

Pre-K Through 5 And Eagle Academy School Pre-Referendum Building Committee
Special Meeting Minutes
May 20, 2026
Available on YouTube

The Pre-K Through 5 and Eagle Academy School Pre-Referendum Building Committee held a special meeting on May 20, 2026 at Enfield Town Hall, 820 Enfield Street, Enfield, CT.

1. CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order at 6:09 PM by Randy Daigle

2. ROLL CALL
MEMBERS PRESENT

Randy Daigle, Tina LeBlanc, Christine DeBonee, Lauren Andrews, Bob Cressotti, John Dague, Steven Moccio, Jaclyn Valley, Jeff Wyszynski, Antonia Ciaverella, Chris Cykley

ALSO PRESENT
John Santanella

MEMBERS ABSENT

Gina Cekala, Janet Cushman, Kate Flanagan, Danielle Girard, Dean Gousse, Amanda Pickett, Marie Pyznar, Charlotte Riley, Scott Ryder, Justin Hopkins

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion made by Tina LeBlanc to Approve the Meeting Minutes of April 29, 2026

Seconded by Bob Cressotti

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Tina LeBlanc to Move Agenda Item B - Special Legislation Text and Process, before Item

3. OGA/Grant Application Activities

Seconded by Bob Cressotti

Motion passes by a show of hands

4. ARCHITECTS PRESENTATION

Jeff states so everyone is aware, the last two pages of the packet have the text related to the special legislation.

Mr. John Santanella states the waivers that you asked for were approved and in the school construction bill which is what you see here at the end of your packet, for two of the five schools. One of the problems with approving all five of them this year is that we were asking for a half of billion dollars for five schools and the total ask across the state from all the other cities and towns that are doing school construction is about \$2 billion. That is in excess of what normally the bonding commission appropriates for school construction. We were taking up 25% of it for the state. Our projects are not as imminent as some of the other districts that are beginning school construction. There is no need to be concerned that the reimbursement rates are going to change. At one point during this process, I was asked why are you putting this in the construction bill because the reimbursements are statute there, they're in the law and the law is not going to change. There were some things that were related to the timing issue, related to the housing bill, because the housing bill 5% increase happens on July 1st of this year. We are putting in our application on June 30th, so we didn't want to miss the opportunity to get that additional 5% by one day. That waiver is in there for Prudence Crandall and Hazardville Memorial and there's no reason to expect that we wouldn't get that same waiver in the future. With regard to space waivers, the legislature does not have to take affirmative action to grant a school district space waivers. The DAS commissioner is able to grant space waivers. We have an administrative route first and if we are not granted what we need that way then we would be able to take legislative action. I am not at all concerned that there were only 2 schools included in this budget bill. The implications are more for the question, and the way the referendum question is written, which we would have to discuss with Bond Counsel on whether or not that changes anything or not. At the time of the referendum it may

require a different disclosure in the anticipated, confirmed amount of the reimbursement, because only 2 have been gone through the process. It's going to be minor because the statute covers the bulk of what we're expecting to get reimbursed. The housing bill is a 5% increment, that might be part of the difference and we wouldn't know right now what the total space waivers are because they haven't been granted for the other 3 schools. The disclosure to voters might be a different range/anticipated range of reimbursement. That is a question for our Bond Counsel, who also happens to be the speaker of the house.

Tina asks do we have to put forward another referendum for next year for the next 3 schools?

John states no. I am asking questions to the best of my knowledge. I am not a lawyer. It is one referendum question, it's not going to change. The only thing that may change is how we disclose where we are with the reimbursement as of November of this year. That would be a range of a high or low, and anticipated reimbursement from this to this. I think that is what might need to change. There is nothing happening in the legislature to make me or anybody else believe that the law is going to change on the reimbursement rates that are already in place. The governor is completely committed to education on multiple levels. We can't anticipate that he would suddenly pull back on bonding requests for new school construction.

Randy states we are going to have to collectively come up with is the actual wording for the referendum. As John was saying we have 2 that are in place, locked at the specific dollar amount, in specific reimbursement amount. To have one referendum we're also going to have a caveat question saying by voting this in, we are going to lock in, within these rates and we're going to have to explain it to the public what we're doing and why we have to do that. We are likely to get the reimbursement that we're looking for. We can't put that on the referendum because that's not a fact. We can give a percentage of what we should be able to receive. We need to figure out how to word it and educate the public on this. We need to get this PAC up and moving.

