

School Facility Utilization Task Force

7:00PM on Wednesday, April 22, 2026

Ann Antolini School - Library

All appointed members of the School Faculty Utilization Task Force were in attendance:

Mary Beth Greenwood (Board of Selectman), **Kerry Guilfoyle** (Board of Finance)-*VIRTUALLY*, **Alesia Kennerson** (Board of Selectman), **Eleanor Penny” Miller** (Board of Education)-*VIRTUALLY*, **Carmen Neale** (Community Member), **Jon Puz** (Board of Education), **Samantha Wald** (Community Member), **Bernard Ben” Witte** (Board of Finance), **Kristin Young** (SFU-TF Chair / Board of Education) and Michelle Miller (Project Manager SP+A).

Kristin Young, the School Facility Utilization Task Force Chair called the meeting to order at 7:03PM

A. Approval of Agenda

MOTION by Mary Beth Greenwood to approve the agenda. Second by Jon Puz.

UNANIMOUS

B. Communications to the School Facility Utilization Task Force

Theresa Campanelli – “Building Use” (April 9, 2026)

C. School Facility Utilization Task Force Chair s Report

Ms. Young reminded everyone of the “Public Informational Meetings” to be held at the Town Hall - Senior Center, which will be Q&A style.

- Saturday May 2, 2026 at 1:00PM
- Tuesday May 19, 2026 at 5:30PM

D. Routine Business

a. Approval of Minutes - April 8, 2026

MOTION by Mary Beth Greenwood to approve the April 8, 2026 meeting minutes. Second by Jon Puz.

UNANIMOUS

b. Timeline Check In

The process is meeting expectations, they are nearing the end of the research phase. The process is to begin investigating options based of the research so far.

E. New Business

a. [Silver Petrucelli & Associates delivers Site Analysis and Preliminary Options](#)

Michelle Miller provided several options with project costs, reimbursement rates, anticipated reimbursements and anticipated town shares. Please see the presentation provided by SP+A for exact numbers.

Before proposing solutions, the physical characteristics of each site must be determined to understand what directly influences: safety, functionality, and long-term flexibility. There are challenges in some way at all three schools, although most concerned about New Hartford Elementary and Bakerville School, those challenges will need to be evaluated further. There are opportunities and constraints that are really important because it's going to impact: *student arrival, circulation, security*, and will determine what can be done to these buildings.

Michelle Miller went through the three schools, the problems with each site: Bakerville, New Hartford Elementary and Antolini, the size of the site, what each individual lacks, focusing in on where utilities are, vehicular circulation, pedestrian, playgrounds and open space. If the school population is increased, the parking will need to be increased. Connecticut School Construction Standards and Guidelines state that an elementary school should be at a site about 10 acres, plus one acre per every hundred students. Two current sites are under that size.

Previously Michelle Miller gave numbers based off of gross square feet, which has been changed to net square feet (removing the exterior walls from the formula). The State is going to calculate square footage based on the net square feet, measuring the inside, “what you are actually using in the building”. She also clarified the reason new construction was being explored. Michelle explained that she has to provide both, a renovate as new and new construction to make sure renovate as new is the most cost-effective solution compared to a new construction. The options provided are high level and not fully vetted at this time. That will be the next step.

Option A: “Maintain Existing”, three schools as they are, taking the buildings down to the walls, keeping the structure, but building the infrastructure with all new materials, reconfiguring spaces, put up new walls to separate shared rooms. Major improvements within the facility itself. The demolish and rebuild could be roughly the same price as maintaining existing because costs to the town depends on the reimbursement rate. There are four options within A: A1, A2, A3 and A4. For example, in A1, the reimbursement rate is not on every single item, not all of them are eligible for reimbursement, only some, therefore, the reimbursement rate is much smaller. Depending on the options the numbers changed greatly. At Bakerville School the modulares need to be removed because they can't be certified for 20 years. Part of any renovate as new or big project, the Town needs to certify the project is going to last for 20 years. Bakerville does not have public water or sprinklers. A1 does not account for portables at Bakerville that need to be demolished.

Option A (Anticipated Town Share Rough Numbers) = A1: 29 million, A2: 58 million, A3: 73 million and A4: 78 million

Option B: Combine PreK through second grade into one school at an existing site. For example, what happens when that moves to New Hartford Elementary (B1) and what happens when that moves to Bakerville School (B2). There will be 208 students at the location. New Hartford

Elementary is located in a flood plain zone, there is not much room for expansion, but there is public water.

Option B (Anticipated Town Share Rough Numbers) = B1 (NHE): 16 million (32,921 SF) and 36 million (52,830 SF). B2 (BS): 16 million (31,603 SF) and 37 million (52,830 SF).

Option C: Combine PreK through second grade into one school, a new construction (*“new/theoretical site”*). There are different reimbursement rates for new construction. There is potentially the option to explore adding a school up at Antolini School. A campus setting is a great attribute to have for a school system. There is importance to compare C and B together. School Cost Comparison between B & C: 208 students at BS the anticipate town share is 37 million, 208 students at NHE the anticipated cost share is 35 million and 208 students at a new school the anticipated town share is 43 million. The costs are not as far off as you’d think.

