Member Comments
 - c. Good to the Order
6. Motion to Adjourn
 - Motion made by Amanda Pickett
 - Seconded by Christine DeBonee
 - Motion passes by a show of hands

Adjourned at 8:05 PM

Submitted by Ellen Smith