

Mariya Hurwitz:

Good evening. This is Mariya Hurwitz, President of the Sherman Library board of trustees. Today is Monday, March 21st, and this is a special meeting of the board. I call the meeting to order at 6:33 PM. I want to make a quick clarification on how the meeting will proceed. So in a moment, I will read the motion that we're here to vote on. After I've read the motion and it is seconded, I will open the floor to discussion. Please use the raise your hand feature in Zoom so that I may call on you. Take a moment to find the feature so you know where it is.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Once I call on you, you will have three minutes to speak and then I'll give you a warning. I'll be timing. I'll give you a warning when you have 45 seconds left. And then when you're finished, I will call on the next person whose hand is raised and repeat that process until all who wish to speak have spoken. After that, I will give everyone the opportunity for another three minutes, which will also have the 45 second remaining warning. Once everyone who wishes to speak the second round has spoken, we will close the discussion and I will conduct the vote.

Mariya Hurwitz:

We need a quorum to conduct a vote, which requires seven people in attendance. We have than that, so we do have a quorum, and a simple majority will be required to pass the motion. I'll conduct the votes via roll call so that Laura can record the votes. Does anybody have any questions about the meeting format? All right. If you want to go on mute, I'm hearing lots of background noise.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Henry has a question.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Go ahead, Henry.

Henry Cooperman:

Are we going to be able to modify your motion at all?

Mariya Hurwitz:

So if the motion as, and please correct me, Laura or from Barb, if I say this incorrectly, if the motion doesn't pass as written, that would be when we would modify it, but not before we voted on the motion as written. [inaudible 00:02:16]?

Henry Cooperman:

And who came up with the motion?

Mariya Hurwitz:

The COVID advisory committee wrote the motion, and so I'll read that.

Henry Cooperman:

And can you identify who's on the COVID advisory committee?

Mariya Hurwitz:

Sure. Yep. Dee Ratterree and Barb Ireland.

Henry Cooperman:

Okay. Thank you.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Sure.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Mariya, and I'm going to ask Barb for some assistance here, I think the Roberts rules of order after the discussion, if someone makes a motion to amend the motion, they have to state what that amendment is. They need a second and we would have to take a vote on amending the motion. After that, we would then go back. If the amendment is approved, we would take a vote on the amended motion. All right? The amendment has to be clearly stated as to what the amendment is. If it's adding a word, changing a word, adding a paragraph, or modifying a paragraph with a specific language to be used in the modification, it needs to be seconded. And then we need to take a vote on the amendment.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. If that were to happen, I have the motion available to put up on the screen. I can always put up an amended motion. We can make it visible for everybody to see it and read it. That would be fine.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Right. I just want to check with Barb. Did I get that right, Barb?

Barb Ireland:

Yes. That is correct. But to just say it once more, Mariya will read the motion. Someone will second. Then the motion will be before us and will be open for discussion. We'll have discussion. And at some point in time during discussion or after discussion is almost over, if somebody wanted to amend the motion, they then would offer an amendment and it does require a second. And if it gets a second, then the amendment has to be read. And then we would vote on the amendment first. And if the amendment did not pass, we go immediately to the motion. If the amendment passes, then we go to the motion as amended. Does everybody understand?

Mariya Hurwitz:

This is Mariya. I'm having an unstable internet connection so I'm turning my camera off to try to help my bandwidth. That's why I just turned my camera off. Barbara, I apologize. I did not get to hear everything you said because of my bad connection.

Barb Ireland:

Okay. I essentially said you will put the motion on the floor. It will be seconded by someone. Then it's open for discussion. There will be discussion maybe for a while, and then if somebody wants to amend it after maybe there's been discussion and some questions have been answered, they can state and an amendment that they would like to make and it has to be seconded. And then the amendment has to be

read and we vote on the amendment at that point. If the amendment passes, it becomes part of the motion as amended. If it fails, we vote then on the original motion. Everybody understand?

Mariya Hurwitz:

I think so. And just keep us in line if that happens and we're going off course, just please bring us back. Okay. Any other questions on process? Okay. So I'll read the motion now as it's written. Motion to set requirements for entrance to the women's soiree based on the state of Connecticut COVID-19 weekly data tracker average daily rate map for Sherman and surrounding towns as follows. If the map indicates red or orange, then proof of full vaccination or negative test by a provider is required. If the map indicates gray or yellow, then full vaccination or a negative test by a provider is encouraged. Details will be posted on the website. Can I have a [crosstalk 00:06:46]

John Ehrenreich:

This is a question just for clarification.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Yes, please go ahead, John.

John Ehrenreich:

The motion refers to Sherman and the immediately surrounding area. So one question is what are we describing as the immediately surrounding area? What towns? And two, what happens if some of them are red or orange and others are gray or green?

Mariya Hurwitz:

Barb, can I turn that over to you?

Barb Ireland:

We talked about that, John, in the meeting, and actually this is not the proper time to do this. The motion should be before us, before we ask the questions. Okay? But to clarify, we are mainly concerned with Sherman, and we talked about the fact that New Milford is not a good indicator because it's a much larger town. But the most of the town that will be most like Sherman is Kent.

Henry Cooperman:

Barb, can I ask you-

Laura Jagodzinski:

Before we go-

Barb Ireland:

But the important thing is-

Laura Jagodzinski:

Barb?

Barb Ireland:

... is that Sherman has to be red or orange.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Barb?

Barb Ireland:

Yes.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Should we be getting a second before we open it for discussion?

Barb Ireland:

Yes, you're supposed to. That's what I was just saying to John.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Do I need to read the motion again to get a second?

Barb Ireland:

Yes.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay.

Barb Ireland:

Go ahead.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Motion to set requirements for entrance to the women's soiree based on the state of Connecticut COVID-19 weekly data tracker average daily rate map for Sherman and surrounding towns as follows. If the map indicates red or orange, then proof of full vaccination or negative test by a provider is required. If the map indicates gray or yellow, then full vaccination or a negative test by a provider is encouraged. Details will be posted on the website. May I have a second?

Dee Ratterree:

A second?

Mariya Hurwitz:

I think I saw Barb too. Barb. Thank you. Okay. So let me just stop sharing. Let me pull up my notes again here. Okay. All right. So now it's open for discussion. Remember to use the raise your hand feature. I'll call on you. Just wait until you've been called upon and remember to please unraise your hand after you've spoken. Okay. So it's open for discussion. Henry, go ahead.

