

Comments from Nikki Milevsky, First Vice-President of the Sacramento City Teachers Association (SCTA) and Cindee Stewart to the Sacramento City Unified School District Board of Education, March 4, 2021. This combines their time.

## Item 7.2 School Reopening

Today, the biggest impediment standing in the way of SCUSD schools reopening for in-person instruction is Superintendent Aguilar's refusal to spend \$2 million on proven, easily accessible, and affordable portable HEPA air filters and CO2 monitors.

\$2 million. When the District has received \$128 million from the federal government in coronavirus relief—federal funds targeted for exactly this purpose: mitigating the spread of COVID-19 and helping schools to resume in-person instruction as soon as it can be done safely.

On February 11<sup>th</sup>, SCTA presented to SCUSD our 5-point plan for reopening. (See attached)

On February 18<sup>th</sup>, we gave SCUSD a more formal proposal. (See attached.)

Vaccinations: Sac City staff is in the process of being vaccinated and if the supply of vaccines continues, we are on pace to see all staff offered the vaccine with the appropriate waiting period for the vaccine to take effect to meet or come very close to the April 8<sup>th</sup> reopening date target. And we want to acknowledge the great work that Health Services Director Victoria Flores has done, working with our school nurses, to get SCUSD's vaccination clinic up and running.

Low Community Spread: Sacramento County's case rate and positivity rate continues to improve. Current projections are that we will be entering the red tier in a few weeks, again meeting or coming very close to the April 8<sup>th</sup> reopening target date.

Ventilation: Here is the biggest impediment—and it shouldn't be. Virtually anyone with knowledge of COVID mitigation measures in the United States from the CDC, to the CDPH, the Sacramento County Department of Public Health, the White House, Congress, the Governor, the State Legislature, and most importantly the scientific experts like Theresa Pistochini from UC Davis, Dr. Richard Corsi, Dean of the College of Engineering at Portland State University, the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) are united in

finding that without improvements in ventilation and filtration in schools, airborne particles will linger in classrooms and spread the virus.

The experts also are in agreement that portable, affordable HEPA air filters, in combination with CO2 sensors to monitor ventilation is cost-effective, and in the words of Dr. Richard Corsi, an “easy way” to immediately improve air quality.

In other words, on this issue the science is settled. Portable HEPA air filters, together with CO2 monitors, work.

Theresa Pistoichini of UC Davis, the co-author of the definitive white paper on school ventilation (see attached), has specifically recommended that SCUSD use portable HEPA filters and CO2 monitors and avoid using the unproven UDVI air “purifiers.” (See attached). The Sacramento Bee provided detailed coverage of the advantage of using cost effective, HEPA portables, versus the UDVI units.

And they are readily available and accessible. At a cost of approximately \$250 per unit, SCUSD could equip every one of its approximately 1600 classrooms with 1-3 portable HEPA units depending upon classroom size and a CO2 monitor for under \$2 million.

\$2 million!

That’s 1.6% of the \$128 million SCUSD has received in federal COVID relief funds already. This does not factor in the tens of millions more the District will receive when the Biden administration’s \$1.9 trillion relief package, the largest in American history, is signed into law next week.

\$2 million.

What the District has been telling the press is that the portable HEPA filters and CO2 monitors “aren’t required by the State,” as if that’s an excuse not to spend money the District clearly has on an improvement that experts agree will significantly improve the health and safety of students and staff, and not just in this pandemic, but in response to wildfires and others risks in the future. A 2013 study by scientists at the Berkley Lab found that improved ventilation reduces student absences, while other studies have established the connection between ventilation and improved learning and test scores.

The science says portable HEPA filters and CO2 monitors work.

The District has the money.

What cannot be explained is why Superintendent Aguilar is unwilling to spend \$2 million to both immediately improve the learning environment for students and the working conditions for staff.

As a school board, you have a moral and fiscal duty, to act in the best interest of students and staff. As Dr. Corsi has said, this is a no-brainer, whether it's "required by the state," or not.



