

**Pelham School Board Meeting**  
**July 10, 2024**  
**Pelham Elementary School**  
**6:30 p.m.**

**School Board Members:** Troy Bressette, Chair; David Wilkerson, Vice-Chair; and Garrett Abare

**Superintendent:** Chip McGee

**Business Administrator:** Deb Mahoney

**Absent:** Mya Belanger; Rebecca Cummings; Darlene Greenwood; and Sarah Marandos

**Also in Attendance:** Mike Davey, EEI; Dan Voss, Kearsarge Energy; and Bethany Greenblatt, Beacon Integrated Solutions

**I. Public Session:**

**A. Call to Order:**

Chair Troy Bressette called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**II. Public Input @ 6:34 p.m.**

**a. Debbie Kruzel, 44 Beacon Hill (Carina Carter read the letter)**

Ms. Kruzel wrote, "This week, I became aware of Yonder Pouches and the school policy being discussed regarding the problems with cell phone usage. As a very active substitute teacher in another District, I completely understand the challenges of cell phones in classrooms. Teachers deserve the students' full attention while in the classroom. I have sat in many high school classrooms that successfully use the shoe pockets hung on the walls, and I've seen other teachers choose not to use the shoe pockets, even though they are in the classrooms.

I attended Chip's chat session today in the library and asked what other options were discussed before the policy was presented. He said that the current policy, which is putting the phones in the backpacks, does not work. I asked if the idea of shoe pockets was discussed, and they were not.

The people of Pelham elected the School Board to work for us. The Board hired the Superintendent, and when a new policy is presented, like cell phone pouches, the Superintendent should offer options for you to choose from and discuss the pros and cons rather than present one idea as the only solution. I agree 100% that students need to concentrate better. Don't get me wrong.

The way this whole situation has played out is unacceptable. I have heard in the recording discussion that someone would get parents' feedback, and I understand from several friends that this hasn't happened, or did it? Was there a survey that went out? As School Board members, you are elected and took an oath to protect us and our children. When options are not presented, and there's at least one option, you're not having a robust discussion to protect the people of Pelham that you are sworn to protect.

Many of our friends are worried about the safety of their children and communicate with them during the day with scheduling changes for after school. Some parents are the one safe person the child needs to talk to because of anxiety. What happens if, God forbid, there's an active shooter event in the school, and the kids don't have their phones? Please consider trying the shoe pockets with discipline to be used for those who are offenders. We do not need to be tyrannical and remove children's cell phones for the entire day if there are consequences in place for not using the shoe pocket properly.

The Superintendent said that he did not feel comfortable with the liability of holding phones in shoe pockets. In response to that, it is a scare tactic. The Facilities Manager can install shoe holders, as they exist in many other Districts. Thank you very much for your consideration."

56 b. **Carina Carter, 19 Brandy Lane**

57 Ms. Carter stated, "I have concerns about the lack of communication. There were many times in the last school year when  
58 practices or events were canceled, and I didn't find out until my kids texted me. Many times last year, the school didn't  
59 communicate cancellations to me. Unfortunately, I work in Boston, so if I don't find out until the end of the day, my kids  
60 will sit there for an hour and a half.

61  
62 I am also disappointed that other options were not presented or considered and that parents did not receive feedback.  
63 The policy came out before the School Board's approval, and schedules have already been rearranged to accommodate  
64 the change before the School Board's approval. This behavior from the adults I'm supposed to trust with my children was  
65 unsettling.

66  
67 Lastly, there's a safety hazard inside of them. There is a small sharp pin, and essentially, the District is giving kids  
68 weapons. They will have to deal with the liability of hurting themselves or others or getting their fingers caught. All things  
69 should be considered before this choice is made. Thank You."

70  
71 c. **Mike Carter, 19 Brandy Lane**

72 Mr. Carter stated, "I will just stick to a few points of my own. It's off-putting as a  
73 community to get a few discussion points at the last meeting that rubbed folks the wrong way. The communication  
74 came out, and this was already in motion. This was approved without being approved. The Board has not  
75 voted, but we've changed the school schedule to accommodate this. We've already put out a notification to the  
76 community. That's a mistake. It's unprofessional.

