



"Cloud" services and security requirements defined by governmental mandates. (no simple singular solution at this time)...

6. Committee shared objectives and goals – to identify and encourage joint venture, common efforts where each team may leverage available resources. Example – Service Desk, network, Enterprise applications, Data management (DBA, SQL).
7. Town technology is fundamentally a Microsoft shop (office 365); NPS is a Google shop. Licensing and fees are vastly separate, and laws exist to stop one entity from taking advantage of favorable pricing offered by either entity.
8. Town follows "Roles Based Access Compliance" (RBAC); which means an individual can only perform a specific role granted by administration... This is required by Federal mandates. NPS does not follow RBAC guidelines, but has implemented protective software to identify ransomware, phishing, and other viral invasions. NPS end users (teachers, staff, students) have greater latitude to install, implement software. Town does not. Not difficult for NPS to implement RBAC discipline; but incremental cost/support would be required... (Not in current budget model)
9. State and Federal guidelines clearly require the separation of licensing between Education and Government entities (Police, Law Enforcement, Data Management). Both departments can address nuances associated with data management, but procurement and pricing is different dependent upon actual end user (Student, Educator, Law Enforcement or Town Employee). No initial savings available; but the technology directors would evaluate any future procurement decisions are rendered.
10. Who will be in charge of the combined department -- Town Manager? Need to work out. Current model has two different bosses.
11. S. Silvia noted he has no issue with allocating all infrastructure support to the Town. Applications can be allocated on Enterprise (Town); and NPS (Education). Common help desk, service request system can be leveraged. Evaluation of all existing software and access can be performed. Licensing can be adjusted to reflect evaluation and utilization.
12. Participants agreed, no reduction in existing work force; roles and responsibilities could change to meet future organizational model.

#### **Conclusions:**

- At the moment, recommendations support the implementation of fiber optic network infrastructure which allows respective technology departments to leverage.
- Generate new policies to be approved by Town and BOE to define how the technology departments will operate (who is the boss making the strategic decisions?) Today, technology has two separate bosses...
- Infrastructure acquisition can be staged over time with dual recommendations from NPS or Town technology directors... The fiber optic network is the core foundational requirement to serve future Councils or BOE boards as they migrate towards a shared service.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Agenda item: Facilities	Presenter:	D. Vida. L. Jachimowicz

**Discussion:**

1. D. Vida distributed handout to participants to outline high level deliverables, philosophies and data streams maintained by Custodial and Maintenance Services.
2. Discuss philosophy and mission statement of school facilities operation.
3. Shared staffing breakdowns by facility; adding maintenance people = total of 43 people. One of the FTE's is assigned as a Café driver supporting food services.
4. Café Driver is a NPS subsidy to food services supporting central food preparation. Would need to realign budget allocations to accurately capture café driver expenses under the food service budget should future consolidation of departments occur.
5. On average each custodian oversees 21,000 sf... total SF = 792,813 for all seven schools. Actual roles/responsibilities of the 43 staff was not available for discussion. (editor's note – autonomy of each lead custodian to assign/allocate resources as necessary creates TEAM approach at each school). School is evaluated by NPS staff; feedback given directly to D. Vida. NPS facilities team is always on call (actually occurred during meeting with D. Vida's communication device in action)
6. Review of Local, State and Federal mandates for ADA compliance, chemical handling, training and compliance with Hazmat, Spill prevention and Laboratory Safety policies. Asbestos Containment Material (ACM) training, CIRMA Training (safety, slips, falls, lifting, Blood borne Pathogens); OSHA Work and Safety Practices. Training performed on annual basis. Inclusive of Town personnel and neighboring towns.
7. Maintenance Work Ticket Requests (400-600) per year... lots of additional requests received via email, phone calls or in-person – Not tracked via Work request system. D. Vida noted that NPS management does not track every request. Insufficient data exists to evaluate work force/requests or skill sets required. No analytics of the existing work request system performed to evaluate type of work, who is submitting work requests; duration of work requests (effort, time, money) ... Primarily a tracking tool at this time.
8. D. Vida establishes expectations with each custodian. How they achieve the objective is not dictated; thus, each school facility has a different "heart-beat" aligned with local NPS administration. Students and staff are their customers for each custodial team.
9. Custodial meets with School administration daily to review calendar events and discuss open work request items in progress or completed.
10. Shared work 95/5% for custodial; Maintenance is 40/60%. Most custodial work is handled in house with the exception of specialty cleaning (ServPro if water damage or similar issues

arise) ... Repair of Pools was performed by outside services as was the addition of safety balusters at Ruth Chaffee...

11. Majority of Maintenance work performed during summer months, leveraging the PSCIP fund (\$1.2 million limit by town ordinance).
12. BOE gets some support from the town's engineering department for sidewalks or building consulting. All CIP work is outsourced. Competitive bidding was not discussed.
13. No role or responsibilities documentation was shared or discussed.
14. Work request system is used for large efforts, not to track small requests from the end users. Post work entry into system is not required by NPS.

**Conclusions:**

- Share vision and strategic objectives with D. Vida and L. Jachimowicz; acquire input/suggestions. Garner their respective inputs.
- Committee asked T. Lane to acquire similar metrics as presented by D. Vida – specifically, FTE per facility aligned with custodial and maintenance. Understanding of Work Requests submitted by town.
- All participants remain open to further discussion on how the town/BOE may work collaboratively to find additional opportunities to share services.

Meeting concluded at 6:37 pm

---

**Agenda item:** Next Meeting

**Presenter:** Group

**Discussion:**

Next scheduled meeting – September 26<sup>th</sup>, 5 pm

*The contents and minutes shared above represent the interpretations and understandings of the scribe, Steven Silvia. Should anyone desire to modify or correct the understandings noted above, please contact Steven Silvia.*