A public hearing was held on August 30, 2022 at 6:30 p.m.

Attendees: Jonathan Ramsay, Chairman
Mary Ann Rosa, Vice Chair
Ken Demirs
Robert Desena
Anthony DiBona
Gary Lafferty
Robert Retallick
Mark Raimo, Town Manager
Susan Zappone, Asst. Town Manager//Finance Director

Chairman Jonathan Ramsay read the public hearing notice.

The Town Council of the Town of Watertown will hold public hearings at the Watertown Town Hall, 61 Echo Lake Road, in Watertown, Connecticut, on Tuesday, August 30, 2022, at a time and purpose indicated below:

At 6:30 p.m. to hear comments on the proposed ordinance: “AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING $1,500,000 FOR THE ACQUISITION OF A FIRE TRUCK AND RELATED EQUIPMENT; AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUE OF BONDS OR NOTES AND TEMPORARY NOTES IN THE SAME AMOUNT TO FINANCE THE APPROPRIATION”
David Bromley, Fire Chief: Good evening, I will start tonight by stating that Ladder 2 which is 30 years old, we are looking to replace. Since reading this report over the weekend we have had an issue with the ladder truck, the ladder itself is leaking on the pistons for raising the ladder and it is estimated to be repaired from $10,000 to $15,000 currently.

Ladder 2 Replacement Request:
August, 2022

Watertown & Oakville is a mix of residential and commercial buildings, each which provide for unique challenges to the Fire Department. Buildings with different access restrictions (roads, driveways and obstructions) exist as well as buildings with various heights, layouts and construction methods (wood, masonry, metal, etc.).

Building occupancies in our town include residential structures ranging in size up to several thousand square feet, along with commercial, industrial, municipal, academic and religious buildings. The largest fire life hazards are residential properties as well as the Taft School and multi-tenant housing areas such as Greenbriar Apartments, Highgate Condominiums, 4 large elderly housing projects, and several assisted living / convalescent residence projects, as well as the Towns 5 Public Schools and 2 Parochial Schools.

The Watertown Fire Department responded to 2989 emergency calls in fiscal year 2021-22. These calls included everything from medical emergencies, car fires, building fires, brush fires, building alarms, hazardous materials emergencies, rescues, and other emergencies. Of the 2,865 fire incidents responded to during the past four fiscal years since 2018; 1,239 incidents (43%) required an aerial ladder response. Of these calls, there were 95 fires in buildings of which 69 (73%) were two stories tall or higher.

The Town of Watertown needs aerial ladder trucks to conduct rescues of victims and firefighters who may become trapped (timing is essential). The life safety of firefighters conducting dangerous fire operations (i.e.: working on roofs); to ventilate buildings of heat, smoke and toxic gases is a task firefighters must perform to increase department efficiency and firefighters must be provided an avenue of escape, should something go wrong while preforming these tasks.

WHY DOES WATERTOWN NEED AN AERIAL LADDER?

1. RESCUE – To conduct rescue(s) of people (victims and firefighters) trapped at fires, construction sites and other emergency scenes. Timing is critical to the effective rescue of disaster victims.

2. LIFE SAFETY

   a. Enables firefighters to safely access roofs, chimneys and other elevated areas of all homes, businesses and other structures.

   b. Enables rapid ventilation for search, rescue and fire extinguishment as well as emergency access and exit from the fire building. An aerial ladder provides a safe working platform.
c. Reduces injuries by providing quick and rapid ventilation.
d. Most newer roof construction is of “truss” type, which is lightweight and fails early in a fire. Aerial devices allow for safer roof ventilation operations.

3. VENTILATE BUILDINGS OF HEAT, SMOKE, & TOXIC FIRE GASES

a. Firefighters cannot enter a building to conduct rescues, searches, or extinguish a fire until the heat (in excess of 1,500° F) is released.
b. Due to the amount of plastics and synthetics in homes, fires double in intensity every 10 - 30 seconds. Ventilation of a building as soon as possible reduces the risk of firefighters being caught in flashovers and backdrafts. This risk increases in newer, better insulated buildings.
c. One firefighter can raise an aerial ladder to a window or roof to open up the building to allow smoke, heat, and gases to escape. Ground and roof ladders take two to six firefighters to accomplish the same task safely. Each ground ladder requires a Firefighter to 'foot' the ladder which uses extra manpower that may be critical to other important tasks on the fireground.