77  
78 Another unprofessional aspect of this is the lack of accountability. The discussion does not focus on anything related to  
79 what we are impacting. We are implementing an intervention. What is our goal? How are we measuring our progress  
80 toward that goal? What are we trying to get from this? If we don't get that from this, why are we spending **\$14,000** this  
81 year and then **\$4,000** in perpetuity?

82  
83 If I can make a request regarding tonight's discussion, it would be great to hear what the annual **\$4,000** charge is for.  
84 These are physical pouches and magnets. This is a replacement term similar to the Chromebook replacement, which  
85 should be done as a complete aside, as 1/3 over three years, not everything in one year. But if that's what we do with  
86 pouches, then we turn them over every three years.

87  
88 Interestingly, the fee for any damaged pouch is more than the cost of the pouch itself. The pouch costs **\$30.00**, but parents  
89 will pay **\$40.00** if it's broken. Are these pouches assigned to individual students? What if a pouch is mishandled by one  
90 student on Monday, and my student gets it on Tuesday, and now the edges are frayed, and it doesn't hold the phone right  
91 anymore, and I'm paying **\$40.00** for that?

92  
93 Many issues have yet to be discussed or worked out, yet we've already changed the  
94 schedule to accommodate them and notified the community. That's all."

95  
96 Mr. Bressette thanked the two speakers. He noted that he did expect answers to several of their questions, but they  
97 would reserve them for the portion of the agenda regarding the School Handbooks.

98  
99 Public Input closed at 6:40 p.m.

100  
101 **III. Presentations:**

102 **Pelham Memorial School Student Voice Regarding Dress Code**

103 Mr. Bressette welcomed two teachers and one student to the table. Dr. McGee introduced Lucia Roman, who would  
104 discuss another portion of the handbook revision for PMS. He also introduced Teachers Katie Ralls and Megan Delucia.

105  
106 Ms. Roman introduced herself and mentioned that she was the Student Council Co-President. She commented that she  
107 was at the meeting to speak on behalf of Co-President Autumn Whiting about the dress code at PMS. She noted that  
108 the dress code could be updated to align with neighboring School Districts.

Ms. Roman presented the current PMS dress code and the neighboring School Districts. She mentioned that they felt necessary updates were needed for what they feel is an unfair and outdated policy. The biggest problem with the dress code is the policy surrounding shorts.

Ms. Roman stated that, as written, the policy does not account for people of different heights wearing the same shorts. She pointed out that this can make shorts appear longer or shorter depending on someone's height. Ms. Roman presented a picture of three women of different heights wearing the same shorts.

Ms. Roman said they have proposed changes to the dress code, including standardizing the length requirement for shorts and shirts. The change will make understanding the policy easier for parents, students, and staff.

Mr. Bressette thanked Ms. Roman and informed her that the presentation was well done. He added that he was impressed with some of the proposed revisions at their last meeting.

Ms. Ralls mentioned that the proposed handbook changes came through Ms. Lucia and herself, and then they took the proposal to Mr. Medlock. Ms. Ralls added that the changes make things much easier and coincided with neighboring towns. The dress code hasn't been updated for quite some time, so they looked at the neighboring Districts.

Mr. Bressette commented that the Board has had conversations about it from time to time over approximately six years. He noted that it seems to be one-directional regarding the dos and don'ts by gender. Mr. Bressette added that what they shared and reflected in the handbook helped eliminate some issues.

Mr. Wilkerson pointed out that he is a parent of adult children, all but one of whom are tall. He noted that they all struggled with the same issues the students were facing. Mr. Wilkerson thanked them for addressing the concerns with the dress code.