Henry Cooperman:

So first of all, Mariya, I'd like to thank you for doing this and opening it up to the whole board. I think it was something that should have been done from the beginning, but I appreciate you doing this now. So I have a couple of concerns. One is one of the factors that's taken into consideration in determining whether a town is red or yellow is the fact that children are considered part of that group. They won't be attending the soiree. So for example, in the latest Sherman numbers, which was six in the last two weeks, I spoke to Don today about this, two of those, or a third, were children. So are we taking those people out? And then my other concern is that I think it's a great idea that we're doing Sherman and the surrounding towns, but what about all the people that are weekenders that come up from New York City? Are we not taking them into consideration?

Henry Cooperman:

And third, are we taking into consideration all those people who are vaccinated and are still getting COVID, again, who could be passing on? So whether my concern is that I think it's more appropriate to say masks are optional, but that's up to everybody's own opinion of what they want to do, but I think it's more appropriate that we need to take in consideration taking though those numbers and taking out the children that are testing positive, if you want to use those as a baseline, and looking at New York City. New York City is opening up. The Barclay Center just changed its rules about COVID and not requiring proof of vaccination.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Excuse me, Henry, 45 seconds more.

Henry Cooperman:

That's all right.

Mariya Hurwitz:

No, no. Go ahead.

Henry Cooperman:

You can tell me to ... and then my other thing is that I would rather see us go with something that is more appropriate towards, as we get closer to the soiree and saying that we would be looking at the CDC recommendations at the time of the soiree. Thank you.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Thank you, Henry. Okay. Barb, I saw your hand raised. Would you like to go now or are you answering a question?

Barb Ireland:

I'm answering a question. Just in relation to the CDC, Henry, we decided not to use it to CDC because their data is not updated as much as Connecticut's is, and that's why we decided to stay within the state of Connecticut because they do publish that data map every Thursday. We would be looking at it every Thursday between now and when the soiree is. So I think the last date we'd probably look at it as somewhere around the 23rd of May.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Would anybody else like to raise their hand, share their ... oh, Ro, go right ahead. Hi. Yeah. You're not on mute. You should be good to go.

Ro D'Ostilio:

So I've been thinking about our last meeting and everything. So one of the things I think is if ... I'm sorry, my voice is a little weird today. Whatever's out at the time that the soiree happens, which is quite a bit farther away, would supersede anything we're saying right now. I mean, we have no idea if there's going to be higher rates or lower rates. So I think in our communication with the public that's what needs to be coming forward is this may change due to state and local recommendations.

Ro D'Ostilio:

The other thing is, the school actually ... no, I'm sorry, the town and the school together have a COVID team, a COVID board that meet every Friday and they discuss what's happening in the state, what the numbers are in the state, and they have a panel of ... Evan Hack is on it, the doctor, the first selectmen and administrators from the school are on it, and some other I health professionals. I don't exactly know the whole panel, but that would be something that I would assume we should get involved in. It's open to the public. That might be a place that we would get information that would be more cohesive with the whole town.

Ro D'Ostilio:

That might be who we would follow their recommendations of how to go about this. The other thing that I was thinking about is I recently flew on a domestic flight. I was not asked for any proof of vaccination. I was just told to wear a mask. So I think that's kind of the mindset of people in the-

Mariya Hurwitz:

30 seconds, Ro. Sorry I missed it.

Ro D'Ostilio:

... in the general public. If we're asking to get tested, it's \$140. It's not covered by insurance. It's out of pocket because it's not medically necessary if you're not symptomatic. So the idea of a home test instead, maybe, I don't know if that's an option, but the other thing is maybe we just say we're requiring masks, N95s or surgical. And if they don't have it, we provide those for them, and that's option as well.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Thank you, Ro.

Ro D'Ostilio:

Thank you.

Mariya Hurwitz:

We're going to have another chance for everybody to go around if they want.

Ro D'Ostilio:

Okay.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Hi, John.

John Ehrenreich:

Okay. I'm still concerned about the metric here. If I understand correctly, and I may be wrong on this, the Connecticut COVID data tracker classification is based simply on cases, which is turning out to be a rather bad indicator because so many people are testing at home and they're not reporting it and so forth. The CDC, by contrast, although it uses cases in a broad sense, it's more importantly hospitalization rates, which is probably a better indicator, although also somewhat flawed.

John Ehrenreich:

So that's just a question I'm raising, whether it's the best indicator. The second question is that perhaps following up on Henry's comment, I don't think we can assess the rate in every possible community that anybody might be coming from. But I do think that we should specify that it's Sherman, Kent, New Milford, New Fairfield, which is the immediately surrounding area from which people other than weekenders are most likely to be coming from.

John Ehrenreich:

The fact that New Milford is larger is irrelevant. I mean, whatever the rate is the rate of transmission in the community. Similarly, with respect to the kids that Henry raised the question about, I understand the logic of what you're saying, Henry, but I think again, that what we're concerned about is what the rate of communication of disease is potentially in the community and kids transmit disease to parents and so forth. It's a reasonable indicator to just use the overall rate, it seems to me. But I do think that we need to both specify what communities we're talking about, as of what date in terms of the soiree, and then we need to think a little bit about whether, in fact, simply the daily case rate is the best indicator.

Mariya Hurwitz:

You still have a minute left if you have anything else you want to ...

John Ehrenreich:

Not really.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Okay. So Barb, I think you maybe were going to answer a question of John's.

Barb Ireland:

The Connecticut chart does take into account hospitalizations. It does. So that's one thing. Like I said, when we had this discussion in the group of the committee, they did feel that our majority thought had to be about Sherman because we tried to look at who came in previous years and overwhelmingly it's probably 90% Sherman people. You've got a few people that you could count on one hand probably from New Fairfield. You maybe got a couple of people from Kent. The weekenders, I can't speak to that real well because some of the weekenders actually stay out here longer than what we think, but we felt that that's why we feel that we need to really look at Sherman the most.

Barb Ireland:

We did think about Kent only from the standpoint of size, and I hear what you're saying about it doesn't matter about the size. But for instance, some communities do a better job of reporting than others too. That's why the CDC numbers are not great at this point, because it's gotten very lax in terms of how they're reporting the CDC numbers.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Thank you. Laura, go ahead.

Laura Jagodzinski:

I was just going to comment on the CDC, John. What I read recently on the CDC is there's a concern about the CDC, their ability to get data, because the data that they have is reliant on the states submitting the data to the CDC. And as the states loosen their guidelines, there's less reporting from the states to the CDC. So using that as data points may not be a challenge today, but it could be a challenge in a couple of weeks.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Laura or Irit, go ahead. You've got to come off mute first, Irit.