4. FIRE SUPPRESSION

The aerial ladder can be used for extinguishing fire and for limiting fire spread, as the water supply is integrated with the ladder.

5. LIMITED MANPOWER

a. Fire Service ground ladders are designed to carry a number of firefighters in full gear, hose, rescue equipment, and civilians being rescued. They are much bigger and heavier than commercial ladders and require two to six firefighters to carry and raise, depending on their length.
b. An aerial ladder can be raised to a window or roof by one firefighter much faster than two to six firefighters can raise ground and roof ladders.
c. If upon arrival immediate rescues or ventilation is needed, one or two firefighters can accomplish this with an aerial ladder while the other firefighters assist in rescue and provide water to begin holding the fire back.
d. Without an aerial ladder, numerous firefighters may be tied up with raising and footing ground ladders. Because an aerial ladder can quickly be moved, it takes the place of multiple ground ladders.

6. CAN BE USED ON ALL TYPES AND SIZES OF BUILDINGS

a. People often ask us why do you need aerial ladders? How many buildings do we have that are that tall? The answer to the question is that we do have some tall buildings, the Old Pin Shop, the Siemon Co., and most importantly Taft School with its very high life safety
hazard in the multi-story dormitories. But height is not the only determining factor in the need for aerial ladder trucks. It is reach and safety! An aerial ladder can be used on all types and heights of buildings. It provides a safe working platform for all buildings.

Almost every structure fire we go to requires the use of these trucks. It can be a chimney fire at a 1-story ranch style home on a wintry day. Rather than expose our firefighters to the danger of an icy roof and icy portable ladders we are able to put them in the secure bucket of Tower 1 or the top of Ladder 2 and get them to the top of the chimney where they can quickly and more importantly safely do their job and extinguish the fire.

It may be an ice rescue on a frozen pond. Ladder 2 or Tower 1 can be extended out across the ice to safely get our rescuers to the victim.

These are just some examples of the numerous uses and the necessity of the aerial ladder trucks. Not to mention the need to refill our breathing air bottles at many fires.

Ladder 2 is a 110 ft. ladder and was purchased in 1992 for approx. $500,000.

The truck carries numerous portable ground ladders, a very important SCBA (breathing air) filling station and a large amount of tools needed for all types of rescues and fires.

Ladder 2 is a 30-year-old vehicle. It weighs over 68,000 pounds (or 34 tons) and it has performed extraordinarily well for those 30 years. But it is old and fatigued and many of its very complex operating systems are beginning to set in. Mileage is not the problem. With the exception of the engine, the drive train is in good condition, but the operating features we depend on at an incident scene are beginning to fail and parts are becoming hard to get. NFPA recommends replacement of Apparatus at 25 years old. In the past two FYs the department spent over $31,247 to repair the aerial ladder’s hydraulic system and the engine ECM issues and over the past 4 FYs $54,359 was spent.

We continue to monitor the truck for intermittent electrical issues & hydraulic leaks

Tower 1, our 100 ft. aerial platform truck was purchased in 2015. Some may question: Do we still need two aerial ladder trucks? The answer is: absolutely. The life safety of those inside a burning structure, both the victims and our firefighters are the most important reason. The time it would take to get a mutual aid ladder from another town versus our immediate response with two aerials is most definitely a matter of life and death.

Based on all of this the Volunteers of the Fire Department are asking the town for the approval and the funds to replace Ladder 2. The estimates we have obtained indicate a new Ladder truck is expected to cost $1,500,000.
Public Comment:
Al Mickel, 95 Woodvine Avenue: Mr. Mickel stated that the Fire Truck is an excellent idea and should be passed. Mr. Mickel asked questions regarding the resolution for the bonding process on how much it is going to cost over the long run. He also talked about the bonds that come after for the Police Station and the Senior Center/Community Center having concerns on bumping up the debt, having some kind of adverse effect. Mr. Mickel asked what the process is and cost for the lawyer.

Questions from the Council:
Vice Chair Mary Ann Rosa: What will happen to the current ladder truck?

David Bromley, Fire Chief: Once we get the new truck, it would be retired and put up for sale.

Anthony DiBona: The estimates that we retained would cost is 1.5 million, did we get more than one.
David Bromley, Fire Chief: The average for the market right now today is at 1.6 to 1.7 for a ladder truck depending on what you are buying. I originally put in 1.8 it was knocked down to 1.5, every month you go forward on this $5,000 is added to the chassis cost due to steel prices, supply and demand issues.

Anthony DiBona: Are there two or three major manufacturers of it?

