

**CRANSTON SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING**

**WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2005**

**WILLIAM A. BRIGGS BUILDING**

**845 PARK AVENUE**

**PUBLIC WORK SESSION: 7:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**A public work session of the Cranston School Committee was held on the evening of the above date in the William A. Briggs Building Reed Conference Room with the following members present: Mrs. Greifer, Ms. Iannazzi, Mr. Lupino, Mr. Stycos and Mr. Traficante. Absent were Mr. Archetto and Mr. Palumbo. Also attending were Mrs. Ciarlo, Mr. Scherza, Mr. Balducci, and Mr. Zisseron. In addition, Mr. Charles Fasnacht representing Energy Education, Inc.; Mr. John Johnson, representing Conn Edison; and Mr. Angel Tavares and Ms. Faye Sanders of the law firm of Brown Rudnick representing Siemens Corporation, were also present.**

**The work session was called to order at 7:10 p.m.**

**I. Energy Conservation**

**Mr. Lupino stated that this work session was the third in a series of many meetings the committee has had over the past 2-1/2 years to try**

to get to a point where they could delve into energy management on the school buildings. They hoped to realize some energy savings in the process. He added that Mr. John Johnson representing Conn Edison was the third person to come forward. Part of that came about from Conn Edison being on the state bid which is somewhat related to what the committee is looking for.

Mr. Johnson asked for background information on the School Committee's selection process. In response, Mr. Lupino indicated that this all came about from a program that he was interested in that was successful in Warwick where they hired an energy manager and educated the staff; they realized some energy savings, and as a result of those energy savings, was able to put some things back into the infrastructure of the schools such as retrofitting, etc. The district has been looking at it for well over eight years. The committee was sidetracked the last couple of years due to budget constraints, law suits, and other matters. The committee has had some presentations made to them. They sent out an RFP, and one company responded. The company was ready to make an award at that point in time, and then another group came forward and said that they didn't like the way it was advertised. They wished to put forward what they wished to present to the committee. That group came forward and made their presentation. A suggestion was then made that because the State of Rhode Island had looked into a similar program that the committee would invite the other players in that group. Conn Edison was the only company that responded from that group.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Lupino if the committee was talking with the other companies they were looking at. Mr. Lupino commented that EEI, Energy Education, Inc. and Siemens are the other companies. Mr. Traficante commented that he was informed that the four companies that were selected by the State were assigned different regions. Conn Edison was assigned to this particular region. Mr. Johnson responded that Conn Edison was one of four ESCO's that were selected from the State. ESCO is an energy service company. The State put out a process of selection, and there were four energy service companies selected, and Conn Edison was one of them. Siemens, Chevron Texaco, and Murasco were the other three for the energy service companies. The State took all of the different larger users similar to the size of Cranston and split them up among the four service companies. Conn Edison was provided the Cranston school district as one of their selected companies that they could work with. They were given sole right to go after Cranston. It is not in an official contractual way, but there was a gentlemen's agreement that they would have Cranston as one of their organizations they could work with. Mr. Lupino asked who the gentlemen's agreement was with, and Mr. Johnson said that it was done by the State of Rhode Island. Mr. Johnson indicated that the documentation to this effect was signed by Tim Howath at the Governor's Energy Office. Conn Edison was not to go after the other ESCO agencies, and they

were really not supposed to go after their selection agencies. It is not hard and fast, and the district can hire whomever they want.

Mr. Johnson asked the committee what their anticipated selection process was going to be. Mr. Lupino responded that it would be open for discussion with the School Committee. He added that this was a work session, and no vote could be taken. The discussion would be followed up with a resolution at another meeting at which time the committee would vote on a company that they feel would best mirror what the committee wants to accomplish. Mr. Johnson asked for some ideas as to what they might be. Mr. Lupino indicated that the district has no money for retrofitting. The intent of the original committee that put this together, and he added that he was speaking for himself, that they would take a portion of the realized savings and earmark those dollars for retrofitting whenever recommended. If the company thought they should buy windows, they would not buy windows for a building. That is primary to how he feels, and he was on the original committee that started this process. Ms. Iannazzi commented that Mr. Lupino should speak for himself. Mr. Lupino further commented that some of the companies have given the committee hard-fast figures because they have an experience in this area; some have not.