Irit Granger:

Just a slightly different angle on this. I just wanted to mention that what we all know is that this is our first event, the library's first event, since COVID. So that's a big deal and we're expecting 120 to 150 women. That's a big deal. That's something to take seriously while the pandemic is still with us to some extent. So I think it's important to get the message out, whatever we decide today as to what the protocol will be at the soiree, I think it's important to get the message out to the community and to the school community like Ro and Katelyn were mentioning that this is why we're taking this so seriously.

Irit Granger:

It's our first big event with people in an indoor space, eating and drinking and standing very close to each other. We want to make sure everyone stays safe. So whatever benchmark we use, we'll use the benchmark to determine at the time what would be the best protocol. It's not like we're trying to set something in stone right now, I don't believe, correct? But I think it's important to just reiterate that to the community, that this isn't just a stance in ideology. It's taking this first major step in two years very seriously with regards to our patrons health and wellbeing.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Thank you, Irit. Okay. Barb, I don't think you actually ... did you have anything you wanted to say? I know you've answered some questions. Same with Laura. Did you have any points you wanted to make?

Barb Ireland:

No. I just think in the spirit of what we'd like people out there to understand is that we tried to put together language, whether we felt was reasonable, so that we're good for today and we're good for May because the data does change. And therefore we thought it was in the spirit of being fair that if we used the chart that Connecticut puts out, it may very well be yellow or gray by May. I'm hoping it is. I think we all are. And so we felt that was a good compromise to use that chart. And then also, I had



asked last time we met about possibly using a negative test so that people who were not vaccinated could come, because we would really like for them to come, but we'd also like the people to be safe.

Barb Ireland:

I think that we should join the committee with the school and town hall, but we need to recognize that their situations are different from ours in that. I don't think I've ever been in town hall except a board of selectors meeting, where there was more than 10 people there during the day. I don't know what restrictions they have right now on board of selectors meetings. But they're a smaller group than what we anticipate we're going to be dealing with at the soiree.

Barb Ireland:

And the school, as Henry wisely pointed out, they're not going to be attending. The kids are not going to be attending. So from that respect, it's different and it's a different population. And we know then originally they were not getting COVID as much. Although with some of the variants, I think they've started to get it a little more, but I just would hope that people would think that this was a fair approach, but yet trying to maintain a safe situation for people.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Thank you. Laura? Come off mute though.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Lowered my hand. I didn't unmute myself. Don had an article in the Sherman Sentinel about the town and the masking requirements. So masks are optional. If you're unvaccinated, you have to wear a mask.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Are you just answering the question? Did you want to-

Laura Jagodzinski:

Yeah, I'm just answering that question.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Okay. I know I've seen a couple people raise their hands for the second round of talks, but I want to make sure everybody gets their first chance. Jeff, I see your hand raised. Go ahead.

Jeff Matusow:

So I think I appreciate the point that was just made that this is the first event and it's indoors and it's a lot more people and it's different than I think a lot of these other organizations are dealing with, and that given that, I think we need to be cautious. We need to take some sort of measures. I mean, I haven't been to the event, but I don't imagine that wearing masks at an event like this would be very conducive to making it an enjoyable, not that it won't be enjoyable, but certainly would probably hinder the enjoyment of the event and the ease of the event.

Jeff Matusow:

So doesn't seem to me like that's a great solution. That could be a solution for town hall or for school where they're just sitting there, but mingling and cocktails and eating, I think masks is going to be very restrictive in that scenario. So I think we unfortunately have to be cautious. We put the language in, which we've put in. I think we've all acknowledged that none of us knows what the situation will be like a month from now or six weeks from now. Hopefully this is all a moot point and COVID continues to subside and we don't need any of this, but I think we have to have the language there that gives us the out, in case six weeks from now there is a situation that warrants caution, and we've at least warned people. That's my view.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Thank you. I think Lauren and Laura are the only two people that didn't take three minutes. So you both are welcome to if you want, but obviously not required. And I actually do not ... everybody has said everything I had on my list of points, so I'm not going to take my turn. Laura, go ahead.

Laura Jagodzinski:

So I just want to say that the soiree is one of our three top fundraisers and it would be my goal to make that a success. We target \$10,000 to make out of the soiree. Half of that is in ticket sales. The other half is in raffle tickets, silent auction, and the sale of goods. And so I think for me, the objective is how do we make it a successful event, right? What foods are we serving? What beverages are we serving? How do we know make the space comfortable and for people to feel safe? That's my objective and that's my concern, that we're able to do that for the library.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Thank you. Okay, Lauren, I thought I saw you shake your head, so you're good and I'm good. So let's open it up for second round of questions, clarifications, anything. Just raise your hand so I can call on you please. Nobody? Oh, Ro, go ahead.

Ro D'Ostilio:

I can appreciate the comment about the masks. I can see how that would be not as enjoyable. I also am not comfortable with the wording of the motion, however. I don't feel comfortable with the fact that we are going to require something that's not being required on a larger scale. As a matter of fact, it's being scaled back by places that are similar to us. I would feel more comfortable if it were something along the lines of at the time, we will make a decision as to what to do. And then if we decide that we want to have a proof of vaccine because the numbers are astronomical, then fine, but six cases in two weeks, and we're going to send this out to a community that's very torn between all of this, and we are getting mixed messages left and right about validity of everything, I just think we're setting ourselves up for alienation of people that we don't necessarily want to ... that we don't want that to have happen.

Ro D'Ostilio:

I know we can't please everyone in this, but if we put this out now, I think we are going to get a kickback. If we wait and we can decide later and say, "Oh, look, it's in the gray or the yellow, and we don't have to worry about it, everyone can come, then there's no harm in that. And we didn't have to put it out there that, yeah, we're going to require vaccinations. I would wait to require vaccinations until it's closer to the event, if things have blown up bigger. That's all I have to say.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Thank you. Henry?

Henry Cooperman:

Thank you. So I'm kind of agreeing with Ro here. I had the opportunity to go out for dinner on Friday night with a physician friend of mine, female who usually attends the soiree, and reached out to get a medical opinion, whether she thought request requiring vaccinations is something that we should be doing. Her thought process was that most people today are vaccinated. If you look at the cases, it's not what's testing positive, but how many hospitalizations there are, and those are way down. My biggest concern, like Ro's, is getting this mixed message out to the community the way it's worded. I have no problem with saying, "Let's see what's going on closer to the event," but maybe lighting a fire at this point would have more negative feelings than positive to the community at large.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Thank you. Who else? John, is that a raised hand sort of?

John Ehrenreich:

Yeah, I guess so. I think I disagree, although I understand the point that Ro and Henry are making. We've been through two years of this and people are used to the world in which various precautions to protect themselves and protect their neighbors and community are required. I think that by making it clear that this is not an artificial position, that it's one that's based on a metric that will become available at the time. People who said if the rate's going up, then we might have to do it. And if it's not, then we don't have to consider it.