John Santanella states the 2 schools that were approved to jump the priority list, if you look at the language, the first paragraph, section 414, that first paragraph is us jumping into the 2025 priority list. We are not starting construction until 2027. We are on a priority list one year early for the 2 schools that we started with. We were put on a priority list much earlier than we needed to be.

Christine asks is that because of how the schools are? The conditions of them?

John Santanella states no, I think that is because we were banging our fists on the table saying we need to be on the priority list. Because of the timing of our applications and our referendum, we are a little bit earlier. I want to be absolutely clear, we are very confident that the reimbursement amounts that you have presented to the public will be the amounts that will be reimbursed when this is all done, nothing has changed on that front.

Jeff states there are a couple of clarifying questions the superintendent is planning on asking related to reimbursement. One of them is the 15% for the specialized education that's within the facility. That is written a little bit differently than the early childhood. Remember the early childhood applies to the entire building, the specialized applies just to the space assigned. The clarifying questions we hope to get answered are how do you measure that space? Do you include the corridor associated with it? Where do we measure from? The reason why that is important is when we were presenting to the community with these reimbursements rates, we took the base reimbursement plus the 15% for the pre-k less ineligibles and that's what we were using. We didn't add that calculation for the specialized ed allocations, so that should help with that range going up. Just to be clear any of the information that we had shared to the community did not include that extra 5% for the housing, either. We will make sure we articulate those clearly, but we need more information from the state on how to measure it in order to calculate the effective reimbursement rates. We are laser focused on the grant application. We had really good conversations. John Dague has set up all of the electron grants with the superintendent's coordination. A lot of the information is populated in the electronic system already, we are well on our way. One of the components is the Phase One Essay, those are now completed, we have all of the reports. Those reports have been transferred over to the schools for uploading into the electronic grant application. We will provide a summary of those findings.

Nothing out of the ordinary from a phase one. Phase one is site environmental. They're looking for paperwork for tanks that were removed properly and closure paperwork. That ties to what's called 053 which is a site analysis form. We've populated all the specifics for all 5 projects, downloaded, and all the maps. There probably about 8 or so in some instances, that accompany that specific to each of the sites. That has all been completed and uploaded. There were no real surprises and in good shape. Ed Specs, we already went through the board of ed approvals, all has been documented and uploaded. Approved minutes, the actual ed specs, everything has been posted there. We're now moving into uniform level two estimates, coordinating with Gilbane on those. They are in progress, the expectation is over the next week and a half is to get the finalized numbers. There's a lot of numbers to tie out between the soft and hard costs. In a form the state is requiring there's about 150 line items we need to make sure they all tie out. We are working with Chris to make sure the allocations are validated. We will then upload those to the PS CCD. The state has a website we upload those costs to. We will complete it over the next week and a half. All of the other approvals related to the resolutions have been captured, including the meeting minutes and posted. All of that is on the website. Tecton and Enfield Public Schools had a meeting today related to the grant application, screen shared, talked about the referendum. We know the referendum is in November. We populated that section of the application to satisfy the state grant application. Once the referendum occurs, you have until November 15th, presuming that it passes, to submit the recorded certified results. That one will stay open until then. In 2Cii there are questions that the superintendent will ask for clarification. They are very real because they are material to the reimbursement rate, is it the net area of the room or is it the gross area. If there is a special ed office that's dedicated to this particular program, does that include it as well. We just want to be sure we're capturing it the way the state is expecting to see it and we're maximizing reimbursement. The superintendent will submit those on the projects behalf for clarification. There are two main components that are left open, estimates and another form called SCG 2500, which is the program document. It's already in the ed spec, it's taking the number of spaces, the size of spaces, and putting them into their form. We're having weekly meetings with the school just to screen share and make sure we're populating. Our goal would be for mid-June to press the button to submit the grant application. There are some more detailed applications, but the unique aspect of the Eagle Academy at Eli Whitney is that it's a renovate as new and that comes with a list of forms you probably are familiar with from JFK. We will work on those. Tecton will create, publish and then they just need to be authorized by the superintendent. Our goal is in the next 2 to 3 weeks to be 99.9% complete. There are technical questions we have related to the grant application but that's something we can work on offline, as far as electronically. In summary, making very good progress. The 3 main components we're work on, is the program document, estimates, and renovate as new checklist. If there is any need to update anything, I don't know from a town side if anything changed financially. If there's any updates that need to be done for a tax impact, just let us know. Our numbers are the same that we've been presenting all along. Community engagement materials, I am happy to provide the graphics related to those if and when whomever needs them.