#### **IV. Main Issues / Policy Updates:**

##### **A. Energy Efficiency Investments (EEI)**

The discussion shifted to Energy Efficiency Investments (EEI). Ms. Mahoney introduced Mike Davey, who has met with the School Board several times to review the annual performance report related to the energy efficiency project initiated in 2019. She noted that this is year four.

Mr. Daveys stated that the project initially aimed to convert buildings from propane to natural gas, resulting in substantial energy savings. The project's first year (2019) saved **\$214,000**, and despite increased electric loads from additional cooling and extended ventilation due to COVID-19, the District continued to see significant savings. Adjustments for these changes still resulted in **\$110,000** in annual savings, exceeding the annual guarantees by over **\$28,000**.

Mr. Davey explained the need for a new baseline for energy usage following the addition of new square footage at the middle school. The continuous monitoring and monthly reports help identify areas for improvement, significantly reducing energy consumption. He pointed out that the elementary school's high-efficiency rate now makes it eligible for Energy Star status, reflecting the project's success.

Board members inquired about the monthly recommendations and their implementation. It was confirmed that adjustments are made electronically and promptly, although specific figures on implemented changes were not provided. Ms. Mahoney recognized the elementary school's efficiency and potential Energy Star certification, highlighting the dedication and progress made.

Mr. Davey mentioned that the District can put a plaque on its wall stating that the building is Energy Star certified.

**B. Update on Solar Project from Kearsarge Energy - [Pelham Public Schools Rooftop Solar PV Projects](#)**

The meeting proceeded with an update on the solar project from Kearsarge Energy. Ms. Mahoney mentioned that Kearsarge Energy is the company that the District is working with to secure solar panels on the roofs of all three buildings. She noted that this presentation is the follow-up to the presentation that occurred in February 2024. Ms. Mahoney introduced Dan Voss of Kearsarge Energy and Beth Greenblatt of Beacon Integrated Solutions.

Mr. Voss provided a brief overview of the project, which involves installing a 1.9 MW DC system across the three schools. He detailed the interconnection process with Liberty Utilities and the associated costs. Initial estimates for interconnection costs were significantly lower than the current projections of **\$414,000**, primarily due to upgrades required at the high school and substation.

**Interconnection Update**

- a. Applications were submitted to Liberty Utilities in October 2023. On January 22, 2024, Liberty Utilities initiated the Impact Studies for PES, PMS, and PHS.
- b. Impact study results were finalized in mid-May 2024. Studies called for approximately **\$735,000** in upgrades to local and substation equipment. RFP response carried an allowance of **\$192,000**. Kearsarge / School team met with Liberty in late May to explore cost-saving options.
- c. In June 2024, Liberty responded with an updated analysis that reduced the overall expected IX cost by **\$320,000** to **\$414,750**, with **\$24,500** attributable to PES and PMS and **\$390,250** attributable to the PHS. Liberty projected that the substation upgrades for PHS would take between 18 and 24 months following the issuance of the Interconnection Service Agreement.
- d. Once the building program is decided, Interconnection Service Agreements can be executed, and payments made to start the utility upgrade clock.

Mr. Voss outlined two scenarios:

**Commercial Update**

- a. Following the Interconnection response, Kearsarge assessed two scenarios.
  - i. **Scenario 1.** Build only the PES and PMS
  - ii. **Scenario 2.** Build PES and PMS first, and follow with PHS per timeline
- b. Kearsarge modeled the PPA price adjustment for each scenario and the expected completion timing given expected Utility costs and schedule.
  - i. **Scenario 1.** PPA price increases from \$0.13/kWh to \$0.142/kWh with a 0.5% escalator and 25-year contract. Completion window for schools April 2025-June 2025.
  - ii. **Scenario 2.** PPA price increases from \$0.13 to \$0.133 with a 0.5% escalator and a 25-year contract. The completion window for PES and PMS is April 2025 – June 2025 and for PHS from March 2026 – September 2026 (assuming three months to ISA).