John Ehrenreich:

But I don't see what the problem is in saying, well, if it goes up, we might have to do it. And if it doesn't go up, then we won't, which is what the resolution pretty much says. I think that balance of caution and risk is a very difficult one that clearly people feel very strongly about, ranging from people who think that even at the worst of the times, that restrictions were not warranted to people who were extremely cautious and want more. So I think to say that they were tying it to a metric, in fact, responds to the anxieties of each of them. It's not an arbitrary issue.

John Ehrenreich:

The other just quick thing is that I don't know what the current figures are on vaccination rates in Sherman. At least some weeks ago, they were relatively low for this part of Connecticut. But I don't know whether that still is the case. And I think it's at least a somewhat relevant consideration. If it continues to be 70, 75% and not 85, 90%, then I think that it adds to the justification for being cautious.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Thank you. Let's see. Laura, did you want to answer a question or do you want to speak again?

Laura Jagodzinski:

I was going to mention the last we looked at the rates in Sherman, you can get them at thect.gov website. Actually, if you do a search for CT vaccination rates, you'll get the numbers, and their vaccination rates all are broken down by single vaccine for a single shot, two vaccines for the double

shot. Boosters is a separate number. So they consider fully vaccinated one shot for one dose, two shots for two doses, and it's broken down by age group.

Laura Jagodzinski:

The overall Sherman rate, I think, is somewhere in the mid seventies. Our numbers were lower than I think Kent and New Milford. Close maybe in New Fairfield. Our 65 plus numbers were the highest. They were in the, I think, the low seventies. And then the numbers got lower as the age groups were lower. The age groups, I think, are 44 to 65, and then 25 to 44 and 65 plus.

Mariya Hurwitz:

All right, thanks for that information. Dee, all yours.

Dee Ratterree:

Would it help simply to add to the motion a date at which we begin to consider this?

Mariya Hurwitz:

I do think that would be helpful. And I do think that we need to clarify if it's the intention that whether we're looking at Sherman's color or whether we're looking at other town's colors, I think that needs to be a little bit clearer because it does, and I didn't pick up on this when I read it 20 times before today, Sherman and surrounding towns. So what do we mean by the surrounding? Are we looking at the surrounding towns or are we just looking at Sherman? I don't know if anybody else has that same thought. I think, John, you might have said something along those lines in the beginning. Barb, go ahead.

Barb Ireland:

I don't have a problem with looking at just Sherman, because like I said, when we sat down and looked at who came to the soiree in the past, it was very high numbers from Sherman, very high. Very few people from other towns.

Jeff Matusow:

So I think that I agree with what you both just said, and I think we should take out the words and surrounding towns. It should just be that because either you define them, because this is some hard test that somebody's going to conduct. We want that to be clear and people understand what that test will be, I don't think surrounding towns are relevant. So I think it should just be for Sherman.

Mariya Hurwitz:

And should we say here as of, and choose a date? Yes, Laura, sorry, go ahead.

Laura Jagodzinski:

That's okay. I would look at the motion to be those things that are going to be firm and would not require a change. If we put something in the motion, let's just say we said as of date X and we've determined it should be date Y, X plus two, then we would need to reconvene for a vote to change that date. The other alternative is we have the date, we agree on a date and we included an FAQs with the details on our website. That would not require a quorum and a vote, but it's up to the group what they want to do in the exact motion.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. I know, Dee, you didn't have your full three minutes. [crosstalk 00:41:20]

Dee Ratterree:

The only thing I want to say about that, and I don't disagree with Laura, except that it seems less confining if you can say like a week before, instead of this open ended we're going to look at you for the next month before you can come. I think setting a date is not a bad idea. I don't understand Robert's rules of orders enough to understand why we'd have to go back to have another motion, but I don't know. Does anybody else feel that way about a date or is that just me?

Mariya Hurwitz:

Barb, go ahead.

Barb Ireland:

I have no problem with setting a date. I think some of us had actually talked about that at one point where we thought maybe May 23rd would be a reasonable date because that still gives people time to get tested. That's the Monday before.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Does somebody want to make a motion to put May 23rd to amend this language and put May 23rd in here?

Dee Ratterree:

I do if Barb doesn't. I would like to make a motion.

Barb Ireland:

I was just looking at where you [crosstalk 00:42:47].

Dee Ratterree:

Are you looking how to put it in? Right?

Mariya Hurwitz:

This is just an example, right?

Barb Ireland:

Okay. That's good.

Dee Ratterree:

Yeah.

Barb Ireland:

Okay.

Dee Ratterree:

I think that makes perfect sense.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Is on the May 23rd better than as of May 23rd? Just trying to come from-

Dee Ratterree:

Look at the rate map and see. It comes out what every Thursday, the rate map rate?

Barb Ireland:

It's the 19th. The 19th is the last.

Dee Ratterree:

So there won't be one until the 26th. Okay. So we should maybe say the 19th. Do you see what I'm saying or no?

Mariya Hurwitz:

I do. Jeff, go ahead, please.

Jeff Matusow:

Yeah. On this one, I agree with Laura. Like we've been saying over and over, we don't know what's going to happen. It could be a fluid situation. I think if you put it in here, you potentially back us into a procedural corner that just becomes more complicated a week before the event. I like the idea, Laura. I think Laura suggested that it's part of the last sentence, details will be posted on the website, and on the website as it gets closer and as we understand what it's going to be, post everything on the website, including if we do need proof of vaccination, there's going to be other details that have to be put in there.

Jeff Matusow:

So I think that you put it in here, I mean, hopefully this all goes away and it's irrelevant, right, as we've all said, but if it doesn't, I think we potentially back ourselves into a corner that is somewhat unnecessary. So I'm saying I wouldn't put a date in here. I would put it in the details on the website.

Mariya Hurwitz:

I think for me it comes down to us as a board and our comfort level that we agree on emotion and that we're comfortable that details are not in the motion and that they're somewhere else, and how will they be arrived at, or do we agree on them tonight? That's really where I'm coming from is wanting to make sure everybody, when they place their vote, is comfortable with what those details are, the intention is with those details. And I'm not hearing any concern, which is wonderful, it seems to me. So, Laura, I can't tell if your hand is still raised or raised again. Okay. Ro?

Ro D'Ostilio:

I would think that more general is better. Yeah. I mean, if this is going to pass, I think the discussion around the negative test by a provider might also need to be had, because you're now asking for another expense to our patrons and that has to be taken into consideration.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Barb, I'm sorry, I lost track of protocol here. We're sort of as a team coming up with language for the motion and I thought somebody needed to propose language and then we either agree to it or we don't and we move on. So can you just help me out here?