Mrs. Ciarlo commented that in the beginning the district was looking for energy savings, and the first approach was one that spoke of emphasizing education and changing the behavior of people before

going into retrofitting. As time went on and other people presented, it became clear that some members of the committee and members of the administration wanted to see both proposals that allowed for educational change to

Page 3      October 12, 2005

take place but also at the same time would provide opportunities. The district had begun retrofitting the lighting system with Narragansett Electric, but they had to stop it because they ran out of money. The district is now looking for something middle of the road, someone who is able to do both of them for the district. Mr. Traficante stated that regardless of what the district can or cannot afford at one point in time, he told Mr. Johnson that the committee wants to hear his entire package.

Mr. Johnson apologized because he did not come to this work session intending to give the committee numbers. He was not sure if the district was looking for someone who would, at their own cost, generate numbers for comparison, or that this was a qualification meeting. He was under the impression that it was a qualification meeting. The next step might be to do some numbers. Mr. Lupino responded that the other companies came forward with numbers. He didn't know why Conn Edison wouldn't come forward with numbers to this presentation indicating what they could do for this district. He

asked Mr. Johnson to present what he had. Mr. Johnson asked if the committee could delay the presentation so that his company could come back with the numbers. Mr. Lupino responded that the committee had delayed this a few years already. At the prompting of a potential law suit, the committee entertained another company, and then at the suggestion of the Governor's office, the committee is entertaining Conn Edison. Mr. Johnson stated that he could come back to the committee in a week or two with numbers that were meaningful. Mr. Lupino stated that the committee is in the midst of negotiations and other matters. He didn't know if he could provide another meeting time to Mr. Johnson and asked him to provide the documents and the numbers. If the committee decided that they would like him to come back after seeing the hard numbers, then it would be done. Ms. Iannazzi stated that if Conn Edison were allowed to come back the process would have to be opened again to EEI and Seimens.

Mr. Johnson asked if there was an RFP that was behind this meeting, and Mr. Lupino responded that there was. Mr. Stycos suggested that the RFP be given to Mr. Johnson and also the other two bids that came in. Mr. Lupino stated that EEI responded to the RFP, and no one else responded. In typical RFP fashion, other people presenting do not necessarily get to look at each others RFP's. Mrs. Greifer commented that it was not fair to see the others. Mr. Lupino did see EEI's because of the scenario that happened. It would be similar to someone bidding on the Cranston East project. If you show me

yours, I will show you mine to come up with a figure. Mr. Stycos stated that he made the remark because Siemens had the benefit of looking at the EEI proposal. He would like to see Conn Edison treated in the same way that everyone else is treated. If Siemens had access to the EEI bid, then Conn Edison should have access to the two of them. He further commented that the committee's interest should be getting the best deal possible. Ms. Iannazzi suggested calling Mr. Piccirilli in the morning and then getting the information to Conn Edison tomorrow. Mr. Lupino stated that if one were bidding on hardware, that company wouldn't have the right to see someone else's bid.

Page 4      October 12, 2005

In this situation, this occurred because of an improper wording in the RFP. That is how Siemens was able to see EEI's. Mr. Lupino stated that he was speaking for himself, and he would like to see something to back up the figures. One of the companies who presented figures had comparable districts that they had worked with and had comparable energy savings and had comparable types of buildings. The other company took a different track and primarily pinpointed their savings on retrofitting. There was some education component, but most of it was towards retrofitting thermostats, heating systems, windows, etc. He told Mr. Johnson that whatever his company does the best that is what the committee is looking for.

**Mrs. Ciarlo stated that if the committee doesn't allow Mr. Johnson to submit a proposal, they will entertain two more challenges coming forward. Mr. Lupino responded that it was not the proposal but rather his ability to look at the RFP. Mrs. Ciarlo commented that since Mr. Johnson was not prepared with a proposal this evening, in order for the committee and administration to evaluate, they need a complete package of the proposal. At this point in time, they could schedule another meeting in order to be fair to everyone. She stated that she was concerned that they would never get to saving energy because they will be bogged down in the process. Since they had submitted a proposal, it was important to make information available to Mr. Johnson. As Mr. Stycos had said, everyone should be treated the same. She asked Mr. Johnson if he wished to piece meal his presentation this evening or wait until another time. Mr. Johnson responded that he would rather wait. He further commented that this was not a conventional way of coming to a decision. His company was not looking for any kind of advantage over the other companies by looking at their bids. Mr. Traficante suggested that the committee call an emergency meeting to entertain these energy companies. A meeting could be called to have these three companies come back to refresh the committee's memory, and then they could make a more rational and educated decision knowing what was presented to them that evening.**