**Next Steps**

- |  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| a. Kearsarge requests Interconnection Service Agreement for three sites  | June 2024                   |
| b. School Board decision on Scenario 1 or Scenario 2                     | July 10, 2024               |
| c. Detailed design/permitting  | July - October 2024         |
| d. All Interconnection Service Agreements in hand                        | October 2024                |
| e. Elementary / Middle School - Construction starts                      | October 2024                |
| f. Elementary / Middle School - Energization                             | March – June 2025           |
| g. High School - Early Construction starts                               | October 2025 **             |
| h. Utility Substation work complete / High School Energization           | March 2026 – September 2026 |
| i. ** Construction starts six months before projected utility completion |                             |

The Board said they would wait until after Ms. Greenblatt made her presentation to ask questions.

The best scenario, which involves building solar for two schools, increases the CPI cost from **\$0.13/kWh** to about **\$0.142/kWh**. This reflects the economic loss in construction, as significant fixed costs are associated with the project. Building solar panels for PHS leads to only a one-third of a penny increase in the PPA price. This means the school system would have two projects coming online, with a gap before the third project starts.

The recommended scenario involves completing PHS in a timely manner. The next steps include requesting connection service agreements with three sites and expecting responses for PES and PMS in the next week or two. The PHS agreement will follow once a decision is made to move forward. A follow-up is expected in August.

Mr. Voss mentioned that the detailed design will start this month, beginning with anchoring down the engineering team. This design phase is expected from late July through the end of October, with all service agreements in hand before reaching a buildable project. PES and PMS construction would start in October, focusing initially on structural work, with a target completion between March and June 2025. PHS construction would begin in October, assuming an 18-month build schedule, leading to completion around September 2026. If a 24-month schedule is adopted, the timeline will be extended accordingly.

Ms. Greenblatt started by explaining the current cost structure and the changes in the energy markets. The District has locked in fixed-price contracts, insulating itself from market volatility. The updated assumptions reflect the current cost of utility delivery charges and avoided costs, which have dropped about two cents, significantly impacting the project's economics.

Scenario one involves PES and PMS only, with savings of about **\$45,000 over 25 years**. Scenario two includes all three schools, with savings of about **\$511,000**. These savings are based on current data and fixed-price contracts for future energy costs.

Ms. Greenblatt emphasized the projects' benefits, their impact on the District's budget, and the importance of moving forward. The Board acknowledges the frustrations with the lack of state and federal policy support but recognizes the projects' benefits.

The Board appreciated the updates and progress in energy efficiency and the solar project. Mr. Bressette acknowledged his frustrations with the lack of state and federal policy support but recognized the projects' benefits.

Mr. Bressette asked about the project timeline and costs. It was noted that Liberty had met its timelines, and the allocation of costs for transformer upgrades was discussed. There is potential for negotiating these costs, but the complexities of working with utility companies like Liberty and National Grid were noted.

Overall, the presentation underscored the project's importance for the District's future energy savings and stability despite the challenges and frustrations faced along the way.

Mr. Abare asked if the energy costs remained static would there still be a savings of **\$515,000 in scenario 2**. Mr. Voss confirmed there would be savings of **\$515,000** if the costs remained static.

Mr. Bressette asked whether the investment would be handled by Kearsarge, the District itself, or a private investor via the PPA. Ms. Greenblatt stated that Kearsarge would be the investor for their investors (the PPA entity). She emphasized that the agreement would include a provision ensuring that any investment would ultimately benefit the District contractually, either through reduction of the PPA, payment, or some form of recapture.

Mr. Bressette expressed surprise at learning about these possibilities and classified the provided estimate as very conservative, noting the 1% escalator on utility market rates and a 0.5% escalator on the agreement. Dr. McGee mentioned an additional point regarding savings related to reducing peak demand, which was not included in the analysis. This omission further reinforced the conservative nature of the estimate.

The discussion highlighted that spinning the meter backward could reduce demand, but demand charge savings couldn't be guaranteed since they are based on the highest 15 minutes of usage in a month. Behind-the-meter solar projects have shown demand savings, though quantifying these savings is challenging.