David Bromley, Fire Chief: There are a few manufacturers that are out there and it would be put out to bid.

Chair Jonathan Ramsay: How much equipment can be taken off the current ladder truck and be used on the new one vs. new equipment being purchased?

David Bromley, Fire Chief: Quite a bit of it is reused, the only equipment that is not used is the ground ladders. When you buy a new ladder truck, you get ground ladders with the new truck. All the suppression equipment, the new SBCA system would be put in there for refilling, the saws, axes and the small tools would be transferred over.

Robert Retallick: Is there a way we could we buy the chassis first and then make a Fire Truck out of the chassis?

David Bromley, Fire Chief: Not really you would want to do it all as one package because of the building of the body of the truck.

Chair Jonathan Ramsay: Are we planning on getting one that is similar in size?

David Bromley, Fire Chief: Same exact style truck, not bigger or smaller.

Chair Jonathan Ramsay: Seeing or hearing no other comments I will close this hearing, thank you.

The meeting adjourned at 6:47 p.m.            Respectfully submitted,

____________________________
Jonathan Ramsay, Chairman
Watertown Town Council

Approved: _________________________
Susan King, Clerk
TOWN COUNCIL
WATERFORD, CONNECTICUT
TUESDAY, AUGUST 30, 2022
PUBLIC HEARING

A public hearing was held on August 30, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.

Attendees: Jonathan Ramsay, Chairman
Mary Ann Rosa, Vice Chair
Ken Demirs
Robert Desena
Anthony DiBona
Gary Lafferty
Robert Retallick

Mark Raimo, Town Manager
Susan Zappone, Asst. Town Manager//Finance Director

Chairman Jonathan Ramsay read the public hearing notice.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
TOWN OF WATERFORD, CT

The Town Council of the Town of Watertown will hold public hearings at the Watertown Town Hall, 61 Echo Lake Road, in Watertown, Connecticut, on Tuesday, August 30, 2022, at a time and purpose indicated below:

At 7:00 p.m. to hear comments on the proposed ordinance: “AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING $5,000,000 FOR VARIOUS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS AND RELATED WORK; AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUE OF BONDS OR NOTES AND TEMPORARY NOTES IN THE SAME AMOUNT TO FINANCE THE APPROPRIATION”
Mark Raimo, Town Manager: The Town of Watertown has approximately 145 miles of accepted paved roads, 37 miles of sidewalks and 4,500 catch basins. We have estimated that it would cost approximately 23 to 25 million dollars to pave all the 145 miles of Watertown roads without any construction improvements. In April or May of 2022, the committee charged to do so by the Town Council created and distributed a survey that received approximately 300 responses for the usage of ARPA funds. As a result of the survey, it is a clear message from the survey respondents that our roads were in dire need of attention. In 2022 the Town Council committed approximately 1.5 million dollars from the ARPA funds to road pavement. We recently contracted with the Connecticut Company BETA for a Pavement Management Road Survey. The survey will provide the Town with Comprehensive Pavement Condition Assessment of all 145 miles of roadways. This comprehensive assessment will give the council a road map for an infrastructure improvement plan for our streets. There is a clear need to invest monies to our roadway infrastructure and the five million dollars being considered for bonding will be wisely and responsibly spent with clear guidance from our relationship with BETA. BETA advises their analysis will be available by the second council meeting in October and we will post that information before the referendum in November.

Chair Jonathan Ramsay: Is there anyone from the public that would like to make any comments relating to bonding for our roads.

Hearing none.

Questions from Town Council:
Anthony DiBona: The program with BETA, they are going to prioritize which roads need what work in order of how damaged they are, if you could comment on that a little bit?

Mark Raimo, Town Manager: They are currently out there evaluating our roads they have three vehicles out there that are actually mapping our roadway and taking a survey of the level of need for improvement for those roads. They will give us a report back identifying the roads that need the most immediate attention and then give us a plan moving forward so that we can make decisions on the Capital Improvement Plan moving forward to keep that infrastructure solid. My hopes are when we get that plan, we can look at this amount of money, determine our process that it will take to improve the roads that need it and maintain the ones that are currently in decent shape and this analysis will give us all that information.

Anthony DiBona: Before how did we do it, we relied on Public Works to determine it?