**Mr. Lupino asked Mr. Johnson how long it would take him to present his evidence to the committee. Mr. Johnson stated that his company**

would be given a period of three to four weeks to have access to the facilities to see what they have in the district. The process of being notified that one has been asked to bid, being allowed access to the facilities, and putting a bid together is generally about four to eight weeks. It depends upon the size of the facility. Mr. Lupino indicated to Mr. Johnson that he kept referring to retrofitting, and the committee right now is interested in the educational component. Ms. Iannazzi interrupted and stated that the committee is interested in both. Mr. Johnson remarked that their bid could be a combination of education, behavioral changes, posters, stickers on light switches, etc. However, in their experience, those kinds of measures have limited effectiveness; and the real way to get verifiable and continuing savings is to make some investment of dollars.

Page 5      October 12, 2005

Mr. Traficante commented that if he recalled correctly Mr. Zisseron had said that he was interested in a complete package. Whether or not the committee could afford the retrofitting was not the question. He wanted to hear the entire package not only regarding the education aspect of it, but also the retrofitting aspect of it, the energy audit aspect of it, and a variety of other things. The committee should look at the entire package.

**Mr. Zisseron stated that he was speaking as the Director of Plant, and he knew that some of the committee members differed on the way it should be approached. The first thing this district and the School Committee need to do is in order to decide which direction they want to go in is to have an energy audit done in every school to determine what that school needs, what the cost will be and what the pay back is. There are many pretty programs out there, but the committee has to first see what they are dealing with. He is not against educating the staff, and he is sure it will work well; but when a thermostat is set at 68 degrees in 20 degree weather with wind, one can walk up to any window in any of the schools and feel the wind coming into the building. They cannot maintain a 68 degree comfortable setting in a classroom or throughout a building. In his mind, the committee needs an energy audit of every school, what that school will need, what the cost will be, and what the pay back will be. Then, the committee can take the second step. In his mind, there are phases in this whole process and not just one phase. For the district, he would not like to get involved with a sole source vendor because he has a couple of sole source vendors which cost the district a fortune when he has to repair something. It will take some time to do it, but it should be done right.**

**Mr. Lupino noted for the benefit of the players present at this work session, they should be told what the district's asset protection budget has been for the past five years. He noted that they would be shocked at how little that budget is. Mr. Zisseron stated that one of**

the biggest problems this district has is whether or not they put a teacher in a classroom or should they repair or replace univents, etc. The answer always is that they will place a teacher in a classroom. When the districts need money, plant and transportation is always cut. They are always hoping to make it through the school year. This district's asset protection is anywhere from \$142,000 to as little as \$100,000. Mr. Lupino added that one year it was only \$46,000. Mr. Zisseron could foresee in some of the work that needed to be done is that if they are to do replacements should they refinance it. If it goes through capital budget, the district would have to go through a bond process. There is some bond money, but not enough for what they are looking to do. There are a lot of decisions to be made. There was one community that was successful with hiring an energy company to come to re-train staff, but they also made some big investments on their equipment out of capital to begin with. This district doesn't have that luxury unfortunately. He sees it as different phases.

Mr. Lupino asked Mr. Zisseron what was in the upcoming bond proposal for energy savings or asset protection. Mr. Zisseron in response indicated that the district is

Page 6      October 12, 2005

having a serious problem with fire code, and his recommendation to the city will be to continue with the fire code. There are nine

**buildings that will require sprinkler systems over the next five years, and that will cost a lot of money. Mr. Lupino added that it will cost approximately \$200,000 for door closers. Mr. Zisseron added that this will have to be done by next June.**