Mr. Bressette pointed out that voters approved the plan, assuming **\$300,000** in savings over the project's lifetime. With updated numbers and assumptions, the economic benefit is now estimated at over half a million, making option one economically unviable. The Board members agreed that Scenario 1 was not worth the District's time.

Mr. Abare asked Ms. Greenblatt to clarify the difference in kWh costs and savings. She explained that the avoided cost includes the supply piece of approximately \$0.10 and associated delivery charges, comparing what is not bought from the utility to what is delivered from the solar arrays. He then asked where the savings would go if they increased beyond projections. She said that the savings would be realized immediately in avoided costs.

Mr. Wilkerson moved to adopt scenario two as we continue executing the project described. Mr. Abare seconded the motion, which passed (3-0-0).

The Board expressed their appreciation for the hard work of negotiating competitive supply contracts that saved taxpayers significant amounts.

Mr. Bressette moved to reorder the agenda to go into the School Handbook presentation, followed by the Capital Improvement Plan Submission. Mr. Wilkerson seconded the motion, which passed (3-0-0).

### **C. School Handbooks:**

Superintendent McGee led the discussion on changes at PMS, specifically the cell phone pouches. Mr. Bressette pointed out that this topic had been discussed during public meetings as far back as May. It was noted that the letter from Mr. Medlock should have been sent after receiving Board approval. Dr. McGee owned the mistake made by the District but pointed out that the big picture is to make PMS a cell phone distraction-free space. He shared the letter Mr. Medlock sent to the families with the Board members.

Dr. McGee stated that the PMS schedule includes a soft start and a flex block. He stressed that this schedule would occur whether the District implemented the cell phone pouches.

Dr. McGee said that the pouches for cell phones will be assigned to individual students and collected at the end of the day to limit the possibility of devices being taken home still in the pouch. He added that data from other schools, i.e. Tewksbury, implementing similar policies showed improvements in academic performance, student behavior, and engagement.

Dr. McGee mentioned that he spoke with Ms. Cummings regarding her no-vote for the pouches. Ms. Cummings asked him what measures would be used. He stated that Yondr will include built-in surveys to assess the impact on attitudes toward device access. The survey would go out to parents, students, and staff.

Dr. McGee commented that one concern was schedule changes at the end of the day. Mr. Medlock decided to build the unlocking of the Yondr pouches into the Flex Block.

During the final five to ten minutes of school, students may check their devices for messages from their parents about after-school plans, such as whether to go to the library or take the bus. This information is important, and having access to devices facilitates communication. Dr. McGee apologized for any confusion caused by proceeding without the Board's approval. The arrangement was made with the Board's trust, and they will not move forward without the Board's consent.

Mr. Bressette thanked Dr. McGee for owning the mistake.

Mr. Abare expressed concern over phone issues, suggesting that physically taking possession of phones may not be the best approach. He referenced an effective method he observed at a concert, using pouches that lock phones away. Mr. Bressette agreed that minimizing phone distractions is crucial for enhancing student learning, as middle school students may lack the executive functioning skills to resist the temptation of their devices.

The Board discusses the practicality and security of using pouches, mentioning a YouTube video showing how easy it is to open older versions. Dr. McGee said the current generation has improved locking mechanisms to prevent tampering. The pin will be in the locked position the entire day. If a student tries to jar the pouch open, then the Yondr pouch can be damaged. The Board also considered the ongoing expenses of replacing pouches as they wear out, estimating up to **\$4,000** annually.

The discussion then focused on ensuring the project's economic viability, addressing the conservative nature of the estimates, and implementing a new cell phone policy at PMS to enhance the learning environment. The Board members agreed on the project's economic aspects and moved forward with the new policy, emphasizing its potential benefits for the school community.

Mr. Wilkerson reflected on the District's current cell phone policy, questioning its effectiveness. He noted that recent South Carolina legislation requires School Districts to implement policies prohibiting cell phone use during school hours. However, he emphasized the importance of parent support and engagement for the success of such policies. Mr. Wilkerson expressed concern that not enough parents provided feedback to have the District move forward with the project.