Mark Raimo, Town Manager: There was quite of bit of reliance on Public Works advising the council on the needs. From what I understand they had a process where they broke the Town into five areas. Over the years, they began that process the council but as the budget became tight, they were not able to fund the balance needed to maintain those five districts. At this point we are outside that plan we need to come up with a different plan. This is going to make it easy for us to say these roads are in most need of repair.
Vice Chair Mary Ann Rosa: Main Street is not in great shape either, is there some process I assume that we reach out to the state and voice our concerns about the condition of the Main Street.

Mark Raimo, Town Manager: As far as pavement, yes, we can ask.

Vice Chair Mary Ann Rosa: As long as we are going to improve things let’s start with the center of town where everyone is going up and down every day, to get that in decent shape.

Chair Jonathan Ramsay: I want to touch on one other thing Mark mentioned which was the ARPA survey. We had a handful of different questions related to those funds and the last question of projects, is there any other project or concerns in Town and nearly hundreds of people put in roads, roads, roads. There has been a large voice from the public saying that we need to invest more in our Town and into our roads to make them safe and more appealing to the Town. If there are no other comments, we will end this public hearing.

The meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Ramsay, Chairman
Watertown Town Council

Approved: __________________________
Susan King, Clerk
TOWN COUNCIL
WATERTOWN, CONNECTICUT
TUESDAY, AUGUST 30, 2022
PUBLIC HEARING

A public hearing was held on August 30, 2022 at 7:30 p.m.

Attendees:
Jonathan Ramsay, Chairman
Mary Ann Rosa, Vice Chair
Ken Demirs
Robert Desena
Anthony DiBona
Gary Lafferty
Robert Retallick

Mark Raimo, Town Manager
Susan Zappone, Asst. Town Manager//Finance Director

Chairman Jonathan Ramsay read the public hearing notice.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
TOWN OF WATERTOWN, CT

The Town Council of the Town of Watertown will hold public hearings at the Watertown Town Hall, 61 Echo Lake Road, in Watertown, Connecticut, on Tuesday, August 30, 2022, at a time and purpose indicated below:

At 7:30 p.m. to hear comments on the proposed ordinance: “AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING $11,000,000 FOR VARIOUS SCHOOL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUE OF BONDS OR NOTES AND TEMPORARY NOTES IN THE SAME AMOUNT TO FINANCE THE APPROPRIATION”
Dr. Alison Villanueva, Superintendent of Schools and Mr. Luigi Velardi, Director of Facilities: We would like to say thank you to the Town Council and thank you for your consideration. Dr. Villanueva and Mr. Velardi gave a presentation on the Watertown Public Schools Capital Improvement Plan Project.

See attachment

Chair Jonathan Ramsay: Is there anyone from the public that would like to comment on the bonding package for the schools?

**Public Comment:**
Elizabeth Lawton, 81 Walnut Street: I am a parent of children in three out of the five schools here tonight. I have children that participate in spring and fall, track and field sports. We are lucky enough to use the Watertown Schools and we see the benefits of this that can happen on the fields. We owe our children safe facilities; our schools are one of our best investments in town. Our community will benefit on what we have heard here tonight and I would appreciate the consideration of the full 12 million.

**Questions from Council:**
Mark Raimo, Town Manager: I want to point out that a few months back Dr. Villanueva and Luigi Velardi had given me a tour of the projects that we are looking at. I would like to comment on the staff that is taking care of the schools. They really did an extraordinary job of keeping our schools in the condition they are. As Mr. Velardi talked about, they have tarps over their computer equipment to divert water into buckets. I looked in there and I am saying to myself, why would we ask staff members to do that. I am fully supportive of moving forward and I do think at this point after reviewing all the documents and reviewing the damage that we should consider bumping up the bonding to accommodate the twelve eight the school is asking for. I think when we looked at the bonding projects in general, we did not hear a lot of consideration about the rebate from the state which will allow us to pay back this bonding more quickly as we receive that money. I think it would be a good investment for us, that is my opinion.

Vice Chair Mary Ann Rosa: I support the monies you need to make improvements that you are requesting. I have a concern. I was on the BOE when those fields were put in and I objected to and voted against them at the time because the board was not putting in the annual amount of money needed to maintain them. The manufacturer that came and did the presentation told us what it would take and the board never put that money there. My concern now is once this is approved once those fields are updated, we need to have reassurance from the board that you are going to maintain them. At that time, it is was like $50,000 and even that amount of money could go a long way of making sure they last. That is something we would all be concerned about if they would be maintained once they are done.

