



# DRAFT Meeting Minutes

*Special meeting of the*  
**School Building Projects Advisory Council**  
**School Safety Infrastructure Criteria Subcommittee**

October 31, 2022 at 11:00 am  
Held via Microsoft Teams

**Meeting Video:**

[https://ctvideo.ct.gov/das/SBPAC\\_School\\_Safety\\_Infrastructure\\_subcommittee\\_meeting-20221031\\_111612-Meeting\\_Recording.mp4](https://ctvideo.ct.gov/das/SBPAC_School_Safety_Infrastructure_subcommittee_meeting-20221031_111612-Meeting_Recording.mp4)

Members present:

First	Last
Noel	Petra
Paul	Hinsch
Don	Poulin
Lance	Hall
Julia	McFadden

Departmental representatives and staff present:

- Douglas Rogers, Director of the Office of School Construction Grants and Review
- William Turley, DESPP
- Robert Celmer, DAS OSCGR
- John McKay, DAS
- Timothy O'Brien, DAS.

1. Called to order by Deputy Commissioner Petra at 11:15 am.
2. Deputy Commissioner Petra gave opening remarks, including introducing Douglas Rogers, the new Director of the Office of School Construction Grants and Review, and discussing the charge of SBPAC to review and revise School Safety Infrastructure Criteria, as needed.
3. Members of the SBPAC subcommittee and subject matter expert staff introduced themselves.
4. Discussion (facilitated by Deputy Commissioner Petra) on review of the current School Safety Infrastructure Criteria, provided for under Connecticut General Statutes Section 10-292r, which was established in Appendix A of the *Report of the School Safety Infrastructure Council*.
  - a. Discussion (McFadden) that the language in the Criteria is not standard in security industry, that the intent is not clear. Example includes regarding entrances being ballistic and blast resistant having no definable level of resistance. A consultant had said blast resistance is perhaps beyond threat need for schools, and that there are eight levels of ballistic rating, and it is not clear what level is required. Also, that there are repetitive items.



## DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

---

- b. Discussion (McFadden, Petra) regarding need to evaluate operable windows as part of the Criteria.
- c. Discussion (Celmer) regarding recreational areas. Criteria not being clear on fencing, as well as eligibility for reimbursement, including fence height, etc.
- d. Discussion (McFadden): Criteria should not just be built around the worst-case scenario, but also include other safety and security concerns. Key areas should include sight lines and good maintenance of school site boundaries and natural and video surveillance. Fencing around playgrounds is needed to prevent little kids from running off or children from being abducted. But very tall fences may provide a false sense of security in absence of other procedures. Height at 4-5 ft has been used. Consider strobe light to warn children of danger.
- e. Discussion (Petra) regarding the Criteria to maintain safety without making schools like prisons.
- f. Discussion (Turley, Petra) regarding outside lighting as warning systems, etc., and in noisy rooms like cafeterias, and staff outside having radios to communicate with main office.
- g. Discussion, (Turley, Petra, Rogers, McFadden, Hall) on the technology of integrated alarm and warning systems. Need to keep technology up to date. How to respond based on response from alarms – real fire vs. shooter pulling alarm. Possibility and challenges of cameras monitoring who pulled an alarm. Many systems sending direct alarm to fire departments. Possible grants for updated alarm and warning systems and standards in new construction.
- h. Discussion (Hall) on possibilities such as using phones in classrooms to send messages to teachers in cases of lockdowns, etc.
- i. Discussion (McFadden) about reviewing real world examples of applying school safety planning – offering Sandy Hook – walking through what was done and why. Things may have changed, since then, too.
- a. Discussion (Petra) on including insights from State Building Inspector Omarys Vasquez and others in the review and changes to the Criteria.
- b. Petra directed staff to post an editable copy of the current Criteria in an online document for members and assigned subject matter experts to propose edits and offer comments.

5. Adjourned at 11:50 am.