Mr. Bressette disagreed, mentioning the efforts made to solicit parents' feedback. The concern was that the forums and surveys conducted over the summer would have low participation rates. Mr. Wilkerson suggested that more efforts are needed to engage the community and gather comprehensive feedback.

The Board discussed the distinction between policy and operational procedures. The Board recognized that while the administration could implement the procedure without Board approval, it is important to consider community input and ensure transparency. Mr. Wilkerson noted that the Board approval would be needed because the District discussed using end-of-year funds to purchase the Yondr pouches.

The conversation concluded with the Board acknowledging the challenges of engaging parents in discussions and making decisions without adequate feedback. The Board agreed that while the procedure could enhance learning by minimizing phone distractions, it is crucial to have sufficient community endorsement before moving forward.

Mr. Abare expressed his thoughts on the matter, acknowledging that while he does not have children, he would need to trust that students will put their phones in the pouch, ensuring quality learning. He admitted that some students are responsible enough to avoid touching their phones all day, but most struggle to avoid using their phones due to the influence of social media like TikTok.

The Board discussed that the cell phone policy topic had been tried in different classrooms, including at PMS and PHS, where teachers had to enforce the policy. The enforcement turned teachers into de facto police, requiring them to manage the checking in and out of phones throughout the day. There were concerns about taking expensive devices from students and the logistics of managing these devices.

The Board acknowledged the challenge of gathering sufficient survey responses, particularly during the summer when school is not in session. There was a discussion about the pilot program being tested at PMS to expand it to the PHS. Mr. Bressette stated that this approach is seen as fiscally responsible, as it tests the policy in a smaller environment before a broader implementation.

Mr. Bressette mentioned that he would approve the handbook, although it was somewhat controversial. Like Mr. Abare, he is willing to deal with the discomfort of potentially deciding on the handbook tonight because of the strong benefits for the students and the impact on the learning environment.

Mr. Wilkerson asked about the unlocking devices in the classrooms. Dr. McGee stated that he and Mr. Medlock have identified having an unlocking device, not in every classroom, but in a common area. Most Districts place unlocking devices at the exits of the buildings. Dr. McGee stressed that the District does not have the money to place one in every classroom.

Dr. McGee expressed the importance of communicating with the community and addressing concerns, including the logistical and security implications of the policy. He acknowledged the anxiety around not being able to contact children in emergencies. However, he emphasized the need for students to follow teachers' directions during such times to avoid misinformation and panic.

Mr. Abare moved to adopt the handbook. Mr. Bressette seconded the motion, which passed (2-1-0). (Mr. Wilkerson voted "nay")

Mr. Wilkerson said he was not opposed to the device but voted "nay" because he did not believe it served the District's best interests to introduce it during the summer. He pointed out that school is out, and most people will not think about school unless they must. Mr. Wilkerson commented that most people probably do not know that the School Board is having this conversation.

Mr. Bressette mentioned that people paid attention to Mr. Medlock's letter and added that this topic was discussed toward the end of the last school year. He stressed that the Board had discussed the Yondr pouches a couple of times before the end of the school year.

Dr. McGee said that on August 14 at 4:00 p.m., there will be an explanation meeting for parents.

#### **D. Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Submission to School Board:**

Ms. Mahoney reviewed the Capital Improvement Plan submission, which included long-term expenses for the District. The items discussed included the PES parking lot, PES air conditioning phases, PHS student parking lot, and PHS boilers. The Board reviewed the prioritization and timing of these projects, emphasizing the importance of maintaining and upgrading facilities to ensure efficiency and cost savings.

Project dates were adjusted to future years as indicated:

- a. The PES Parking was adjusted to three years later than prior submissions.
- b. The PES AC phases were adjusted to one year later than prior submissions.
- c. The PHS Parking lot date was adjusted based on current condition to three years later.