Mr. Luigi Velardi, Director of Facilities: The short time that I have been here, I can’t speak for everyone that was before me. I have set up plans for replay sports and other turf management companies. We have had them come in four times to maintain and work with me on how to properly
maintain some of the areas. One of my guys every morning goes out after an event and check the field. I also put in for a machine that we can maintain it ourselves. It has come down since the fifty grand because of the technology itself. Even though they cut my manpower hours, some people might think it is a maintenance free field, it is not its minimal maintenance but there is maintenance in it. As long as I am here, I will make sure that we are maintaining that field.

Vice Chair Mary Ann Rosa: The other thing you might want to consider is making sure that benches, and chairs are not put on those fields, that we have seen recently that has caused more damage. People have to understand that we are investing this kind of money that they would have to buy into it too to maintain it.

Robert Retallick: Is there contingency money built into this just in case we are coming back and asking for more afterwards.

Dr. Alison Villanueva, Superintended of Schools: We had originally back in 2019 had a ten percent contingency. When we went out to get our reassessed quotes in 2021-2022, they told us to put in a twenty percent contingency. When we brought the number back down to eleven million, we brought it back down to ten percent.

Mr. Luigi Velardi, Director of Facilities: During this process it was new to me I communicated with the state and he told me you have to make sure that you have a dollar amount and he helped me set up the contingency levels of each roofing project and our turf project. There is a small contingency in there we put ten percent.

Robert Retallick: Out of the twelve point eight million request on this. what is the return from the state.

Dr. Alison Villanueva, Superintended of Schools: On the two roofing projects for John Trumbull and Watertown High School you would get a little over four million four on the low end of things. Forty-five to fifty-five reimbursement rates. Mr. Velardi just shared if we do the John Trumbull roofing in April starting then we would get a full sixty one percent back. Either way for any of those projects between forty-five and sixty one percent.

Gary Lafferty: The high school where it shows the pipes in the ceiling, the pipes started to rust away. Are they under pressure at all?

Mr. Luigi Velardi, Director of Facilities: The one thing that I saw a sprinkler pipe, I wasn’t so sure if it was a leak that was oxidating on there or it was put there like that. It was failing so we had to replace that.

Gary Lafferty: On the turf fields, I know at the high school they always had problem with that field there. I am wondering if they put a better base on there going up and down on the fields. Another
question I don’t know how much of a project would cost with all the tiles popping up at John Trumbull School, if you saw the flooring, they had at the Fire Houses they had it painted with the same grit on it. I figure that is the much better way to go.

Mr. Luigi Velardi, Director of Facilities: That is an epoxy and I have thought about it and I have asked the guy for quotes for our foyer section. The vinyl it seems to hold better in the schools and seems to hold up better than the tiles. The cost is higher, we can see what kind of money we have. When you put that in on the long run the maintenance on them is beneficial.

Ken Demirs: Just to be clear on numbers the twelve million eight sixty is the number we are looking for and that number minus the four million four hundred approximately elven the numbers are under eight and a half. We know how the state changes their mind on occasions is that four point four million something that is automatic or a guarantee. Is there a chance that we don’t get the four million.

Mr. Luigi Velardi, Director of Facilities: Just today I had called up the state again and they are going to reset the reimbursement rates and usually it is done in September and they are a little behind right now. He assured me that it would only go one or two percent higher so it may go to sixty three percent or one or two percent lower.

Dr. Alison Villanueva, Superintended of Schools: It can fluctuate up and down a little bit, we are going to hope that it goes upwards. One of the big reasons why school districts don’t get their reimbursement back is because of the project management of it. Project management of it is very important so when they ask for invoice receipts, they look for the timeline is at least put in eligible. It is when ineligible items are written that we don’t get the reimbursement that number goes down. Before anything goes in, we would appoint a project manager specific to these roofing projects so that we have some eyes on the reimbursement. Another part of this we want to do this in a timely fashion, the other reason why schools don’t get the full reimbursements back is because they hold onto their projects and keep them open 10, 11, 12 years and they never close them out. We would like to get it done in a year and close it out in two to three years and get the reimbursement back.

Anthony DiBona: When do we get that reimbursement? Is it in the same fiscal year that the project is completed.

Dr. Alison Villanueva, Superintended of Schools: No, it happens when the project closes. Ultimately, they will have a plan of what it will take to finish it out. All of the work needs to be completed, the state comes for the inspection and tells us through an audit that it is officially been closed and then we sign off on the closure. Until that is done it is still remains open and the reimbursement is not until after that.

Anthony DiBona: Do we know how long does that take?