Barb Ireland:

Yes. We do not have an amendment before us because no one has made a motion to amend the original motion to [inaudible 00:46:45] the amendment would say the following. And that needs to be seconded. And then we can discuss that because it's before us.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Got it.

Barb Ireland:

Because the amendment is before us.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. So would somebody-

Barb Ireland:

[crosstalk 00:46:59] wanted to.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Would somebody like to make a motion and be specific with your wording and then we will discuss it and take it from there?

Jeff Matusow:

I'll make a motion that we remove and surrounding towns and leave it out as is.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. So remove and surrounding and then these edits here as well. Okay. Jeff, does this represent what you just said? And then I can read it.

Jeff Matusow:

Yep.

Barb Ireland:

You need a second, Mariya.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Dee seconded?

Dee Ratterree:

Did he say? I'm not seconding. I'm just asking.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Oh, you're asking. Okay.

Dee Ratterree:

Did he also say and remove the date. Surrounding towns I totally agree with. Did he say remove the date?

Barb Ireland:

Yes, he did.

Dee Ratterree:

Okay. I just didn't hear it.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Does anybody want to second Jeff?

Ro D'Ostilio:

I can second, Jeff.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. So now, Barb, should I read it as it's written?

Barb Ireland:

You read the amendment.

Mariya Hurwitz:

I would like to read the amendment as proposed by Jeff [Matusaw 00:48:13] seconded by Ro [D'Ostilio 00:48:15]. Motion to set requirements for entrance to the women's soiree based on the state of Connecticut COVID-19 weekly data tracker average daily rate map for Sherman as follows. If the map is indicates red or orange, then proof of full vaccination or negative test by a provider is required. If the map indicates gray or yellow, then full vaccination or a negative test by a provider is encouraged. Details will be posted on the website.

Barb Ireland:

Now you ask for any discussion or questions.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Is there any discussion or questions? And Ro, is your hand raised?



Ro D'Ostilio:

Well, I don't have any discussions or questions around that because I think I agree with taking out surrounding towns. But I didn't-

Barb Ireland:

[crosstalk 00:49:07] call for the vote on the amendment only.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Was there any other discussion or questions on this before I take a vote on the amendment only? Henry, come off mute, Henry.

Henry Cooperman:

In response to what Ro said earlier, would the board consider taking out a negative test by a provider, and if somebody could show proof that they had a negative test that day? A home test.

Mariya Hurwitz:

So I think we have to vote first on his amendment.

Henry Cooperman:

Okay.

Mariya Hurwitz:

But Barb, help me out here.

Barb Ireland:

Yes. You can do it one of two ways. You can vote now on the amendment that Jeff proposed. Okay? If we want to entertain the thought of Henry's amendment, then Jeff would have to withdraw his amendment and the second would have to be withdrawn. And then a new amendment maybe, which would encompass both things, would be offered.

John Ehrenreich:

But I suggested that it's cleaner to vote on Jeff's amendment and then go to Henry's because people may be for one and against the other or vice versa?

Barb Ireland:

Yep. You can do that.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. And we're not voting that this is our ... we're just voting on the amended language. Correct, Barb?

Barb Ireland:

Yes.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Great. Mariya?

Mariya Hurwitz:

Yes, Laura?

Laura Jagodzinski:

The amendment, right, so the motion is to amend the motion to remove and surrounding towns. That's what the actual motion is.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay.

Laura Jagodzinski:

And so we're going to vote on to remove and the surrounding towns. That's what the vote is.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Thank you for clarifying. That helps a lot. Okay. And can we do this, Laura, do we have to do this as a roll call, be consistent? If we're going to do it as a roll call, I'll do it all as a roll call?

Laura Jagodzinski:

We can do it by a raise of hands, but we have to go slowly because they need to be able to see every hand.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Let's do that then, please. So I'd like to take a boat on the motion to remove the language and surrounding towns. So amend the motion to remove the language and surrounding towns. All in favor? Let me put my video on, sorry.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Wait a second. We're raising hands/hands, right? Yes, raising hands/hands, Mariya. Henry, I can't. Okay, Irit, Lauren, Jeff. That's everyone. So that is all in favor. Just to confirm, are there any nays? Any abstains? All in favor.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Great. So this is the current amended language and Henry, I think you were going to propose another amendment.

Henry Cooperman:

I would just say that full vaccination or provide a negative test taken that day.

Mariya Hurwitz:

So to be clear, you're proposing that I remove by a provider is required.

Henry Cooperman:

Yes. My concern is what Ro mentioned about having people having the additional expense of having to pay for a negative test by a provider.

Mariya Hurwitz:

And did you-

Laura Jagodzinski:

Mariya, just to check, I think you still need the is required. I think Henry is proposing to just remove the by provider. Henry, is that correct?

Henry Cooperman:

That's correct.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Not the by. Yes, that's correct.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Is there a second for Henry's motion? Ro seconds. Okay. All right. Discussion? Yes, John. You're good. You're not on mute.

John Ehrenreich:

Who, me?

Mariya Hurwitz:

John. Yes. Sorry. I thought you heard me.

John Ehrenreich:

No, I oppose it. I mean, I understand the issue of the cost, but at the same time, the at-home tests are both less persuasive. And if we're using simply home tests, it's purely, somebody says, oh yeah, I took a test. There's no evidence of it one way or another. And part of the context for my feeling this way is we were talking before about vaccination rates and the Sherman vaccination rates for age 45 to 64 are 67%, which is the lowest by anywhere from six to 20 points of any of the surrounding towns. So I learned that we're in a situation of some vulnerability and yet we're relying on when people who haven't, I mean, to it's sort of bluntly, people who haven't had the courtesy to their neighbors to get vaccinated and yet we're going to trust on their just saying, oh yeah, I took a test. It's fine.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Dee?

Dee Ratterree:

I agree with John.

Mariya Hurwitz:

I mean we're going to vote. Did you want to make comments?

Dee Ratterree:

Yes, I would put back in by a provider.

Mariya Hurwitz:

All right. We have to go. We're going to vote on Henry's motion and then if it passes ... Irit, I thought I saw your hand raised. No?

Irit Granger:

I was mainly going to say that I agree with John.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Mariya?

Mariya Hurwitz:

Yes, Laura?

Laura Jagodzinski:

Just check if there's no more discussion, then it's time for a vote.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Is there any more discussion on the removal of by a provider? Ro, go ahead.