**Sacramento City Teachers Association (SCTA)**  
**Framework for Reopening for In-Person Learning in**  
**Sacramento City Unified Schools (SCUSD)**  
**February 9, 2021**

*In early February, the education unions in California including the California Teachers Association, the California Federation of Teachers, the Service Employees International Union and others released "Classroom Learning and Safe Schools for Employees and Students (CLASSES): A Pathway to Bringing Students Back to Schools." Consistent with the recommendations contained therein the Sacramento City Teachers Association (SCTA) provides the following framework proposal to reopen Sacramento City Unified School District (SCUSD) schools:*

1. **Vaccination:** all staff reporting to District school or worksites must have the opportunity (eligibility and access) to be vaccinated at the recommended dosage with the appropriate time elapsed for the vaccinations to take effect. Accommodations will be made for staff who are medically unable to receive the vaccination or who have extenuating family circumstances that would preclude them from in-person instruction during this pandemic.
2. **Ventilation:** Worksite must be equipped with either:
  - a. currently equipped with a centralized HVAC system that provides air filtration with a minimum efficiency reporting value (MERV) of 13 or better; or
  - b. Currently equipped with a centralized HVAC system that provides air filtration with a minimum efficiency reporting value (MERV) of 8, AND, portable air filtration units with a clean air delivery rate (CADR) of 250 or greater per 1000 square feet of floor area.

In both circumstances, occupied areas shall be equipped with carbon dioxide monitors, according to the provisions of AB 841, section 1625. The monitor will provide carbon dioxide readings to the teacher, and an indicator light or alert system when the carbon dioxide level in a classroom or occupied area has exceeded 1,100 ppm.

3. **Mitigation:** A multi-layered approach to provide the greatest protection to students and staff, including but not limited to:
  - a. **Prioritization of Students in Need**
  - b. **Asymptomatic Testing and Robust Contact Tracing**
  - c. **Safe and Hygienic Schools**
  - d. **Physical Distancing**
  - e. **Masking Requirements**

4. **Low-levels of Community Spread**: School should not reopen until Sacramento County is in the Red Tier or better. The standard should be met in all zip codes in the Sacramento City Unified School District.

-----

5. **Student Interventions\***: Federal COVID relief funding should be used to improve services to students in this time of great need, including but not limited to, the implementation of the following:
  - a. Restorative Practices
  - b. Multi-tiered Systems of Support
  - c. Continued Distance Learning Options for Students
  - d. Targeted Student Interventions, including after-school tutoring, summer school and lower class sizes.

*\*Student interventions can be developed after in-person instruction has resumed.*

Proposed Memorandum of Understanding  
Between  
Sacramento City Unified School District (SCUSD)  
&  
Sacramento City Teachers Association (SCTA)

**Safely Reopening Schools to In-Person Instruction/Services**

**February 26, 2021**

WHEREAS, the Parties agree that the health and safety of our students, staff, families and community is at the forefront of a return to onsite instruction;

and WHEREAS, the Parties acknowledge that guidelines, requirements, and procedures may change based on State and/or County guidelines and evolving scientific information;

THEREFORE, the Parties agree as follows:

1.1. **Onsite Mitigation Factors.** The Parties will follow health and safety guidelines established by the Centers for Disease Control (“CDC”), the California Department of Public Health (“CDPH”), and the Sacramento County Department of Public Health (“SCDPH”). With the exception of Ventilation and Filtration discussed below, the parties will continue to negotiate over the on-site mitigation factors that will be in effect upon the commencement of in-person instruction.

1.1 (a) **Ventilation and Filtration:** In-person instruction may commence when the following ventilation and filtration mitigation standards are in place at each facility classroom, auditorium, gymnasium, nurses’ office, or other occupied area:

1. currently equipped with a centralized HVAC system that provides air filtration with a minimum efficiency reporting value (MERV) of 13 or better; or
2. Currently equipped with a centralized HVAC system that provides air filtration with a minimum efficiency reporting value (MERV) of 8, AND, portable air filtration units with a clean air delivery rate (CADR) of 250 or greater per 1000 square feet of floor area.

In both circumstances, occupied areas shall be equipped with carbon dioxide monitors, according to the provisions of AB 841, section 1625. The monitor will provide carbon dioxide readings to the teacher, and an indicator light or alert system when the carbon dioxide level in a classroom or occupied area has exceeded 1,100 ppm.

The District will not use the UDVI portable units in any area where unit members work.

The readiness of each classroom shall be verified by a Certified Testing, Adjusting and Balancing (TAB) Technician who shall review the HVAC system, including its capacity and airflow, and ventilation rates in each facility classroom, auditorium, gymnasium, nurses’ office, and other occupied areas. Certification shall be as set forth in AB 841, section 1620. The Certified TAB technician shall prepare an assessment report for each classroom or occupied space for review by a

licensed professional, as set forth in AB 841, Section 1626. The District shall provide a copy of the assessment report(s) to SCTA.

