

BOND REIMBURSEMENT & GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Tuesday, September 8, 2020 - 1:30 p.m. – 3:28 p.m.

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

Committee Members Present

Heidi Teshner, Chair
Senator Cathy Giessel
Randy Williams
Dale Smythe
James Estes
Don Hiley
David Kingsland

Staff

Tim Mearig
Lori Weed
Wayne Marquis
Sharol Roys

Additional Participants

Adam Wilson, RSA Engineering
Gary Eckenweiler Bering Strait SD
Dana Menendez, Anchorage SD
Jeremy Maxie, RSA Engineering
Matt Gandel, Kodiak Island Borough
Donna Robinson

September 8, 2020

CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL at 1:30 p.m.

Chair Heidi Teshner called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. Roll call and introduction of members present; William Glumac not present. Quorum of seven was established to conduct business.

CHAIR'S OPENING REMARKS

Chair Teshner thanked everyone for joining the meeting today remarking that it's hard to believe it's already September. She noted that everyone should have received the Preventative Maintenance Handbook via e-mail last Friday, and she explained to guests that meeting materials should be available on the website for reference.

AGENDA REVIEW/APPROVAL

Dale Smythe **MOVED** to approve today's agenda, **SECONDED** by Randy Williams. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**.

PAST MEETING MINUTES REVIEW/APPROVAL – June 16, 2020

James Estes **MOVED** to approve the minutes as presented, **SECONDED** by Senator Cathy Giessel. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**, and the minutes were approved as presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT

A public comment period was offered, and no public testimony was provided.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Design Ratios

Dale Smythe noted that although some work has stalled, some has happened, and the department will be presenting a recommendation to be discussed today. Tim Mearig referred to the position paper and stated that the department wants to see if it can help advance this requirement in statute to identify design ratios aimed at cost-effective school construction, specifically amount of exterior openings to the amount of exterior wall area. He reminded the committee that last spring funding was received through the legislature to do a study of model schools using energy modeling. The results of that energy modeling analysis led to additional discussion within the

subcommittee and the presentation of the structure and content for a recommendation on how much wall and door area of a building an efficient school facility should have. The structure of the recommendation is intentional to include ratio definition and some clarification on how it is calculated so that everyone is doing it the same way. Because the statute suggests that, where necessary, regional variations be incorporated into those design ratios, a table is included that shows the four climate zones established in the AHFC Building Energy Efficiency Standards (BEES). Tim stated that this format is on the table for discussion today; they are also looking for committee assistance overall and comment from any public members regarding the specific ratios that are recommended.

Tim Mearig stated that they are proposing what they are calling a target ratio range. The department would like the target ratio to be based on the modeling analysis that shows the lowest first cost and operating cost based on the study that was done in 2019. The target would be to specify the amount of openings in any particular zone with the ability to expand out plus-or-minus 20 percent on either side of the target to allow for flexibility in the accepted target percentage.

Dale Smythe added that he appreciates Tim's efforts to assist in wrapping this up and presenting the ratio, it matches what was wanted as a goal in the end. He noted that the important aspect is the range and not just a single ratio representation, as well as the inclusion of the climate zones. The study was very complex, and there was difficulty with the dynamic situations of material and energy costs and how those things change constantly. He commented that additional work and good discussions took place related to good lighting in schools to try and identifying what schools across the state were performing well and what those ratio percentages were. Everything the subcommittee received in conjunction with the report supports what is being presented. Dale noted that he personally incorporated it into a school concept design and then checked those ratios against this, and it's not the easiest to do. There will definitely be more conversations with designers on how to measure these things and how the numbers actually come out in a design. Overall, Dale is in support of what has been presented.

Randy Williams wanted to clarify whether zones 6, 7, 8, and 9 are based on BEES, an ASHRAE definition, or perhaps is defined elsewhere. Tim explained that those zones are established in the BEES. Randy asked if the people calculating this are familiar with which zone they belong in so it doesn't become a point of contention. Tim agreed there needs to be a clear depiction of the zones. Lori Weed noted that there is a map available which breaks down the zones by the Alaska census area, which is how AHFC has broken down the regions.