Ro D'Ostilio:

I think there will be some difficulty having people pay \$140 more to get that kind of test. I think the validity issue that people have with tests is very similar to the validity on the other side that people have with the vaccine and people getting COVID who are vaccinated. So I don't know that that argument, in certain circles, holds up. Or not argument, I don't want to use that word, but that line of logic doesn't necessarily hold up. And I understand trying to keep people safe. You're talking to somebody who is vaccinated and boosted. I get it. I am thinking of our community and the demographics of it and the overall feel of it, and the fact that we are doing this without having, and no offense to Barb and Dee. I appreciate all the work you've done on the COVID committee, but we haven't brought in anybody else.

Ro D'Ostilio:

I know Laura's been helping as well, but the bigger picture here of the town and of what we're actually asking them to do for our first event, trying to get people out to fundraise for, I think by requiring them to pay more money to do it, we're going to be going to turn off more people than just the people who are not vaccinated. That's it.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Dee?

Dee Ratterree:

This is, I think, purely a logistical problem. If we're requiring proof of full vaccination or a negative test, how do you prove that you've had a negative test if there's not a provider? I mean, when you have a full vaccination, you have a piece of paper, right? I don't know. I don't think people are really going to cheat on this. I'm finding it a little bit wobbly, I think, that-

Ro D'Ostilio:

Agreed.

Dee Ratterree:

... should you bring in the stick that you did that morning that was blue? Or is that for babies? I don't know. And if it is for babies, that is truly only ... I don't disagree with Ro at all. I don't understand how we know that you've had a negative home test? How do we know that?

Mariya Hurwitz:

Barb, go ahead.

Barb Ireland:

It was my understanding that New Milford hospital was doing free tests. Now I don't know if they still are, but that was as of, I think, last week.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Is there any more discussion on this?

Dee Ratterree:

I went to New Milford hospital today, and it has a sign on the door that says we don't do anything about COVID.

Barb Ireland:

Really?

Dee Ratterree:

Yeah. I spent my whole ... but anyway. Yeah.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Laura, is your hand raised? Okay.

Laura Jagodzinski:

So the logistics of providing proof of a negative test by someone other than a provider is pretty complicated, right? To Dee's point, what are you going to do? Bring in a test strip, and how do we know it's your test strip? Each test is different as to how the results are handled. At this point in time, I don't know how to handle any of those logistics. And so if we don't have any way to handle those logistics, I

don't know how to say that that's an option. Is it the test by a provider, is that a detail and something that's discussed in the details like what proof of a vaccination is? We have a little bit more time to figure that out. I don't know the answers. I'm just raising that as a question.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. I don't think Jeff has had a chance to talk on this issue yet.

Jeff Matusow:

So I was going to say exactly what you just said, Laura, that perhaps this is something that like the date, we gloss over it here the details of it, because I agree, there is no way that we could effectively and realistically have people do home tests and us check it. Because you do a home test and they say on them check it 15 minutes, but after 30 minutes you can't trust it. I don't think anyone's going to cheat and all that, but I just think it's a waste of motion. So why don't we punt this one again like we did with the date and keep it vague here, and it'll go in the details and hopefully we're all going to pray really hard that this is all a moot point again and it won't matter.

Jeff Matusow:

But if it is relevant, then we're going to have to figure it out two weeks before the event and we'll have real data. What does it cost to get a test? Does it cost to get a test? If there's a big flare up of COVID again, COVID tests will be free again. Again, I feel like we're making policy and I realize it's not six weeks, we're 10 weeks away. Right? We're making policy for something that we really have no idea what it's going to be like. I think we keep this as general and vague as possible and everything will get referred to that last sentence, details will be on the website.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. John?

John Ehrenreich:

I don't object to Jeff's position, but just as a piece of information, as of six days ago, the state of Connecticut provided cost free COVID testing at sites in both Danbury and Kent.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Thank you. Okay. Is there any more discussion or I'm going to take a vote on whether to accept the amended language?

Dee Ratterree:

Just quickly to say I looked up New Milford hospital. I don't think it is given free. I can't find it anywhere on their website, but if you can go to Kent, that's fab.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Yes, Barb?

Barb Ireland:

I did look up urgent care centers and they're giving them at urgent care centers. I don't know how much they cost there, but you can get them there.

Ro D'Ostilio:

Yeah. That's 130.

Barb Ireland:

That is 130?

Ro D'Ostilio:

to a 140 to be reimbursed. And as far as the tests through Kent and Danbury, they are on certain days at certain times, which may or may not fit into our timeframe for people to be tested.

John Ehrenreich:

The Danbury one is Monday through Friday, 3:00 to 7:00 PM and Saturday and Sunday, 9:00 to 3:00 PM. The Kent one is Tuesdays 3:00 to 6:00 and Thursdays 3:00 to 6:00. So Kent is somewhat limited, but Danbury is virtually nonstop.

Ro D'Ostilio:

And maybe that's something that if that's the direction we end up going, you can put that in the FAQs of where they can go to do that.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Yep. For sure.

Barb Ireland:

That's a good idea.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. We haven't heard from Lauren yet tonight. Lauren? Come off mute first, Lauren. You have to come off mute. I'm sure you're saying wonderful things, I just can't hear you.

Lauren Kenney:

Sorry.

Mariya Hurwitz:

That's okay.

Lauren Kenney:

I have COVID right now so I can tell you I've gotten many tests in the past day and they were all free. If you have insurance, they're all free. You can get home tests for free. You can go to a drive through and a lot of pharmacies and get it free. Doesn't everybody have insurance? I think the government requires everybody to have insurance. So it's all free.

Ro D'Ostilio:

But you're symptomatic, Lauren. When you're symptomatic, you get it for free. If you're asymptomatic or you're just doing it for flying or something like that, you have to pay for it. The insurance company doesn't cover it.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay.

Ro D'Ostilio:

I'm sorry, Lauren.

Lauren Kenney:

It's okay. I'm not that sick, luckily.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Yeah. I'm sorry too.

Barb Ireland:

I'm glad you're not.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. I am going to read Henry's ... we're going to vote on Henry's motion to amend the motion you see on the screen by removing by a provider in the sentence that if the map indicates red or orange. So Laura, looks like you're about to say something.

Laura Jagodzinski:

By a provider is in two places.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Right. It actually was not motioned to remove it in the second place. That may have been implied, but it wasn't.

Henry Cooperman:

Trying to be like what Jeff said. I think the more vague we are, the better off we are.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. So are you withdrawing your motion, Henry, to amend the language?

Henry Cooperman:

Just to take out by a provider, or just again, both where it says by a provider, to withdraw it.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Is that correct?