The Classroom Readiness Assessments shall include calculation of the required minimum outside ventilation rates for each occupied area based on the maximum possible occupancy and the minimum ventilation rate per occupant set forth in Table 120.1-A of Part 6 (commencing with Section 100.0) of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Occupied spaces must meet the ventilation requirements of Table 120.1-A

**1.2. County Risk Level.** Onsite instruction may commence, and all staff may return onsite when the Sacramento County risk level enters the Red Tier as currently defined by the California Department of Public Health, and according to California's Blueprint for a Safer Economy. The Parties shall return to the bargaining table if the CDPH criteria for risk level tiers changes.

**1.3. COVID Vaccinations.**

1.3.1. Prior to reporting in-person to District schools or worksites for required instruction/services with students, unit members shall have had the opportunity (eligibility and access) to be fully vaccinated for achieved immunity at the prescribed schedule.

1.3.2. The District shall actively support and assist the Sacramento Department of Public Health to ensure the COVID-19 vaccine is widely available and easily accessible to staff, to the best of the District's ability, including the measures listed below:

1.3.2.1. The Parties shall communicate with all unit members in writing about the availability of the COVID-19 vaccine to them, including where they may receive the vaccine and how to make an appointment, if necessary, to receive the vaccine;

1.3.2.2. The District shall each provide to all unit members written educational materials about the vaccine, including accurate information from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) on the vaccine's benefits, risks, and efficacy rates and shall encourage them to be vaccinated against COVID-19;

1.3.2.3. Unit members may use 2-hours to be vaccinated during their work hours without loss of pay. In extenuating circumstances, unit members shall be able to utilize more than 2-hours of paid time in order to be vaccinated.

1.3.2.4. The District shall provide paid five (5) days sick leave to any staff person who is ill from side effects from receiving the COVID-19 vaccine without requiring that staff to use leave banks or accrued leave.

**1.4 Instructional Models:** The parties will continue to negotiate over the Instructional Models related to the commencement of in-person schools. The parties agree that there will continue to be a Distance Learning Only option available to students.

**1.5 Commencement of In-person Instruction:** While negotiations continue regarding "Onsite Mitigation Factors," and "Instructional Models," as set forth above, and anticipating that the all SCUSD employees will have been vaccinated in accordance with Section 1.3 above, "COVID

Vaccinations,” and that Sacramento County will have been in the red tier for two weeks, the parties agree to a targeted commencement of in-person instruction according to the following:

- a. April 8: Pre-K through 3 and all K-6 Special Day Class students;
- b. April 15: All 4-6 grade students
- c. May 6: 7-12 Grade students

**1.5 Onsite Training and Unit Member Preparation.** Unit members shall return onsite prior to students returning. Onsite training related to health, safety, and site procedures, and unit member preparation will occur one week prior to students returning onsite.

**1.6 Return to Work Survey:** Upon the execution of this agreement, the District will survey bargaining unit members to determine the following information:

- a. Staff who intend to return to in-person instruction provided that vaccinations have been made available, and mitigation steps will be implemented, including agreed-upon ventilation and filtration standards;
- b. Staff who intend to return to in-person instruction provided that vaccinations have been made available, and mitigation steps will be implemented, including agreed-upon ventilation and filtration standards, but staff may need assistance.
- c. Staff who do not intend to return to in-person instruction, but continue to teach remotely;
- d. Staff who do not intend to return.

**1.7 Continued Bargaining:** The Parties will continue to bargain the impacts and effects of the specific details of educator return.

**1.8 Non-precedent setting:** This agreement is non-precedent setting.

**1.9 Expiration Date:** This Agreement shall expire in full without precedent on the last day of the 2020-2021 traditional school year, unless extended by mutual written agreement.

For SCTA

For SCUSD

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



**WHITE PAPER**  
**Proposed Ventilation and Energy Efficiency**  
**Verification/Repair Program for School Reopening**

Prepared by  
Christopher Ruch, NEMI – Director of Training  
Theresa Pistochni, UC Davis Energy and Efficiency Institute – Engineering Manager

September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020 Version 3

This paper presents a proposal for a Ventilation and Energy Efficiency Verification/Repair Program that would prepare schools for reopening during the COVID-19 crisis. This program includes certifying school facilities as having functioning air ventilation and filtration systems that meet or exceed OSHA and California Energy Commission requirements, and, to the extent feasible, that meet ventilation and filtration recommendations for reopening schools set forth by the World Health Organization (WHO), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE), as well as any applicable local and state agency school reopening guidance. Providing adequate ventilation and filtration, however, can significantly increase energy demand if not done correctly or where a system is already inefficient or poorly maintained. The program would also ensure that systems are operating energy efficiently and will identify recommendations for efficiency and safety upgrades.