Don Hiley commented that he has a little bit of heartburn about this being seemingly purely based on cost. He understands the energy efficiency differences between many windows being in a Southeast school versus half as many windows in a school on the North Slope, but he has a concern about the human factor of that. His own office has very little outside view or daylight coming in, and he wonders about the effect it's going to have on some of the educational climate of the buildings with very limited windows. He noted that they are talking about buildings with only 6 percent window in it potentially, and that seems like not very much daylight, not very much view of the outside, and people will be sitting in a box.

David Kingsland was looking at that as well. As a person who actually works in the schools in multiple winters from Sitka to Selawik, he appreciates the guidance that the building incorporate

daylight elements and window placement. He has seen a variety of windows, some good and some bad, and he noted that a view outside is a critical element for the further north and the darker it gets.

Dale Smythe stated that the subcommittee considered the concerns regarding the value of daylight in schools. It was a major discussion point, but how to quantify that was difficult. He appreciated the work of Gary Eckenweiler of Bering Strait School District in sending his school ratios as he calculated them. For an extreme northern climate such as his, those percentages came in low. Dale believes it's an example of recognizing climate and that schools in those situations already follow those, and there is a lot of good design out there already. The intent of these design ratios is to put some brackets around it and ensure they are trying to manage it.

Lori Weed added that the Design Ratio Subcommittee pulled data from existing schools. The Yukon Koyukuk district has a school in the 6 to 7 percent range, and they are enjoying the school and it seems to provide enough window to suit their purpose.

Tim Mearig referred committee members to zone 9 and stated that they are not basing it on dollars. The studies showed no lower boundary for cost savings, so in other words, if there are no openings, money will be saved. The department and subcommittee were unwilling to propose that this committee consider a windowless school environment, and as Lori noted, they looked at several examples of schools where there is good teaching and learning happening at ranges down to 4 percent.

Tim asked Dale about his use of the ratio definition and the calculation clarifications, were there were edits that should be put forward? Dale stated that there were a few questions, and he thinks there will need to be some minor edits to make it clearer.

Gary Eckweiler stated that when he looked at his schools in Bering Strait, they did have some schools under 10 percent, and they are one of the colder climates. What he noticed on those schools was that all the classrooms had adequate windows and adequate lighting, but what was lacking were glass foyers and large library windows.

Don Hiley suggested that there may need to be a little more guidance in not only a percentage of opening but something to the effect of the percentage of opening that needs to be in the teaching spaces. Dale Smyth replied that the subcommittee specifically avoided that. The intent was to give designers freedom to take the bracketed range and apply it where needed.

Tim Mearig wrapped up, stating the department would like to work with the subcommittee to come back to this committee with better support for the actual target number and the range number. Otherwise, they would like this committee to be supportive and comfortable that using this kind of definition represents a reasonable way to describe the design ratio recommendations. He stated that good comments were heard from the committee today and those will help the subcommittee and the department to guide this further.

Model School

Don Hiley referred the committee to the recommendation regarding establishing a process for reviewing the Model School. Those tasks have essentially been completed. The subcommittee and department staff recommendation is that the current update process continues wherein the

Cost Model and Model School Building Escalation file is updated by the cost consultant using their experience, with department guidance on the scoping of the contract, and committee review of the recommendations made under that contract. The contractor has traditionally been HMS.

Don then referred committee members to page 20 of their meeting packet and reported that they have had several drafts of the Model School Standard Manual. BDS Architects had been working on that as a contracted consultant. BDS participated in subcommittee meetings to discuss the drafts, and the final draft was submitted to the subcommittee in August. That draft is included in the packet. The subcommittee met on August 24th to approve the recommendations for this full committee on how to proceed.

Don discussed the draft Alaska School Design and Construction Standards manual that BDS delivered as a template in three parts: Purpose and application, design principles, and system standards. He noted that systems standards still has quite a bit to be fleshed out as there will be 11 site and facility systems established. Right now, the document has placeholders for those to be added. The parts that have been done by BDS with some subcommittee input have been exterior closure, interior, mechanical, and electrical systems. A little bit of other work has been done in foundations and bits and pieces of other things.

Essentially, the subcommittee determined three options for how to move forward. The recommended option is for the department staff to take on the role of consultant to continue working on the document to flesh out more parts. Tim Mearig and department staff felt they had the manpower and the time to do that without it being overwhelmingly burdensome. They are looking at hopefully having something for the February meeting to then put out for public comment at the normal April BR&GR meeting.