**Ms. Iannazzi stated to Mr. Johnson that she found it offensive that he came to this work session not prepared to give the committee a presentation. The committee didn't tell Siemens or EEI what they wanted before they came to present. They saw the bid; they came; they presented, and that was the end of the story. She didn't think the committee should be here this evening. The committee is here, and Mr. Johnson is not ready to present to them. He did present it to Mr. Balducci and Mr. Zisseron some time last week. Mr. Balducci corrected Ms. Iannazzi and stated that it was sometime ago and not last week. Mr. Johnson stated that he was not present at this work session to bid on the RFP that involves behavior change. This is not his company's expertise. They are in the business of providing capital to make real hardware changes and then verifying through metering that the company is actually saving energy off their bill and then being paid only that amount of money they actually save to pay off Conn Edison's debt. Conn Edison takes a tremendous amount of risk because it is their capital that they are using. It does not come out of any internal school district bond money or their internal operating budgets. It is all outside capital that is Conn Edison's own personal money. That is what they are in the business to do, and that is what they are interested in doing. They are not an educational**

company. They are not educators. He was present because the state agency has awarded them the right to go after Cranston schools for a state authorized energy saving performance contract. Mr. Lupino asked Mr. Johnson when he presented to Mr. Balducci, and Mr. Balducci responded that it was either in June or July. They met with Mr. Ken Nathanson who is the regional manager for the northeast. Mr. Lupino asked Mr. Johnson if either he or Mr. Nathanson visited the school buildings in Cranston throughout the summer, and Mr. Johnson said that they did not because they were not told that they were awarded the right to look at the buildings. Mr. Lupino asked if either of them rode by the buildings. Mr. Johnson responded that he could not speak for Mr. Nathanson, but he said that there is a process of identifying that the district wants to work with their company. There is no obligation that occurs between Cranston schools and them. It is a good faith that they want to work with Conn Edison and that they believe that the competitive process under which they were selected along with Siemens, Murasco, and Chevron Texaco was an adequate process that meets the state's requirements for competitive bidding. Therefore, the district would be allowed to work with Conn Edison on a sole source basis to move forward assuming that the district likes what they do that they have presented good honest numbers that are realistic, and they would then assume that the district would move forward with a contract with them with open books as to how much the costs are and where they are coming up with savings. There is a lot of work involved in that process. Conn Edison could be spending approximately \$100,000 at

their rates to develop a package for a school system this size would be in the range of \$2 million to \$5 million. It depends on how inefficient the buildings are, how much lighting has been done, etc. It is a major amount of work that Conn Edison is happy to do if they know they are going to be on a level playing field with the district. If the district wants to bring in other ESCO's, it is their right to do that. Other school districts have done it. The University of Rhode Island and Rhode Island College have participated and expended a significant amount of money to come up with an apples-to-apples price proposal for those buildings. It wasn't just on their experience with universities; it was based on their going out with a team of engineers looking at the facilities and coming up with realistic projects. That is the way they work. If the committee wants that process, Conn Edison would be happy to do it. This would take an extra one to two months. The district would be authorized to take them in to visit the schools and then come back with a hard proposal. That is the way they do business.

Mrs. Ciarlo asked if there was a recommendation to do just the lighting if the district could do an RFP so that there would be competitive bidding, and Mr. Johnson responded that this would be a different process. Mrs. Ciarlo explained that it wouldn't be Conn Edison that would do the retrofitting but rather an outside agency.

**Mr. Johnson stated that Conn Edison would have an open-book approach with the school district. They will get bids on lighting themselves, and they will put the RFP together for the lighting or the heating change for thermostats. They will get multiple bids or just one bid if the district wants. They will put the package together and show the bids to the district. They will do the engineering for the RFP or RFP's. They will have overall supervision for the whole process because they will be standing behind all the measures. They can put in lights, thermostats, new boilers, new cooling systems, and they have to live or die by whether they actually save energy because that is all the School Committee cares about that they budget them down. The school district can pay a percentage of that or all of that to Conn Edison to pay off Conn Edison's debt. The more the district pays them, the faster the debt gets paid off, and the investment is free and clear. Mr. Traficante asked who makes the final selection of which vendor to use, and Mr. Johnson said that it would be the choice of the School Committee. Conn Edison provides all of the engineering and does the guarantee of savings. They also provide that package with their markup. They would apply an across-the-board markup that would be agreed upon and negotiated as to what it would be. Then Conn Edison would be acting as a general contractor for the school district taking all of the process out of the district's hands relieving them of the burden of putting out multiple RFP's, the burden of selecting an engineer to do a wide range study. A study alone could range from \$20,000 to \$50,000 to study all the school buildings. The School Committee would have a package to choose yes or no on**

every specific measure. If the committee didn't like them, they wouldn't be done. Conn Edison is very flexible. The advantage of ESPC is that the long process that the committee has had from June until now would be cut down to a very short period of time because they manage the whole process. That is what Conn Edison is interested in bidding on and what he believed he was coming to