Laura Jagodzinski:

So Henry, just to clarify, you're withdrawing your motion?

Henry Cooperman:

I'm not.

Barb Ireland:

No, he's not.

Henry Cooperman:

I'm amending my motion.

Mariya Hurwitz:

You're amending your motion to remove this as well?

Henry Cooperman:

Correct.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Okay. Can everybody see this on the screen? I'll read it. Okay. And then we'll vote.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Mariya, you just need to say the motion is to amend this motion by removing by a provider in the two sentences.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Yes, Dee?

Dee Ratterree:

Can we just say something like future details will be posted on the website? Indicates-

Mariya Hurwitz:

It's Henry's motion, so ...

Dee Ratterree:

So no. Okay. Never mind. Never mind. Never mind.

Henry Cooperman:

It's okay, Dee. I kind of like that also.

Dee Ratterree:

Don't want to step on your toes, Henry.

Henry Cooperman:

It's okay.

Barb Ireland:

Mariya, I have one question. Is it okay with Ro to remove the second by a provider? Because she seconded.

Henry Cooperman:

She seconded it.

Ro D'Ostilio:

Yes.

Barb Ireland:

Okay.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Thank you. All right. Thanks, Barb. Okay. So we will be voting on Henry's motion to amend the existing motion by removing by a provider in two places and inserting the word future in front of details will be posted on the website. Irit, go ahead.

Irit Granger:

I'm sorry, if we accept this motion, does that mean that by a provider will be posted on the website?

Mariya Hurwitz:

No.

Irit Granger:

No?

Mariya Hurwitz:

No. It means it then would have to be voted on again to be the motion.

Irit Granger:

Okay. Thank you.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. So does everybody understand what we're voting on?

Dee Ratterree:

Yeah, but fix the D on details.

Mariya Hurwitz:

I made it little. I got rid of the big D and I made it a little D.

Henry Cooperman:

The big D is still there.

Mariya Hurwitz:

No, it's got a line through it. You just can't see it. It does.

Henry Cooperman:

Oh, yes, I do now. I'm sorry.

Mariya Hurwitz:

That's okay.

Laura Jagodzinski:

So just to clarify, I think Barb's going the same way too. That's a different amendment that hasn't been seconded.

Barb Ireland:

Right. We have an amendment before us. Point of order. We have an amendment before us to remove by provider in two places. That is the amendment that we are dealing with.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Henry actually also asked to insert the word future.

Barb Ireland:

But that was not part of his original amendment. I mean, we can do it, but if you were in the business world, you would not be allowed to do that. Somewhere out there.

Laura Jagodzinski:

A motion was made. It was seconded. Either the motion gets withdrawn and a new motion made.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay.

Henry Cooperman:

Okay. So I'd like to withdraw the original motion and make a motion to remove by a provider in both spots and add the word future in the last sentence.

Barb Ireland:

And you need to check with Ro if she's in favor of-

Henry Cooperman:

She's raising her hand.

Barb Ireland:

[crosstalk 01:10:09] the first amendment and seconding this amendment. Is that okay, Ro?

Mariya Hurwitz:

Are you in favor of withdrawing your second of the first amendment?

Ro D'Ostilio:

Yes.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. And are you in favor of seconding this amendment?

Ro D'Ostilio:

Absolutely. Yes.

Barb Ireland:

Okay.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay.

Barb Ireland:

That makes it legal. Now you can vote.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Now we will be voting on Henry's proposed amendment and Ro's second to remove by a provider twice and to insert the word future in front of details will be posted on the website. All in favor?

Laura Jagodzinski:

I can't see Lauren. Okay. Give me a second. I'm going to vote for as well. Okay. I have for in favor, Henry, Ro, Irit, Laura, Lauren, Jeff, and Dee.

Barb Ireland:

And Barbara.

Laura Jagodzinski:

And Barbara.

Dee Ratterree:

We couldn't see your hand.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Mariya?

Barb Ireland:

Like this.

Mariya Hurwitz:

I'm sorry, if we're voting, we're approving this motion for this amended language, but then we're going to vote on the language itself?

Laura Jagodzinski:

Yes, right now we're just, we're voting on the amend-

Mariya Hurwitz:

I'm fine with the amended language.

Laura Jagodzinski:

Okay. So John?

John Ehrenreich:

No.

Laura Jagodzinski:

All right. It's approved by a majority.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. What is our next step, Barb?

Barb Ireland:

All right. You have the amendment. Now you read the motion as amended and we vote on that.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. All right. I am going to read the motion as amended, and it is also up on your screen. Here hold on, let me ... okay motion to set requirements for entrance to the women's soiree based on the state of Connecticut COVID-19 weekly data tracker average daily rate map for Sherman as follows. If the map indicates red or orange, then proof of full vaccination or negative test is required. If the map indicates gray or yellow, then full vaccination or a negative test is encouraged. Future details will be posted on the website. Can I have a second?

Dee Ratterree:

I second, but can you take the comma out after map?

Mariya Hurwitz:

Oh, does that matter, Barb? Can I just remove a comma here?

Barb Ireland:

Yes, that's a technical thing.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Okay. And so Dee seconded.

Dee Ratterree:

Seconded.

Mariya Hurwitz:

All right. It's open to discussion. I'd like to, if we could, keep it to three minutes or less per person so we can move our meeting along, but not to hush anybody, but Barb, go ahead.

Barb Ireland:

I guess I have a question. As amended, are people going to get the idea that they can do a home test from this language?

Henry Cooperman:

Personally, I don't think so. I think that by putting future details on the website will help clarify that and gives us some protection of being vague in that respect, especially during this time of we have a budget vote coming up in the town, and I just want to probably try to be as user friendly as possible. If we could get people to take a provider test, then are we going to say it's going to be a PTR test or are we going to accept a PCR test or are we going to require just a regular test? So I think there's those variables that come into play. I think that we don't necessarily want to paint ourselves in a corner yet. I think we all hope that this becomes a moot point, but that's my two cents.

Barb Ireland:

Okay. Just for the record then, I don't want anyone to be [inaudible 01:15:24]. I hear what you're saying, Henry, and that does make sense. As long as we all understand that in the future, the future details may have to say that it requires more than a home test. We hope not because we hope that the numbers are going to go down enough so that we can do what we say if it's gray or yellow, but I don't want us to try to fool anybody either.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Laura?

Dee Ratterree:

Is anybody fooled?

Barb Ireland:

No, I'm just saying, I don't want to try to fool anybody into a false sense of security.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Laura, go ahead.