Dr. Alison Villanueva, Superintended of Schools: Two to three years, I would say to wait for the reimbursement. I would have to say though history we have had projects that have remained over 10 years. Again, project management is very important on our end and I think we should make a plan to
have regular updates so it is on everybody’s radar. We are looking to get it closed out at soon as possible.

Mr. Luigi Velardi, Director of Facilities: If I could add to that by doing my research, John Trumbull began in 1999 and it was closed out in 2003 but that is a full school project that was a new school from beginning to end. Roofing projects maybe instead of three or four years, one or two years it may be able close out. As long as everything on that roof is done up to specs we are closing out and we are happy with it.

Anthony DiBona: Just going off of what Ken was asking do we get any written commitment or something from the state indicating that we have been locked in and at what point does that happen.

Dr. Alison Villanueva, Superintendent of Schools: In the presentation, right now we are at the cost estimate stage which comes in from our architect. Then once bonding is definitely secured, we put in our official application to the state for approval. At that point in a month or two they will give us a grant commitment letter and, in that letter, it tells us exactly what the specs for the project are. Two weeks later the state sends up their own architect to reassess our original process and it may have tweaks. Then they give us the full plan review which is a very long document. Then after that we get the approval letter, once that is done, we could go out for one more bid to get the lowest price for our project. The eligible and ineligibles are all in that document, a thick book so you do have it in writing.

Anthony DiBona: That is in the approval letter that they will reimburse the specific amount.

Dr. Alison Villanueva, Superintendent of Schools: Exactly, what is reimbursable and what is not reimbursable.

Anthony DiBona: Who gets that the BOE, the Town?

Dr. Alison Villanueva, Superintendent of Schools: All reimbursement come straight to the Town and I believe it is put towards the debt service account.

Anthony DiBona: Do we need to do turf, could we do grass on those fields?

Mr. Luigi Velardi, Director of Facilities: We could do grass on those fields the cost would be double the amount of just laying the turf back down and to maintain that. Most of our fields our soccer, our hockey field, our Lacrosse field, the track team plays on it and football is played on it every Friday night, as well as practicing there. It is basically our only field that we have on our high school campus. From 2:05 to 8:00 that field is being used. If we were to put grass on it the manpower that is why we are in this situation that we got the field turf was because of the safety of the field and the grass.
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Anthony DiBona: If we only bond for 11 million do we still fall within the state reimbursement, the criteria for eligible projects?

Mr. Luigi Velardi, Director of Facilities: The answer is yes, we would get a little bit more reimbursement with the twelve eight because the low slope roof at John Trumbull, we are short of doing the total re roof of it.

Robert Desena: You said you contacted the state and you were made aware that it says here the state statute allows for maximum reimbursement on roofs every twenty years is that the life span of the roof? You were correct for the Trumbull roof that was built in ninety-nine however the high school was rebuilt in 08 and 09 we are not talking twenty years. Does this still fall into play or will it wait for the high school reached the duration of its initial roof?

Mr. Luigi Velardi, Director of Facilities: This is how it works for the reimbursement, you get twenty years. Any year before that is five percent less, you start of at twenty years at sixty one percent, in the year nineteen if you needed it is fifty five percent, year eighteen is fifty percent. Right now, the high school is at fifty percent, it is going to be at fifty five percent because when they did the school in 2008 all they did was maintenance to it, they did a layover I believe. The total construction of the roof was not ripped off it was just coated with epoxy sort of the material that they use.

Dr. Alison Villanueva, Superintended of Schools: The way I understand it when they did the new portion of the high school, they redid that portion of the roof. This portion of the roof I believe is the old section of the roof which is greater than twenty years old, that is why it is in such shape.

Robert Desena: The fields, everybody is aware that the fields have problems. We are talking about liability to the BOE, the Town itself, risk of injury to our players and importantly also visiting teams and we are making statements here that accurate obviously that the fields are in deplorable condition. The safety and protection of our athletes and visiting athletes and team members is very important.

Dr. Alison Villanueva, Superintended of Schools: Absolutely, when Mr. Velardi started, tell me when we need to close the fields because we never want to see any athlete get hurt. We are always looking at GMAC levels and we had 3 visits already to the Watertown High School field this year to keep it up. We did have to close that section at Swift, it broke our hearts because we had to close it. Once I close something, I am not reopening it until we are fully fixing it. I will stress that we are getting to maximum capabilities of it and that is when it needs to be addressed now before it gets in that position. It is still a safe place to play on and the place that is not safe is closed off and nobody is allowed to be on that portion.