Dale Smythe asked Don if there were details on specific areas where he wanted to continue on with this. Don reiterated that there are a number of items in the systems part, part three of the document, that still need to be fleshed out. Some have been started and others are at various levels of completion; some areas aren't in there at all. Design guidance is going to need a fair amount of work. The subcommittee is hoping to recruit other professional members who will be most impacted by what is contained in the document.

Tim Mearig asked for comments from Jeremy Maxie and Adam Wilson, who were involved in this process. Adam appreciated that DEED is taking the effort to try to compile a document that will help get designers more on the same page. He believes the design community has done a really good job over the years of designing buildings that are efficient and that meet the needs of their clients; but at the same time, there's always room for improvement. Having a document that people can reference to have a starting point will be good because there are a lot of lessons learned that have tried to be incorporated into the document, as well as good technical information. He is eager to get professional and public feedback on it to help serve the community better. Jeremy Maxie concurred with Adam's comments. It was great to get the information on paper that is always swirling in their heads every time they design a school. He thanked Tim and the other subcommittee members that worked on it. The feedback and work that everyone provided was invaluable. Adam Wilson further commented that it was valuable to have people like Gary Eckenweiler look through the document and provide feedback. Ultimately that is the client they are trying to serve, and there is a lot of good lessons learned that they pulled from working with the building operators.

Tim Mearig discussed the Model School File Update paper. The recommendation is to continue the process of doing reviews of the Model School file associated with the Cost Model at this committee and also recognize the need that when the Alaska School Design Construction Standards are put together, a similar process is going to be needed. At this point it's clear that additional professional consultants will be needed to get that document updated.

Commissioning

Chair Teshner explained that this subcommittee has completed their work and will be disbanded. The members of this subcommittee will be reassigned to another subcommittee. She thanked Randy Williams, William Glumac, Wayne Marquis and the industry partners that participated in this subcommittee to complete the work that was done.

School Space

Dale Smythe reported that he intended to restart the School Space Subcommittee after the design ratio recommendations were completed. He hopes to start it in the next two months, and he hopes that the recently disbanded Commissioning Subcommittee members will roll over to School Space to help kick this off. He stated that this subcommittee has the basics of a plan and a lot of conversation has happened. Getting to the next step of doing the work is challenging.

PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE REGULATION IMPLEMENTATION

Proposed Tools and Metrics for Retro/Recommissioning

Chair Teshner stated that in order to remain eligible to request state aid for school capital projects under the statutes and regulations, DEED requires Alaska school districts to have a regular evaluation of the effectiveness of and the need for commissioning of existing buildings. This new requirement has to be applied to all school districts, not just those that are due for their five-year site visit. The department is working toward a communication to all districts, and hopes to have that out by November 1. This will provide the assessment parameters that will be used in establishing compliance by June 1, 2021.

Chair Teshner stated that the timeline is included in the briefing paper, but she noted that the public comment that was scheduled to expire on August 31 has been extended until September 20th. She stated that there are no specific recommendations for the committee, but input and participation in the department's public comment survey are encouraged.

Discussion

Gary Eckenweiler stated that option 2 with the state having a tool that could be used would be best. As a facility director, he is very busy and having a tool would streamline things and give a quicker result.

Tim Mearig stated that two significant changes happened based on the feedback of the committee after the June meeting where they discussed what age of buildings would be likely to benefit from a retro-commissioning where they're adjusting an automated building system energy system to integrate and function effectively. What grew out of that was the notion of target facilities. Tim noted that districts have been required to collect consumption data on their buildings for more than 20 years. To meet the retro-commissioning requirement would be to take the information already collected for buildings that have recent building systems, so only a

subset of district buildings would be required to show a retro-commissioning analysis. Tim stated that he would like to get feedback because even though the intent is to streamline and make it less burdensome, it does require a second step of breaking buildings into two pots: buildings that they would pay attention to retro-commissioning and those they aren't required to.

The second thing that came out of the last committee meeting was this idea of finding some way to use industry metrics to determine the effectiveness of a retro-commissioning effort. Some research that's been presented and is in the public comment phase right now has identified a rule of thumb calculation that says that if the combined planning and implementation costs (at the designated industry metrics) are less than 7 percent of the annual electric and fuel costs, then the building is a good candidate for retro-commissioning.

PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE REGULATION 4 AAC 31.013 (a)(2) REVIEW

Lake and Peninsula School District Issue

Chair Teshner stated that when the department conducted a site visit on the Lake and Peninsula School District in January 2019, the department assessed the maintenance and facilities management operations as required by statute and regulations. During that visit the department determined that the district's energy management program was not in compliance with regulations, and there were four deficiencies. After some back and forth to try to get the district provisional compliance for the 2021 CIP application cycle, the district fell short on the last item, to present monthly waste heat consumption data for each school site. In December 2019, the superintendent sent a letter to Commissioner Johnson requesting relief from having to monitor the recovered heat as a utility and offered a word change to regulation 4 AAC 31.013(a)(2). The district stated that its proposed regulation change is intended to help districts that receive no-cost, unregulated waste heat. Furthermore, the district thinks the current regulation could be interpreted a bit differently, but it feels that argument is lost, so it has proposed these changes. The Commissioner responded to the district's letter and referred the district's request for regulation change to this committee for consideration and review.

Chair Teshner stated that the department's guidelines have not factored cost tracking into an energy management baseline, only consumption tracking. Under this approach, it was determined that even no-cost utilities needed to be tracked in order to provide baseline data for use in a district's energy management program. She further reported that FY 2021 will complete a full five-year cycle of inspections that include the application of recovered heat assessments; and by May of 2021, all 53 school districts will have been assessed through this matrix. To date, there are six districts that have had direct impact from the recovered heat assessment, including Bristol Bay, Chatham, Galena, Hoonah, Lake and Peninsula, and Yakutat. All but Lake and Peninsula have been able to implement a plan to correct the deficiency and receive provisional certification while working on the implementation of their plans.

Chair Teshner stated that the department has discovered that the lowest cost investment is approximately \$5,000 per site for a strap-on monitor solution; although, it could be up to \$15,000 if that included more accurate inline meters with automated reporting and conversion. Lake and Peninsula specifically has a plan showing that, of their nine recovered heat sites, three currently have measurement capability, three have current projects in which the capability could be added, two are interested but have no immediate plans, and one had no capability or plan but is a currently closed school. The district is saying it's going to cost approximately \$25,000 a year for

just one site to be able to provide the data that the department is asking for, and it could add additional costs and ultimately hurt the village's cooling capacity for their generators.

Chair Teshner directed the committee to the three options for consideration and opened the issue up for discussion.

Discussion

Dale Smythe posed to Wayne Marquis, Randy Williams, or any other member who may have the answer, the notion he had that monitoring heat recovery has always been difficult and fairly inaccurate. He also asked if all other districts have been able to do this, and if this issue has really been brought up by one specific district with this one problem with the tracking.

Chair Teshner stated that this is the only district that has been brought to her attention that they cannot meet this requirement. Wayne Marquis agreed that Dale is correct in that strap-on meters are not entirely accurate. He was in touch with the Alaska Energy Authority at the beginning of the implementation of this requirement, and discovered that the better meters are more expensive at \$15,000 to \$25,000. He stated that the department realized that this would not be a viable alternative for schools, so they studied the strap-on meters that are between \$1,500 and \$3,000 but are nowhere near as accurate as inline meters.

Randy Williams concurred that the strap-on solutions are less accurate than inline or other more expensive options. He stated that he isn't sure he fully understands what the value of tracking this information is. He understands that it is tracked in order to provide baseline data for use in a district's energy management program. As an engineer he would love to have that information, but he is unsure how that is applicable to what the department is trying to get out of this. Wayne Marquis explained that it was their interpretation of the regulation. An outside agency asked a few years ago what the department was doing with this data, and Wayne explained that the data isn't for the department but rather it's part of the regulations to make sure districts at least collect it and determine which facilities are operating optimally.

Tim Mearig shared an example in the Bristol Bay Borough with a waste heat loop coming from the power plant. Over time, the temperature differentials and the ability for it to provide energy to the school had changed, and no one at the plant facility and maintenance operations knew what was happening and when it was time to burn more fuel or why they were burning more fuel. They had no way of measuring it, and it left a gap in the understanding of their energy portfolio. As a result, they had to make both capital and operational decisions about how to operate their system in order to compensate, but there was no real understanding of why or how much it took.