Page 8      October 12, 2005

this work session to discuss. Mr. Johnson suggested that if the committee wanted to go ahead with the other RFP for the educational behavior, they could do that; but Conn Edison would not want to bid on just that aspect of it because that is not their expertise. If the committee wanted to receive something similar to what the State of Rhode Island has had them doing over the past six months, he would then suggest that they start fresh with that and have an accelerated selection RFP period so that everyone has an opportunity to play on a level playing field so that when bids are received they will be for real projects on the real facilities.

Ms. Iannazzi asked Mr. Johnson if his company utilizes a union work force, and Mr. Johnson said that they do. She also asked which union they are affiliated with, and Mr. Johnson responded that they can use either prevailing wage and they do not install with their own people. They use sub-contractors, and if they require union prevailing wage help, the committee is in control of that process.

**Mr. Stycos stated that Mr. Johnson's outline sounded like a good approach. He commented that he was getting very nervous about this whole process in making sure that the committee does this in compliance with the law in that they are awarding a public contract. He doesn't know how public contracts are awarded. He felt that administration should make sure that this is done. They should go back to the drawing board to talk with the State to make sure if there should be a new bid or how this has to be done in order to be in compliance with the law and to come forward with a recommendation to the committee as to how this should proceed. This is like the committee is making it up as they go along, and that is not very good.**

**He also felt that what the committee needed to resolve is that he thought at the meeting the committee held in June there was general agreement after an impassioned speech from Mr. Zisseron that they should go with a process that involved capital purchases. The committee instructed administration to investigate the four companies that had been certified by the state and come back to the committee with a recommendation as to what should be done. That apparently has never happened, and now the committee is trying to figure out which is the best company. Administration needs to look at this carefully. They need to sit down with the state people who know more about those things than anyone in this room to come up with a procedure to get this done quickly.**

**Mr. Lupino asked Mr. Johnson which buildings Conn Edison had**

done for the State of Rhode Island. Mr. Johnson indicated that his company acquired a company called Zenergy which is a long-standing company in Massachusetts. As part of that, they worked on the Capitol building and a number of state buildings. This work was done approximately four years ago. They are currently bidding on a number of state buildings. Mr. Lupino asked if the School Committee decided to go in Conn Edison's direction, what would be the outlay with regard to dollars for the school district. In response, Mr. Johnson said that it would be \$0 dollars. He indicated that the school district would not have an investment up front. Conn Edison would provide all the

Page 9      October 12, 2005

equipment at their own cost and investment, and when the equipment is in and operating, as part of their service and engineering of it, they would make extensive measurements of the efficiency of the equipment, wattage consumed by the lighting and other equipment, do some long-term metering as to how the equipment is used, and they would use that to determine where the energy is going in a school. Conn Edison would install equipment, and after it has been installed at their risk and no cost to the school department, they would go back and re-measure that equipment, and they would re-calculate the energy expected to be used. Based on the savings on that, that would determine how much the district would pay Conn Edison. They would be guaranteeing a certain minimum of energy

savings, and that amount of guarantee is the amount that would be paid to Conn Edison. They would use that money to pay off their debt for the period of time they feel the school department would need. Mr. Lupino commented that if the total amount of the equipment costs \$100,000, and after Conn Edison installs it, the savings is 30% which is a reasonable amount to expect from new equipment. He asked if the district would pay Conn Edison only \$30,000, and who would pay for the \$100,000. Mr. Johnson said that Conn Edison would pay for it. That is what they are in the business of doing. Conn Edison would take out a loan for \$100,000 at 5% interest. They would pay that loan back over a period of four years by using the \$30,000 per year that the school district would give them. The district might give them four payments of \$30,000 or \$120,000 total. That would pay for the original investment plus the interest on that investment over that four-year period.