Christine states I met with the PAC today and we just have a couple of questions for Tecton. The materials you have, are we able to use slides from presentation or anything from a presentation?

Jeff states absolutely. Coordinate through our office and Antonia can help as well. We have a graphics marketing group that can help if you want a particular slide. We want to make sure it's at a resolution that's good for you.

Tina asks should the head of the PAC be dealing directly with Antonia?

Randy states no they can't. They have to still come through us.

Christine states he was asking about the coloring activity books. Is that something we can use? Do you have any of those left?

Jeff states we have the electronic file, I don't know if we have copies, we will check. We also have the ability to send that right out.

Christine states the PAC leads want to have a meeting, not during a pre-ref meeting to go over some questions, how do we make that happen?

Randy states everything through us.

Christine states do we have to be there? How many people have to be there?

Randy states we don't need a quorum. The contract is with this committee. Anything that they want to do with them has to come through us. Then we can set it up and we could be there. If 1 or 2 of us, a PAC representative, liaisons could be there. I would definitely like to be a part of it.

Christine states I'll have them email us then we'll set up a meeting with Tecton. The last question he had was do we have final tax impact numbers? Are those the ones that John Wilcox did final numbers?

Bob states those numbers that were presented, were the correct numbers.

Christine states the PAC is up and running. The official name is the Enfield Planning Tomorrows Opportunities Political Action Committee (EPTO PAC). They can take contributions by check payable to EPTO PAC and mailed to PO Box 478, Enfield, CT. 06083. Digital donations, credit cards should be up soon. For anyone that wants to join, the PAC was file as in support of this question. Anyone who wants to join has to know that it's a vote yes PAC as opposed to the opposite.

Randy states as far as everything we just went over and where we're going, the focus from here is finalizing the grant application, which is very minor in comparison to what we've been through to get to this point. We have to support the PAC and start getting information out there to the public. We need to educate the PAC on every question we have been asked so far by the public so we're all answering the questions the same. I don't want anyone going off just because they're for it. We are fact based, we have back up, we have references. There is a fine line using the contract money for the PAC, that's why the PAC has to have their own funds. We can have an account at minuteman press or whoever to have poster printed. We can't ask Tecton to print out flyers, that's not what his contract is for. That would be a mis-use of funds. I'd like to be directly asked anything that's going through the PAC to this committee. I have not been contacted and I've texted several times and I left voicemails and I have not received anything. You have all this information and I appreciate it but it has to go through the right channels to be productive.

Tina states one of the liaisons asked that they thought important information might be, is the maintenance plans that are going to come along with the project. Concerns in the community, if we vote for this what is the upkeep of this school going to be? Having that kind of information as far as the maintenance plan is going to look like.

Randy states one of the things that we've done in the past and we are allowed to do is if we are having a meeting at the senior center or PTO for example, we have invited the architect on record before to come. That is something we can do so it's not just us. It gives more validity when it comes from the architects.

Randy states next meeting is June 10, 2026. If it's not needed we will send out a cancellation notice.

Tina states hopefully on the 10th, the PAC will be here to start giving more information out and the plans, where you can find things, QR codes.

Bob asks are we going to be having any more community conversations, or are we going to rely on the PAC to disseminate all the factual information?

Randy states at this point it won't be driven by us. The PAC will dictate where and what, and we will assist the PAC. If we feel that there is another need, we have fund available to have them come and do another public conversation. Once the PAC gets up and rolling and we're going to have to periodically evaluate where it is and is it

,

being effective enough. Should we subsidize it with one of those. It's not a hard no, it's whatever is needed to get the information out there properly.

5. COMMENTS

a. Committee Member Comments

Tina would like to say thank you to Tecton. I've been on a lot of pre-ref committees and this has been the most seamless. The updates are very thorough, you're completely on top of dates and working with the state. Everything we've talked about it really coming through fruition like the state waivers. To Tecton and Chris Cykley I really appreciate all the work you're doing and the momentum has never died.

Randy states he concurs, I've been doing this for most of my life and this logistically-wise, this is one of the hardest ones I've ever done and Tecton has done everything, I've just contributed. They are experts at this and the team is phenomenal. It's been one of the most impressive referendum procedures ever experienced and I've been through many.

b. Liaison Member Comments

c. Good to the Order

6. Motion to Adjourn

Motion to Adjourn made by Tina LeBlanc

Seconded by Bob Cressotti

Motion passes by a show of hands

Adjourned at 6:48 PM

Submitted by Ellen Smith