Chair Jonathan Ramsay: Going back to the question is it cheaper or better to go to real grass. Real grass is nice till its not nice. Back when I was in high school in Watertown, we had the track and field it closed for the year. The grass it looked perfect after that year, within in month it was completely destroyed and hence why we ended up with turf. After a year of investment, the money invested in it surely almost over night it was completely destroyed. Another question or comment i
have is specific with the Swift field if I recall you had soccer, baseball, softball, is the layout of that going to be similar once it is redone over or is there going to be any changes.

Mr. Luigi Velardi, Director of Facilities: I have looked into a different layout for that field if you walk the field, you will notice that there is a concrete membrane that runs down where turf bumps up to the grass. The cost to take that out and extend the turf to the fence line the way it should be was too much to bring forth.

Chair Jonathan Ramsay: Sue, can you just elaborate on once the grant funds are received how they are treated?

Susan Zappone, Asst. Town Manager/Finance Director: When the reimbursement is in it comes back to the Town and it will be put into our debt service fund and that is the fund to be used to pay down the bond.

Chair Jonathan Ramsay: The 17.5 in bonds whatever the gains are that is where part of the principal interest...

Susan Zappone, Asst. Town Manager//Finance Director: Correct, it is part of the annual budget to begin there that shows how much money we have in debt service that will be spending per year.

Chair Jonathan Ramsay: My last comment is I have heard comments about how the town spends a lot of money on school if it’s the annual budget, it is capital improvement there is always a need, there is always a want and always more money involved that follows all that. I want to make a comment on specifically dealing with fields, it is our students, it is our kids, there is a lot of safety issues that we need to resolve it is truly is for the community as a whole. There are other groups outside of the school system that use those fields and enjoys those fields, they get beat up and they need to be improved. I think it is a great investment for the Town. Any other comments?

Hearing none.

The meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jonathan Ramsay, Chairman
Watertown Town Council

Approved:

Susan King, Clerk
Watertown Public Schools
Capital Improvement Plan
Projects

Presented to Watertown Town Council
By Alison Villanueva, Superintendent and
Mr. Luigi Velardi, Director of Facilities & Security

Tuesday, August 30, 2022, 7PM
1. Requests by Priority

2. State Reimbursement for Roofing Projects

Swift Middle School
Here Everyone Acts with Respect and Tolerance

John Trumbull Primary School
Committed to Excellence

Watertown High School
Increase of costs based on time lapse, increase in industry costs, and re-prioritization of projects based on urgency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Request</th>
<th>Total Capital Improvement Request in Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 <em>(2018 Discussion of a Capital Reserve Fund)</em></td>
<td>$10,450,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>$11,241,372.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022 (Prior to January)</td>
<td>$12,250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected for FY 23</td>
<td>$16,180,940.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected for FY 23 after Reduction</td>
<td>$12,860,940.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*elimination of Swift roof project and lowered contingency costs.*
After Reimbursements...

Original Request for Capital Improvement Projects $12,860,940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount Approved Town Council for Bonding</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Anticipated Reimbursement for Priorities 1 &amp; 4</td>
<td>-$4,410,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Calculated on 50% reimbursement rate. Rates can range from 45-61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements from the State will be put directly towards the Town's Debt Service account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount Spent on Capital Projects After Reimbursements</td>
<td>*$6,859,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*This may vary depending on the reimbursement rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increases in cost due to ....

1. Timelapse:

**Example:** Over time projects worsen and so contingencies increase to cover unanticipated costs that may occur after projects begin. Since 2019, contingencies continue to increase. Also priorities may shift as projects age out.

2. Overall Impact of Inflation:

**Example:** In 2021-2022 most roofing projects are running approximately $50/sq. ft. because of the current cost of materials, labor costs and overall inflation.