Laura Jagodzinski:

So I agree with Barb. I think we're going to have to put information on our website as soon as we're ready to sell tickets. All right? And we're going to have to be clear as to what we're doing. And in some cases, if we don't know yet, then it needs to say to be determined.

Barb Ireland:

Yeah.

Laura Jagodzinski:

All right? And that's not this motion, right. [crosstalk 01:16:38] are going to be a next step on how and what those FAQs are, because people are going to look and say, "What does this mean?" They're going to go to the website for more information. And if we don't have an answer right now, then I think the website needs to say to be determined. Because to be determined means it could be by a provider. It might be a self test, but it has to say to be determined. That's not part of this vote.

Henry Cooperman:

So it's not part of this vote.

Laura Jagodzinski:

No.

Mariya Hurwitz:

I'm raising my hand because I cannot find the raise my hand feature on my own.

Henry Cooperman:

It's under reactions.

Mariya Hurwitz:

For whatever reason, I don't have a reaction. It might be because I'm screen sharing.

Henry Cooperman:

Okay. I don't have it either because you're on there.

Mariya Hurwitz:

I'm concerned that we're putting ourselves in a position where we are going to have to come back together as a board and vote on what we mean by our future details.

Dee Ratterree:

We are.

Mariya Hurwitz:

I want everybody to understand if that's what we maybe agree to here that we've agreed to, that we're going to use the map. Okay. That's great. We've agreed to the map as our decision driver, but we're still going to have to come to agreement as a board on what those details mean. I don't think saying we've come to agreement on this with a board vote and then the COVID advisory committee makes the decision on what the details mean, that's not going to make anybody happy. So I just want to be clear that that's what it appears to me we're setting ourselves up for.

Henry Cooperman:

I'd like to, if it's okay, go back to what Ro suggested about getting involved with having a health provider maybe join the advisory committee or be part of the school and the town's advisory committee, or reach out to our health director, Tim Simpkins, to get his input about how we should go forward after this gets approved or doesn't get approved.

Laura Jagodzinski:

I think there's-

Ro D'Ostilio:

Tim Simpkins is one of the guys on that panel between school and the town. And the reason it's the school is because they're the biggest employer of residents in Sherman.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Let's continue to use the raise your hand and try to give everybody a chance to speak so we can end up in a place where we can vote. Go ahead, Barb.

Barb Ireland:

We have reached out to him on numerous occasions with questions. I just want the board to understand that we have done that.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Laura, did you have your hand raised anew or?

Laura Jagodzinski:

Yeah, I just wanted to reinforce Barb's comment. Tim Simpkins has provided a [inaudible 01:19:46] to almost every one of the COVID meetings when I was on the advisory team. So we've gotten his input consistently. Henry, I think you're right. Getting involved in that group that meets that Ro told us about is excellent, but we're also going to need to get together to define the details on what is proof of vaccine and what is proof of a negative test. And yes, I think we're all going to have to agree on it.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Yes, Barb?

Barb Ireland:



Just to go back for a moment. The last state data tracker before the soiree is the 19th where people could reasonably get tested if they had to be. There's one the day before, but they can't do a PCR test the day before. So if we look at the data, and I don't want to put this in writing anywhere, but for instance, if we look at the data and it's red or orange, then we're going to have to meet and say, "Okay, what are we going to require for a negative test?" The original language made it clear. If it's gray or yellow, we don't really have to be because the original language of the motion said it's encouraged, and that would be valid.

Dee Ratterree:

It's still there.

Henry Cooperman:

It still is.

Dee Ratterree:

Encouraged.

Barb Ireland:

Right. That's what I'm saying. If it were or gray or yellow, we would not have to meet because it just says full vaccination or a negative test is encouraged. Okay? [crosstalk 01:21:41] we would have to meet if it was red or orange and we would have to then put in the details on the website, and I think we would need at least a week for people to know that, what you mean by a negative test.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Are generally people comfortable with the idea of, and this is nothing we're voting on, but if we were to meet as a board around the 19th when we have that most recent data and make a decision?

Female:

Yes.

Dee Ratterree:

Yes.

Henry Cooperman:

I think that's very fair.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay, Laura?

Laura Jagodzinski:

I think that that's fine for the tail end as we get closer, but if people are going to look on our website today for more information, we just need to have some information on the website that says something about this.

Barb Ireland:

Says to be determined.

Laura Jagodzinski:

That's what it is, that's what it is.

Barb Ireland:

I mean, that's what you had suggested earlier.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. Dee?

Dee Ratterree:

I was just going to say to be determined, I wanted to raise my head there, doesn't lock us in, but gives us wiggle room. I think that's completely sensible.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay.

Henry Cooperman:

Exactly.

Mariya Hurwitz:

All right. Is there any more discussion on this issue or can I read this motion? You've given me the thumbs up Barb?

Barb Ireland:

Well, you read the motion before and it's already been seconded. The amendment is in it and we've done the discussion. So the only thing you need to do is ask are we ready for the vote. Is there any further discussion? And then if there is no further discussion, then we can vote.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Right. Is there any further discussion before I conduct the vote? Okay. So we'll be voting on the motion you see on the screen. Do I need to read it, Barb, or we're good?

Barb Ireland:

You've got it already.

Mariya Hurwitz:

It's been read already. All right. So all in favor?

Barb Ireland:

You doing roll call or hands?

Mariya Hurwitz:

No, we're just doing hands. Lauren, is your hand up? I can't tell. Okay. Motion passed. Thank you, everybody. So we will stay in touch with everyone. I think the COVID committee and the soiree will have to get the website updated with to be determined language. But I think we accomplished what we needed to accomplish for tonight. So thank you very much.

Henry Cooperman:

Thank you for a job well done and that everybody was very civil and we could agree to disagree, and we all have passionate feelings about the last two years of our lives, how upside down they've been, but I think that this was a win-win for everybody on this board.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Agreed. Thank you all for keeping it calm, cool and collected. Laura, were you going to say something?

Laura Jagodzinski:

Yes. So Jamie and I will be working on the website this week. Right, Jamie? And so my suggestion is we take the information from the motion and that's what we use with to be determined on the proof.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay.

Jamie Cantoni:

Yes. Agreed. I was actually going to reach out to you and Dee and Barb tomorrow regarding this based on the decision of the board.

Mariya Hurwitz:

And I will send this over to you, Laura, so you have the official wording here. You probably wrote it down already.

Laura Jagodzinski:

I took a screenshot.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Oh, okay. You're good. All right. Excellent.

Laura Jagodzinski:

If you send it to me, that'd be easier.

Mariya Hurwitz:

Okay. All right, everybody. Jamie, you can stop recording. Oh, I'd like to adjourn the meeting at 7:59 PM.