This program would require recipients to (1) assess, maintain, adjust, and, if necessary, repair existing heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems to verify proper and efficient operation, as well as compliance with health and safety standards; (2) install carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) sensors in classrooms to verify that proper ventilation is maintained throughout the school year; and (3) prepare an HVAC Assessment Report documenting the work performed and identifying any additional system balancing, upgrades, replacements or other measures recommended to improve the health, safety, and/or efficiency of the HVAC system. School Facilities that comply with these requirements would be provided a COVID-19 Reopening Ventilation Verification Certificate for posting in the building.

Research has shown that underventilation of classrooms is common and negatively impacts student health and learning. A 2003 report to the Legislature by the California Air Resources Board and the State Department of Health Services found significant indoor air quality problems in California schools, including problems with ventilation, temperature and humidity, air pollutants, floor dust contaminants, moisture, mold, noise, and lighting. The report found that ventilation with outdoor air was inadequate during 40% of classroom hours and seriously

deficient during 10% of classroom hours, in both portable classrooms and traditional classrooms.<sup>1</sup>

The California Building Energy Efficiency Standards has set minimum ventilation rates for classrooms.<sup>2</sup> The California Education Code requires school districts to maintain schools in good repair, including HVAC systems that are functional, supply adequate ventilation to classrooms, and maintain interior temperatures within acceptable ranges.<sup>3</sup> Despite these requirements, poor performing HVAC systems and underventilation of classrooms continues to be a persistent problem in California.

A 2020 report by the University of California-Davis Western Cooling Efficiency Center and the Indoor Environment Group of Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory found over half of new HVAC systems in schools had significant problems within three years of installation, and that the vast majority of classrooms in California continue to fail to meet minimum ventilation rates.<sup>4</sup> Nearly 20% of classrooms had average daily maximum CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations above 2,000 ppm, where an adequately ventilated classroom should not exceed a concentration of 1,100 ppm. The researchers recommended periodic testing of HVAC systems and continuous real-time CO<sub>2</sub> monitoring to detect and correct these problems.

The persistence of underperforming HVAC systems and inadequate ventilation rates in the classroom is of particular concern as California looks to reopen schools during the COVID-19 pandemic. An April 2020 paper by ASHRAE found that viruses such as COVID-19 can spread through the air in two ways. Larger droplets travel between 6 and 7 feet before dropping to the ground, but smaller droplets can evaporate and become aerosolized, remaining airborne for extended periods.<sup>5</sup> SARS-CoV-2 virus has been found within aerosols for 3 hours in one study<sup>6</sup> and viable up to 16 hours in another study<sup>7</sup>. Additionally, 239 scientists have signed on open letter urging the WHO to recognize and mitigate the potential for airborne spread of COVID-19.<sup>8</sup> Increasing filtration levels and ventilation rates removes and dilutes these aerosolized viruses, reducing the

---

<sup>1</sup> Whitmore, et al., California Portable Classrooms Study, Phase II: Main Study, Final Report, Volume II., Report to the California Air Resources Board and California Department of Health Services (2003) at pp. xxii & xxiii ([https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/research/apr/past/00-317\\_v2.pdf](https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/research/apr/past/00-317_v2.pdf)).

<sup>2</sup> See Cal. Code Regs. tit. 24, Part 6, Section 120.1 and Table 120.1-A (Minimum Ventilation Rates).

<sup>3</sup> Cal. Education Code §§ 17070.75 & 17002.

<sup>4</sup> Chan, et al, Ventilation rates in California classrooms: Why many recent HVAC retrofits are not delivering sufficient ventilation, *Building and Environment Journal* 167 (2020) (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360132319306365>).

<sup>5</sup> ASHRAE, ASHRAE Position Document on Infectious Aerosols. ASHRAE (April 2020), ([https://www.ashrac.org/file%20library/about/position%20documents/pd\\_infectiousaerosols\\_2020.pdf](https://www.ashrac.org/file%20library/about/position%20documents/pd_infectiousaerosols_2020.pdf))

<sup>6</sup> Van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN, et al. Aerosol and surface stability of SARS-Cov-2 as compared with SARS-Cov-1. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382:1564-7. <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/nejmc2004973>.