Option C (Anticipated Town Share Rough Numbers) = (New School) C1.1: 18 million and C1.2: 43 million

Option D: One district-wide elementary school at Ann Antolini School, (PK-6), at 449 students. An additional 21,750 SF would need to be added on. The anticipated project cost all together would be 71 million. That would include renovating the existing building, reconfiguring and adding on to the school. The reimbursement rate of 37.99% means the anticipated town share would be 44 million. This also does incorporate Central Office; the entire school system would be all together. The existing is 58,177, and the addition would be 21,750. Additionally, a life skills room would only be at Antolini. One room could hold eight students (life skills). There has been work on a survey for Antolini, there is actually 97 acres total, roughly 20 acres is for the school site and the rest are deemed Antolini Woods (as a park). There is a slight anticipated concern of having the full student population in one building. Potentially future renovations could structure the school where there would not be overlap amongst those student populations. Some might be concerned about having all grades using the same bathrooms.

Option D (Anticipated Town Share Rough Numbers) = (District-Wide at Antolini): D: 44 million

Option E: two schools: New Hartford Elementary (PK-1) and Antolini (2-6) = E1, Bakerville (PK-1) and Antolini (2-6) = E2

There would be 149 at New Hartford Elementary or Bakerville (PK-1) and 300 students at Antolini (2-6). These are renovating as new options. There is better reimbursement with 50 more kids in the building. There is not an existing school in Connecticut that is 2 to 6, there are many schools PK-6.

E1: is two schools, NHE and Antolini: 43 million (1.1) or 52 million (1.2) with additions to improve programs

E2: is two schools, Bakerville and Antolini: 46 million (2.1) or 57 million (2.2) with additions to improve programs

Ms. Young was clear to state there is no commitment by the SFU-TF coming out of this study regarding the repurposing of any buildings. For example, if NHE is eliminated, the SFU-TF cannot say what would happen with the building.

The task force members had discussion including: adjusting options, removing some options, investigating further some options for the next meeting. There was consensus to include demolishing the portables at Bakerville in A1, and not have Michelle explore A3 and A4 any further. Also to create an A5 which takes Bakerville (A2) & combined NHE and Antolini (A1) into another option.

The next steps for Michelle Miller are: site test fits, phase & occupancy, cost & schedule refinement and narrow to viable options. The goal is to dig deeper into these options to see if they are even viable.

F. Public Comment - (For Task Force Business Only)

Shelley Lloyd – 29 Pioneer Drive

Ms. Lloyd gave her thoughts in regards to separating primary kids from upper grade kids within the same school, travel between schools versus staying in one location, civil engineering - the need to know more about the structures.

Katherine Wilder – 415 Stub Hollow Road

Ms. Wilder inquired about the site size of Antolini, are these given by Michelle at today's cost, and who is in charge of build maintenance?

Zachary Johnson - 182 Gillette Road

Mr. Johnson expressed inquiry on consolidation without spending millions of dollars? Is consolidating really going to save anybody money? Is this even feasible? A survey shouldn't be sent to the public until the SFU-TF determines what's feasible.

Taylor Johnson - 182 Gillette Road

Ms. Johnson asked if consideration to traffic with consolidating to Ann Antolini would be a problem for the Fire Department? Is there an idea how much each option would cost per taxpayer?

Daniel Jerram - 535 Town Hill Road

Mr. Jerram stated region 7 is working on a project. He advocated being stuck on NHE versus Bakerville. The reimbursement rate goes up the more students there are in the building. He noted all three schools have challenges and ledge is more expensive.

Karen Nelson - 57 Stedman Road

Ms. Nelson commended the members of the SFU-TF for their time volunteering. She also asked they keep in mind a multi-generational population is important for New Hartford. She wants to see the tax rate attract young people that will stay in New Hartford but also allow for those who have been in New Hartford for a long time, to afford to stay in New Hartford.

Discussion was had about tax increases, bonding, interest rates, and more. Ms. Guilfoyle also included obtaining information from the Town Treasurer as the bond rating does affect the interest rate.

MOTION by Kristin Young to form a subcommittee to study and analyze the relative tax burden per household as a part of this study and further to have this subcommittee include: *Jon Puz, Ben Witte and Kerry Guilfoyle*. Second by Alesia Kennerson.

UNANIMOUS

G. Old Business

a. Update from Stakeholder Engagement Subcommittee

Samantha Wald reported that the members have reached out to the Town and Board of Education - Central Office to inquire about anticipated survey responses. The Superintendents survey usually receives 125-144 responses. The Referendum usually ranges from 305-602 voters, with an average of 384 attendees (with the exception of water and sewer), where there was a response rate of 400 voters. Ms. Greenwood spoke to Frank Rodenberg (a Board of Education member and teacher at region 7) about students volunteering for data entry. Ms. Greenwood also expressed because of the cost of doing a mailer, that this step be prioritized towards the end, potentially before a referendum.

H. Action steps for next meeting w/ date, location and time

- a. Public Informational Meeting - May 2, 2026 (Saturday) at 1:00PM at Senior Center at Town Hall
- b. Regular Meeting - May 13, 2026 at 7:00PM at Ann Antolini School Library
- c. Public Informational Meeting - May 19, 2026 (Tuesday) at 5:30PM at Senior Center at Town Hall

I. Adjournment

MOTION by Ben Witte to adjourn the meeting at 9:28PM. Second by Jon Puz.

UNANIMOUS

Respectfully submitted by,

Elizabeth Domas, Recording Secretary

Attachments:

Theresa Campanelli – “Building Use” (April 9, 2026)

School Facility Utilization Study – Site & Preliminary Options