Gary Eckenweiler stated that tracking this waste heat is hugely important. A couple scenarios that could take place are issues from the electric utility plants and heat exchangers and a whole myriad of things that fail over time. Knowing this data allows people to prepare and have enough fuel on hand if the waste heat goes completely down for a year. Things break and freeze up, and it's slow to get fixed in rural Alaska. He stated that it was also important in a recent dealing with a utility provider where the district felt it was being charged incorrectly for waste heat. They need to know how many BTUs are pulling into the school and be pretty accurate in order to have a discussion about how they're being billed and if they feel they are getting a good or a bad price.

Wayne Marquis shared a story from a visit to Yakutat School District last winter. There was plenty of waste heat available, and the schools were relying entirely on the waste heat plant from across the street. Eventually that power plant was upgraded, with a higher efficiency engine that provided less heat, and the three facilities being served by that plant were getting cooler and cooler. At his most recent visit to the school district this past winter, Wayne found out the plant is tying in a new police station/fire department. People were wearing jackets in the schools now because people hadn't been paying close attention. It would be useful to know how many BTUs were needed to heat the facilities without the risk of anything freezing.

Randy Williams asked, of the districts that have implemented these, are they perhaps districts that don't have much in the way of waste heat recovery, have they been able to find a better way to do it cost effectively, or is there some structural difference in the way that they are using waste heat that Lake and Peninsula is unable to do? Wayne Marquis stated that converting from oil to waste heat is a salvation for many schools, but even though it's free, the regulation stipulates that it's the consumption that is measured, not necessarily the cost. Sometimes it's disconcerting to a district to invest money to measure a free utility. Another argument Wayne hears is that the district is afraid that if it talks to the utility company, the utility company will want to know the measurement and will start charging. Wayne lets the district know that it doesn't have to do that and that it's acceptable to put a strap-on monitor on the facility's side of the system. Wayne also points out that the department doesn't care about exact precision, but the district will be able to compare and look at their aging facilities and use the tracked waste heat recovery data to determine if it's time for a retro-commissioning project. Randy agreed that without that data, the need for retro-commissioning cannot be determined. Randy supports continuing the way the regulation is being interpreted.

Senator Cathy Giessel commented that there is also a political side to this. She is unsure if the regulation is a result of a bill that was passed, but she knows that they in the legislature have talked extensively about how to reduce the cost of energy in rural Alaska, not just for the communities, but for the schools for which they pay. With the budget issues Alaska will have going forward, she knows there will be ongoing questions about what methodology schools are using to measure how much energy they're using and where the savings potential is. This is important data from the political perspective as well.

Tim Mearig stated that Lake and Peninsula's schools have relatively small enrollments, and it is more challenging for that district to make the investment in those nine facilities than it might be for a single-site district. Randy Williams suggested that maybe there is a much lower cost option that could be proposed for Lake and Peninsula and any other similar districts that have a cost prohibition on this. Wayne stated that the cheaper option is the \$1,500 to \$3,000 option. He stated that some districts had the maintenance person install it themselves. It's very simple. Jim Estes stated that Mat-Su recently partnered with Alaska Housing Finance Corporation, and they had grant money to help with building monitoring. He stated that it allowed them to get better real-time monitoring of different utilities. It could be a resource Lake and Peninsula might look into that could lower costs to allow the district to come into compliance. Jim volunteered to reach out to the district and AHFC to facilitate coming to a solution.

Don Hiley stated that once again, this is a nice idea sitting on somebody's desk, but it's not a really nice idea when they take it out to the real users. He works directly with a number of the

districts listed in this document, and none of them were very happy about having to incur the costs associated with this. He stated that this is an expensive process, and some of the districts are having problems with installed meters. Don asked if they are doing this because the underlying reason is to save operational costs, and if those issues can't be fixed, why are they doing this? This strikes him as a one-size-fits-all issue. He stated that if a district has a reason to need it, it's economical for them, it makes sense, and it pays back, a district has the incentive to do it whether or not the department requires it. For years this wasn't an issue, and then suddenly, it's become an issue that sounds like more of a bureaucratic issue than it does a boots-on-the-ground issue. Right now, districts have other things to be spending money on besides buying expensive meters; it really isn't going to help them out or save any money. It's just meeting a requirement that somebody has imposed on them and not given them any money to implement; they have to spend up-front capital and installation costs. Districts are also implementing these requirements to monitor all this stuff. Now it feeds into a retro-commissioning deal, which Don is fine with, but worries it costs money to do that. He feels they are taking one step, compounding it with two steps, and now they are requiring districts to go determine if they need retro-commissioning and presumably go get retro-commissioning, but there's still no money to go fix whatever is found with the retro-commissioning.