Ms. Iannazzi asked the committee to keep in mind that Siemens has a very similar proposal, and they incorporated an education component. Mrs. Ciarlo asked if Siemens was a sole source company. She asked if the school district would have to use only Siemens products or could they use any product. Mr. Angel Tavares, representing Siemens, stated that the district would not have to use Siemens products. They did indicate this fact last time at the work session. Mr. Zisseron may be using Johnson Controls boilers, and that is what his people know how to work on. It would be put in writing to that effect. Ms. Sanders, representing the law firm of

**Brown Rudnick, stated that the energy education component would be the committee's decision as to who undertakes that component.**

**Mr. Lupino commented that Mr. Johnson, at the beginning of this work session, stated that Siemens cannot do business with Cranston Public Schools. Mr. Tavares stated that that statement was incorrect and that subsequent to that remark Mr. Johnson said that the school district has the right to bring in other ESCO's. Mr. Traficante explained that the State of Rhode Island divided up the state. Ms. Iannazzi noted that the state divided up the companies after this had gone out to bid.**

**Mr. Lupino asked Mr. Fasnacht to explain to the committee what EEI did in Warwick. He noted that the savings were used to purchase capital equipment. Mr. Fasnacht indicated that his program is educational based. They don't compete with equipment**

**Page 10      October 12, 2005**

**companies. Their focus has always been working with only the schools districts. Their focus is on saving money so that they can use it for whatever they like to do. In the case of Warwick and most school districts and most recently Pawtucket who hired them twenty-one months ago, have saved over \$800,000 in twenty-one months. Some of that money has been used to supply new boilers that they are now installing. They have also applied for grant money.**

**Narragansett Electric does retrofitting with lighting rebates, etc. EEI's is a comprehensive approach focusing on the people side and focusing on releasing that money to achieve the 15% to 30% savings across the board. Mr. Lupino asked if there was an energy manager in place now in Warwick, and Mr. Fasnacht said there is a new hire there now; the previous energy manager went to the private sector. Even after the four-year contract has expired, EEI will continue to provide support at no additional fee. In the case of Warwick, they are in their seventh or eighth year. When their energy manager resigned, EEI helped them hire a new person.**

**Mrs. Ciarlo commented that after June Conn Edison was asked to come in because this was their area given to them by the State. She asked that administration check with Attorney Piccirilli to determine the process that should be followed with the state relative to awarding to any company that the district wants to work with. It has been such a long period of time that administration and the committee have forgotten what the other companies proposed, and it is hard to make comparisons among them. There should be an opportunity for the three companies to make a very brief summary to the committee so that the committee can then reach a decision. The committee should understand what Conn Edison is proposing along with what the other two companies have proposed since time has elapsed.**

**Mr. Lupino added that before doing another RFP, the committee**

should look at the new RFP before it is done. Mrs. Ciarlo stated that she was not referring to doing another RFP. Mrs. Greifer stated that the committee most definitely should speak with Attorney Piccirilli to get a procedure in place so that the committee could follow it.

Mr. Stycos stated that he agreed with Mrs. Ciarlo's comments.

Ms. Iannazzi commented that it wasn't necessary to contact the state. The committee has had two reliable bidders, and they should have stuck with that.

Mr. Traficante remarked that the committee heard the other two companies in June, and in order for the committee to make a rational decision, they should hear all three companies again. He wants to hear all over again what Siemens and EEI have to say in order to make a rationale comparison to what Conn Edison is presenting. The committee could then make a better educated decision to determine what direction they want to go in. He further commented that Mr. Zisseron made an impassioned speech regarding the kind of direction he would like to see the committee go in. He did not limit

Page 11      October 12, 2005

it solely to an educational component. He wanted to see a component that consisted of education, retrofitting as well as energy

**audits; and Mr. Traficante agreed with that direction.**

**Mr. Lupino stated that the committee would set up a meeting to make sure they were in compliance with the state and Mr. Piccirilli. The presentation would be a maximum of thirty minutes each. Mr. Johnson asked what the committee was asking him to respond to, and Ms. Iannazzi said that it would be to audit, education, and retrofitting. Mr. Balducci commented that the language of the original RFP stated educational equipment with no retrofitting. EEI prepared a proposal and stated that. Siemens prepared a proposal with an education component, and as an alternative, incorporated one with retrofitting.**

**Mr. Balducci asked if the committee wished to have another RFP issued or if the committee was going to conduct another work session with presentations by EEI, Siemens, and Conn Edison. Mr. Lupino responded that the committee would be seeking direction from Mr. Piccirilli regarding this. Mr. Balducci added that the original RFP stated education only with no equipment retrofitting. Mrs. Ciarlo added that if they submitted it, it wasn't held against them. The district wouldn't award that portion of the RFP. Mr. Johnson felt that it would be an incorrect response to an RFP. Conn Edison is simply asking for a level playing field. The State has already gone out and awarded the right to do these projects with the four companies. The district is not required to put out an RFP. The district would simply invite the four companies to a session and tell them what is required.**