In these instances, when districts apply with cost estimates from architects that estimate $25-$30/sq.ft, applications are **denied** because the State knows it is not a realistic cost estimate.
Priority 1. WHS Roof Replacement *(Eligible for partial reimbursement)*
(See Garland Quote and Hibbard & Rosa Architects Quote) **Urgency Level 3**
Total Cost: $4,971,500
PRIORITY 2. WHS Artificial Turf and Track Replacement

(See AstroTurf Quotes) **Urgency Level 3**

Total Cost: $659,430 Turf
Total Cost: $679,300 Track and Base
PRIORITY 3. Swift Middle School Artificial Turf Replacement
(See AstroTurf quote) Urgency Level 3
Total Cost: $630,404.39
PRIORITY 4 & 5 John Trumbull Primary School Low slope & Sloped Shingle Section (Eligible for partial reimbursement)
(see Garland quote: Replace option) Urgency Level 3
Total Cost: $3,850,000 Sloped Shingle Section
Total Cost: $660,000 Low Slope Roof
PRIORITY 6. John Trumbull Primary School HVAC  
(See TriStar Service Inc. Quote) **Urgency Level 3**  
Total Cost: $105,702.50

PRIORITY 7. John Trumbull PreSchool Roof tops and Heat Trace On water piping **Urgency Level 3**  
Total Cost: $97,687.70

Keeping an eye out for the **WHITE HOUSE INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT** for potential funds
PRIORITY 8. Swift Middle Roof Maintenance
(See Garland quote) **Urgency Level 2**
Total Cost: $54,762.50

IN PLACE OF PRIORITY 9 - Swift Roof Restoration Project eliminated
PRIORITY 10. Security Camera Replacement and Upgrade at WHS Urgency Level 2
Total Cost: $400,000

- Outdoor cameras for parking lots
- Increased # of cameras inside building and with greater vantage points
PRIORITY 12. John Trumbull Primary Flooring Replacement

Urgency Level 1

Estimated Cost based on Square Footage: $500,000.00
PRIORITY 12. John Trumbull Primary Boiler Plant System Replacement Urgency Level 1
Total Cost: $153,450.00

PRIORITY 13. JUDSON BOILER BURNER REPLACEMENT Urgency Level 1
Total Cost: $67,964.60

Judson Elementary School
Success begins when you make the RIGHT choice!
STATE REIMBURSEMENTS FOR ROOFING

1. State Statute allows for maximum reimbursement (~55-60%) on roofs every 20 years.

2. Turfs/Fields/Tracks are ONLY reimbursable at the time of a new school construction OR when part of a renovation that is 25 years or older.
HOW DO STATE REIMBURSEMENTS WORK?

1. State assigns municipalities a **State Reimbursement Rate** each fiscal year July 1-June 30. Rates can increase, decrease, or stay the same from year to year.

2. Watertown’s reimbursement rate has ranged between 55-61% over the past 10 years.
   - FY 22 Rate: 60.36 %
   - FY 21 Rate: 59.64%

3. The Town/District is responsible for the **local share** of any costs outside of any eligible State reimbursements.
CAUTION: Strong recommendations from DAS

The State’s Checks and Balances

- The Town budget must show a line item for all open projects. The State must be able to see available funds year over year until project is complete.

- Towns/Districts are strongly recommended to fund a project in its entirety and use language that states,

  "the cost of [project X] will cost up to the [full amount of the project]"

This will ensure if any ineligible costs arise a district/town is covered.

- Towns/Districts that plan to the penny or do not allocate enough funding often have to stop projects midway and in the worst cases are unable to find any alternate funding and so a project is left incomplete or are required to return funds to the State.
EXAMPLE ONLY:
A Typical Timeline of How Projects are Reimbursed by DAS

1. **(Immediate)** District gathers a “**Cost Estimate**” from Architects for the project.

2. *(ex. October 1, 2022)* District/Town submits “**project application**” to State for approval.

3. *(ex. November 10, 2022)* **Grant Commitment letter** is issued to district/town.

4. *(ex. 2 weeks later)* Architects meet with district/town to complete a **Plan Review**
   - During a Plan Review, architects make adjustments and fix items in original cost estimate

5. *(ex. 1 month later)* State issues **Plan Approval Letter** to district/town for project.

6. Once Plan Approval Letter is received, district/town can go “**Out to Bid**”
FINAL TAKEAWAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected for FY 23 after Reduction</th>
<th>$12,860,940.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*elimination of Swift roof project and lowered contingency costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The Town/District will be reimbursed by the State for *a portion of the following projects (% of reimbursement TBD):  
   a. Priority 1 - WHS Roof  
   b. Priority 4 & 5 - JTPS Roof

2. Field/Turfs/Tracks are not reimbursable.

3. The White House Infrastructure Grant is another opportunity to receive funds towards Air Quality projects (Priority 6 & 7) but is not available yet.

4. Projects will be staggered to maximize reimbursement rates and ensure manageable oversight of all projects that require major construction.
Thank you and Questions