Don Hiley continued on to state that he has talked to several people this summer, one who is absolutely convinced that instead of having a fixed cost, the district is going to have to start paying more. So, what did it serve that district to go put meters on and then their utility costs get jacked up because they know how much the facilities are actually getting in waste heat? He feels like the point has been missed here. They are worried about a regulation that's been imposed and an interpretation of a regulation that's been imposed, and they have lost sight of the people that it's being imposed upon. A lot of these are very small districts that have very little maintenance resources, and the COVID pandemic has amplified that. He feels that he needs to speak up and say something, because a lot of these districts don't have the time and the resources to attend these meetings all the time. He assured the committee that very few people in the maintenance departments are paying attention to public comment.

Chair Teshner stated that perhaps she needs to meet with Tim and Wayne to look at doing something at the department level to look a little bit further into finding other resources to try to help address this situation for districts.

PUBLICATION UPDATES

Cost Format

Chair Teshner stated that the committee saw a draft of the *Cost Format* publication in June of 2020 for feedback prior to public comments. Public comment received during the July 17 through August 11 public comment period is in the packet. The latest draft of the 2020 edition is included in the packet. The department is asking the committee to acknowledge the updated version and to finalize it for publication.

Senator Cathy Giessel **MOVED** that the committee approve the 2020 cost document, **SECONDED** by David Kingsland. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**. The department will finalize the document and put it into final format for publication on the web.

Alaska School Facilities Preventative Maintenance Handbook

Chair Teshner directed members of the committee to the *Preventative Maintenance Handbook*, which was e-mailed to committee members on Friday. Sharol Roys stated that the effort for this draft was to align the handbook's Appendix A component list with the Level 4 Cost Format DEED system structures. She stated that they are looking to assess the remaining effort to complete the publication and adjust the BR&GR Committee work plan accordingly. This draft was done in June, and it requires considerable additional development; a summary of work remaining is in the packet. Lori Weed stated that staff would welcome any committee members' comments or ideas they would like to contribute to the handbook. If committee members have any particular section they are interested in, the department would appreciate any forward momentum, because this has been a large project that has taken a lot longer than they had originally hoped.

ASHRAE 90.1 – 2016 UPDATE

Chair Teshner directed stated that the State Board of Education opened a period of public comment on the ASHRAE 90.1 2016 Ed. change to regulation 4 AAC 31.014 at their July meeting. That public comment period closed on August 25th. The department received one comment that is shown in the packet. The State Board of Education will review this again with a motion to adopt the regulation change during their next quarterly meeting on Thursday, September 17. Although written public comment is over, there is still an opportunity for public comment at the start of the State Board of Education meeting on Wednesday, September 16 at 8:30 a.m. if anyone is interested in offering public comment.

WORK PLAN REVIEW

Chair Teshner directed committee members to review the work plan. She noted the next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 2 and will also be a teleconference. Committee members should feel free to contact staff if they see anything in the work plan that needs to be adjusted or added, particularly as it relates to the work of the subcommittees.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Committee members each took an opportunity to thank the other members of the group and staff for their continued participation and hard work. Randy Williams volunteered to participate on another subcommittee where his expertise is appropriate to help out.

Chair Teshner thanked members and department staff for their participation in today's meeting. She acknowledged the volunteers from around the state that assisted the department with the August 18th Summer Summit, which was a webinar on facilities-related protocols for schools reopening. It was a very informative presentation, and she thanked everyone for their help.

In closing she wished everyone luck as they continue with the start of the new school year and any unknowns they have coming forward. She hopes everyone stays healthy and safe.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Senator Cathy Giessel **MOVED** to adjourn, **SECONDED** by Dale Smythe. Hearing no objection, the motion **PASSED**, and the meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.