**Mr. Johnson indicated that Conn Edison spends a lot of money at risk to do a highly specific set of real retrofits, and he will be right within 10%. He will indicate how many boilers have to be put in along with their specifications, and he will be within 10% of the savings he will guarantee. Mrs. Ciarlo asked if it would be possible for Mr. Johnson to explain in his response all what his company would do. If the committee in looking at all three proposals decides that it wants to go that route, that is when Conn Edison would take up doing the thorough audit. Mrs. Ciarlo also asked how much preparation time Mr. Johnson would need, and he responded that he would require one month to come back with a specific proposal. Ms. Iannazzi asked that the actual presentations be limited to thirty minutes.**

**Mrs. Ciarlo asked Mr. Balducci to contact Mr. Piccirilli to be sure that the committee is complying. A work session will be held on Monday, November 7th, at 6:30 p.m. in the Briggs Building to discuss energy education.**

Mr. Johnson requested that someone send a letter stating exactly what they want them to propose and under what process. Ms. Iannazzi asked that the same letter be sent to all three companies. Mr. Johnson asked that administration and the committee try to be specific whether they would like a proposal on specific investments or just the education component or on both of those. Mrs. Ciarlo responded that since administration and the committee began the process, they have moved from just the educational to wanting both. This was started with a previous School Committee, and there are some new members as well. Mr. Johnson should contact Mr. Zisseron for technical questions. He noted that Conn Edison is interested in those areas of the buildings where the equipment and systems are in particularly bad condition. Mrs. Ciarlo asked Mr. Balducci to contact Mr. Piccirilli to be sure that the committee is complying.

Mr. Zisseron stated that he becomes very frustrated because different vendors are coming from different directions selling a product. The committee has to decide what they want, not for the vendors to decide what they want to give but what the committee wants for the district. The committee has to think in terms of what the condition the schools are in and what it is going to cost and what the payback is. It may be expensive, but now they will have a good document in front of them. The committee will still need some up-front money. There is still the problem of capital, and the committee has to begin thinking along those lines. Mr. Lupino agreed

with Mr. Zisseron, and that indicated that this was the reason he was leaning toward the educational component because the savings realized could then purchase equipment. It works hand in hand. The district doesn't have capital outlay for equipment. Mr. Zisseron responded that asset protection will not carry what is needed to be done in the schools.

Mr. Traficante asked Mr. Zisseron to provide the committee with what they have available regarding capital dollars, what is left in each of the bonds, and what portion of that money has to be dedicated to the fire code. Mr. Johnson stated that it would be helpful for the next meeting to let the vendors know if there is any capital money in the budget that the committee would want to throw into the pot for Conn Edison's investments. Mr. Johnson added that it would not have to be a commitment. Mr. Zisseron said that Cranston does not do what other communities do which is to put out \$30 million for the schools in bond money. If the schools in Cranston get \$2 million in bond money, they are lucky. Right now the district is committed to a chunk of money for fire code upgrades. He doesn't know how much will be left for other projects. He will know in approximately one month how much is left. He knows how much the district could dedicate; it is whether the district will get it from the city. If the district puts forth a \$3 million capital budget, it can be reduced at city hall, and the district has no control over it. Mr. Johnson commented that their best assumption would be to provide all the capital, and the district would provide no capital.

**Mr. Tavares commented that if Mr. Johnson is going to get a tour of the facilities it could be done together for all of them. Mr. Lupino asked Mr. Zisseron if he would be available to give a building-by-building tour to these companies. Mr. Zisseron responded that if these companies want a building-by-building tour, it will be done. It may not be given by him, but it will be done. Mr. Tavares said that Siemens did visit one or two schools, and they want to present something that is apples to apples.**

**A work session will be held on Monday, November 7th, at 6:30 p.m. in the Briggs Building to discuss energy education.**

**Moved by Mrs. Greifer, seconded by Mr. Traficante and unanimously carried that this work session be adjourned.**

**There being no further business to come before the work session, it was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Anthony J. Lupino**

**Clerk**