<sup>7</sup> Fears, A. C., Klimstra, W. B., Duprex, P., Hartman, A., Weaver, S. C., Plante, K. S....Roy, C. J. (June 22, 2020). Persistence of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Aerosol Suspensions. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 26(9), 2168-2171. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2609.201806>

<sup>8</sup> Lidia Morawska, Donald K Milton, It is Time to Address Airborne Transmission of COVID-19, *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, , ciaa939, <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa939>

risk of infection for occupants. For that reason, WHO<sup>9</sup>, the CDC<sup>10</sup> and ASHRAE<sup>11</sup> recommend ensuring ventilation systems operate properly, increasing ventilation rates, and installing filters with a minimum efficiency rating value (MERV) of 13 or better where possible in order to reduce the spread of COVID-19. A May 2020 report by Dr. Jovan Pantelic at U.C. Berkeley further recommends continuous CO<sub>2</sub> monitoring and maintaining relative humidity in the range of 40%-60%.<sup>12</sup>

These steps can however increase energy consumption, particularly in systems that are already inefficient due to age, deferred maintenance or improper installation. Studies have shown that the efficiency of an HVAC system is highly dependent on the quality of its installation. Poor quality installation of HVAC systems results in a 20% to 30% increase in energy use.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, poor quality installation is pervasive. A study by the California Energy Commission found that over 50% of new HVAC systems and 85% of replacement HVAC systems that they evaluated were not performing correctly due to poor quality installation.<sup>8</sup> Utility-funded studies have found the vast majority of HVAC installers don't have the technical training, knowledge, skills, or abilities to properly install systems, resulting in high failure rates for job performance on even routine tasks.<sup>14</sup>

The program would prepare schools to reopen with functional ventilation systems that are verified as having been tested, adjusted, and if necessary repaired or replaced, by qualified personnel in order to provide recommended ventilation rates as reliably and energy efficiently as possible. Ventilation rates will be documented in an HVAC assessment report submitted to the program administrator and available to the public upon request.

---

<sup>9</sup> World Health Organization, Considerations for school-related public health measures in the context of COVID-19 (May 10, 2020) (<https://www.who.int/publications-detail/considerations-for-school-related-public-health-measures-in-the-context-of-covid-19>); World Health Organization, Considerations for public health and social measures in the workplace in the context of COVID-19 (May 10, 2020) (<https://www.who.int/publications-detail/considerations-for-public-health-and-social-measures-in-the-workplace-in-the-context-of-covid-19>); World Health Organization, Q&A: Ventilation and air conditioning in public spaces and buildings and COVID-19 (July 29, 2020) (<https://www.who.int/news-room/q-a-detail/q-a-ventilation-and-air-conditioning-in-public-spaces-and-buildings-and-covid-19>)

<sup>10</sup> Centers For Disease Control and Prevention, Operating schools during COVID-19: CDC's Considerations (August 21, 2020) (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/schools.html>); Centers For Disease Control and Prevention, Interim Guidance For Businesses and Employers Responding To Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) (May 6, 2020) (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/guidance-business-response.html>)

<sup>11</sup> ASHRAE, ASHRAE Epidemic Task Force: Building Readiness (updated August 19, 2020) (<https://www.ashrae.org/file%20library/technical%20resources/covid-19/ashrae-building-readiness.pdf>) ASHRAE, ASHRAE Epidemic Task Force: Schools & Universities (updated July 17, 2020) (<https://www.ashrae.org/file%20library/technical%20resources/covid-19/ashrae-reopening-schools-and-universities-c19-guidance.pdf>);

<sup>12</sup> Pantelic, Using IoT Environmental Sensing to Reopen Spaces, SenseWare (May 2020) (<https://cdn2.hubspot.net/hubfs/5238584/White%20Paper%20Senseware%20Covid.pdf>).

<sup>13</sup> California Energy Commission, *Strategic Plan to Reduce the Energy Impact of Air Conditioners* (June 2008), CEC-400-2008-010, at p. (v) (<http://www.energy.ca.gov/2008publications/CEC-400-2008-010/CEC-400-2008-010.PDF>); see also Zabin, et. al, *Workforce Issues and Energy Efficiency Programs: A Plan for California's Utilities*, Don Vial Center for Employment in the Green Economy (2014), at pp. 32-34 and Appendix 2B (<http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/workforce-issues-and-energy-efficiency-programs-a-plan-for-californias-utilities/>).