The Board then discussed the priority maintenance of the PHS boilers. Emphasis was placed on ensuring that the boilers function optimally, particularly during winter, to avoid any disruption in school operations. The Facilities Director recently had an evaluation done, which resulted in a proposal indicating a cost of **\$532,000**. This figure was not included in the current packet, and additional items in the proposal must be addressed. Further information will be provided as the budgeting process continues.

During the discussion, it was clarified that the current annual savings are approximately **\$12,000**, assuming the present natural gas costs remain stable. Concerns were expressed about the high expenditure of **\$532,000** for relatively modest yearly savings.

Mr. Abare asked about the boilers' current fuel source, which was confirmed to be natural gas converted from oil. The bids received were not correctly sized for natural gas, which led to a discussion about the consequences of an eroded flue, the potential of the heating unit failing, and the health risks associated with inadequate ventilation.

Ms. Mahoney noted that the boilers are over 20 years old and approaching the end of their useful life. The discussion highlighted the need for planning to avoid emergency replacements, which could be more costly and challenging to implement. Concerns about the safety of the current system were addressed, with assurances that the system is monitored and functioning safely for now.



The Board discussed the importance of planning documents for budgeting purposes, even if it does not commit them to immediate expenditures. For further scrutiny, Ms. Mahoney was asked to provide the evaluation report, including pictures and detailed information.

The summary includes the town's calendar year and the school budget's fiscal year to clarify the District's planned timing for the submitted needs.

Mr. Bressette asked if it was possible to bring in EEI, as a neutral third party, to evaluate the PHS boilers. Ms. Mahoney stated that she could, but EEI was the company that provided the evaluation and estimate.

#### **CIP Submission**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<b>Anticipated Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Anticipated Calendar Year</b>	<b>Estimated Priority of the Projects</b>
<b>PHS</b> – Replace Boilers and Venting	\$532,000	FY 2026	CY 2025	1
<b>PES</b> – Air Conditioning Phase II – First Floor Classrooms	\$584,790	FY 2027	CY 2026	2
<b>PES</b> – Air Conditioning Phase III – Gym and all other spaces remaining	\$600,132	FY 2028	CY 2027	3
<b>PES</b> – Asphalt Parking Lot and Roadways	\$304,266	FY 2028	CY 2027	4
<b>PHS</b> – Student Parking Lot Replacement	\$342,461 (incl. drainage est.)	FY 2030	CY 2031	5

Mr. Wilkerson moved to present the CIP to the Committee as drafted. Mr. Abare seconded the motion, which passed (3-0-0).

Dr. McGee commended Ms. Mahoney and Mr. Sands for the enormous amount of work they did.

#### **V. Policy Review:**

The Board reviewed the policy listed below.

##### **a. First Reading:**

- i. JKAA - Use of Restraints and Seclusion
- ii. AC - Non-Discrimination Equal Opportunity Employment and Anti-Discrimination Plan
- iii. ACE - Procedural Safeguards: Non-Discrimination based on Handicap/Disability
- iv. ACF - Food and Nutrition Services Anti-Discrimination and Civil Rights Complaints (New Policy)
- v. ADB/GBEC - Drug-Free Workplace & Drug-Free Schools
- vi. ADC - Prohibitions Regarding Use and Possession of Tobacco Products

##### **b. Second Reading:**

- i. None

The Board's discussion covered policy reviews, with updates reflecting legislative changes and ensuring compliance with non-discrimination and equal opportunity standards.

Mr. Bressette proposed changing the meeting agenda format and suggesting a consent agenda to streamline routine items. This is not a policy change and would include the items currently under Housekeeping. The consensus of the Board was to accept the proposed change.

466 **VI. Other:**  
 467 Dr. McGee pointed out that the Board had not approved all three handbooks. The Board acknowledged the need to  
 468 approve two other handbooks (PES and PHS) to ensure all necessary documentation was correctly handled.  
 469  
 470 Mr. Wilkerson moved to adopt the PHS and PES handbooks. Mr. Abare seconded the motion, which passed (3-0-0).  
 471  
 472 **VII. Board Member Reports:**  
 473 A. None  
 474  
 475 **VIII. Housekeeping:**  
 476 **A. Adoption of Minutes**  
 477 a. June 19, 2024 – Draft Public Minutes  
 478 b. June 19, 2024 – Draft Non-Public Minutes  
 479  
 480 Due to the lack of a quorum for voting, the minutes were tabled until the next meeting.  
 481  
 482 **B. Vendor and Payroll Manifests**  
 483 a. 551 \$ 151,004.80  
 484 b. AP071024 \$3,631,495.15  
 485 c. BFPMS68 \$ 32,446.40  
 486 d. PAY551P \$ 7,287.55  
 487  
 488 Mr. Wilkerson moved to approve the Vendor and Payroll Manifest as presented. Mr. Abare seconded the motion,  
 489 which passed (3-0-0).  
 490  
 491 Ms. Mahoney mentioned that since the Board would not meet for more than a month, she wanted to provide a date for  
 492 the Board to sign the manifest. The date was July 24.  
 493  
 494 **C. Correspondence & Information**  
 495 a. None  
 496  
 497 **D. Enrollment Report**  
 498 a. None  
 499  
 500 **E. Staffing Updates**  
 501 **a. Leaves**  
 502 i. None  
 503  
 504 **b. Resignations:**  
 505 i. Kristin Croteau PHS School Nurse  
 506 ii. Allison Miller PMS Teacher – Grade 6  
 507  
 508 **c. Retirements:**  
 509 i. None  
 510  
 511 **d. Nominations:**  
 512 i. Kristen Figueiredo PES School Nurse  
 513 ii. Lauren Burgess PHS Math Teacher  
 514 iii. Julie Phelan PHS School Nurse  
 515 iv. Tracy Acker PES Preschool Teacher  
 516  
 517  
 518

519 Dr. McGee commented that the District had two resignations. He mentioned that Kristin Croteau has never worked for  
520 the District. She took the position and immediately withdrew. A respected social studies teacher, Allison Miller, was  
521 promoted as Milford's High School Assistant Principal. The Board expressed their congratulations.  
522

523 Mr. Bressette moved to accept the resignations as presented. Mr. Abare seconded the motion, which passed (3-0-0).  
524

525 Dr. McGee commented that they have two Nurses, a Math Teacher, and a half-time Preschool Teacher. He added that  
526 Lauren Burgess, with a math background and interest in administrative roles, was highlighted. Her commitment to  
527 teaching math was praised.  
528

529 Mr. Wilkerson moved to accept the four nominations of the individuals mentioned. Ms. Cummings seconded the motion,  
530 which passed (3-0-0).  
531

532 **IX. Future Agenda Planning:**

533 A. No Future Agenda Planning  
534

535 **X. Future Meetings:**

536 A. 08/14/2024 – 5:00 p.m. School Board Retreat @ PHS Library

537 B. 08/28/2024 – 6:30 p.m. School Board Meeting @ PES Library  
538

539 **XI. Non-Public:**

540 Mr. Abare moved to enter a non-public session under RSA 91-A:3 (II) (i) – Emergency Planning at 8:51 p.m. Mr.  
541 Wilkerson seconded the motion. The motion passed (3-0-0).  
542

543 **Roll Call**

544 Mr. Bressette - Aye

545 Mr. Wilkerson - Aye

546 Mr. Abare - Aye  
547

548 **XII. Reconvened:**

549 The Board returned to Public Session at 9:08 p.m.  
550

551 **XIII. Adjournment:**

552 Mr. Wilkerson moved to adjourn the School Board Meeting at 9:09 p.m. Mr. Abare seconded the motion, which passed  
553 (3-0-0).  
554

555  
556  
557 Respectfully Submitted,  
558 Matthew Sullivan  
559 School Board Recording Secretary  
560  
561