<sup>14</sup> SCE Energy Efficiency Business Plan 2018-2025 at p. 63; SDG&E Energy Efficiency Business Plan 2018-2025 at p. 216; PG&E Energy Efficiency Business Plan (2018-2025), Residential Appendix at p. 30; see also C. Zabin, et. al, *Workforce Issues and Energy Efficiency Programs: A Plan for California's Utilities*, Don Vial Center for Employment in the Green Economy (2014), at p. 34 (<http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/workforce-issues-and-energy-efficiency-programs-a-plan-for-californias-utilities/>).

Improving the performance of school HVAC systems not only saves energy and provides a safer and healthier building environment, it also has a significant correlation to student performance. In a 2017 literature review, W. J. Fisk summarized that 8 studies reported statistically significant improvements in some measures of student performance associated with increased ventilation rates or lower CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, with performance increases up to 15%.<sup>15</sup>

A 2018 report in the Environment International Journal found that short-term CO<sub>2</sub> exposure beginning at 1000 ppm affects cognitive performance, including decision making and problem resolution.<sup>16</sup> The Wisconsin Department of Health states that CO<sub>2</sub> levels between 1000 and 2000 ppm are associated with drowsiness and attention issues. CO<sub>2</sub> levels above 2000 ppm affect concentration and can cause headaches, increased heart rate, and nausea.<sup>17</sup>

This program will thus also provide the additional benefit of addressing the numerous studies finding that the widespread underventilation of classrooms in California is negatively impacting student health and learning.

---

<sup>15</sup> Fisk, W. J., The ventilation problem in schools: literature review, *Indoor Air*. 2017;27:1039–1051 (<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/ina.12403>)

<sup>16</sup> Azuma, et al, Effects of low-level inhalation exposure to carbon dioxide in indoor environments: A short review on human health and psychomotor performance, *Environment International* 121 (2018) (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160412018312807>).

<sup>17</sup> Wisconsin Department of Health Services, Carbon Dioxide (Dec. 20, 2019) (<https://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/chemical/carbondioxide.htm>).

## **PROPOSED REQUIREMENTS:**

**School Ventilation and Efficiency Verification and Repair Program.** The Office of Public School Construction or other appropriate state agency shall create and administer a School Ventilation and Efficiency Verification and Repair Program that shall allocate grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) to prepare schools to reopen with functional ventilation systems that are tested, adjusted, and if necessary repaired, by qualified personnel in order to provide recommended ventilation rates as reliably and energy efficiently as possible. Recipients shall: (1) assess, maintain, adjust, and, if necessary, repair existing HVAC systems to ensure ventilation rates meet or exceed the standards set forth in Table 120.1-A of the 2019 Title 24 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards; (2) provide MERV 13 filtration or better where feasible, or the maximum MERV filtration that the system design can handle; (3) install CO<sub>2</sub> sensors in classrooms to verify that proper ventilation is maintained throughout the school year; and (4) prepare an HVAC Assessment Report documenting the work performed and identifying any additional system balancing, upgrades, replacements or other measures recommended to improve the health, safety, and/or efficiency of the HVAC system. School Facilities that comply with these requirements shall be provided a COVID-19 Reopening Ventilation Verification Certificate for posting in the building.

An LEA that accepts a grant under this Program for verification of a school facility shall perform the following tasks for all air handling units, roof top units and unitary and single zone equipment in that facility's HVAC system or systems:

### **Assessment, Maintenance, Adjustment and Repair of Existing Facility Ventilation System.**

**1. Filtration.** Consistent with the recommendations of the ASHRAE Guidance for Reopening Schools and Universities, MERV 13 or better filtration shall be installed in the facility's HVAC system where feasible. Qualified Testing Personnel shall review system capacity and airflow to determine the highest Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) filtration that can be installed without adversely impacting equipment, shall replace or upgrade filters where needed, and shall verify that such filters are installed correctly. Where a system uses Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation (UVGI) to disinfect the air, the UVGI lamp shall be checked for proper operation, replacing bulbs as needed and verifying that the ultraviolet light does not shine on filters. Recommendations for additional maintenance, frequency of filter replacement, replacement or upgrades to allow for more protective filtration shall be recorded in the HVAC Assessment Report.

**2. Ventilation and Exhaust.** Following the assessment of the filtration, Qualified Testing Personnel shall assess the ventilation rates in the facility classrooms, auditoriums, gymnasiums, nurses offices, restrooms and other occupied areas to determine whether they meet the minimum ventilation rate requirements set forth in Table 120.1-A of the 2019 Title 24 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Assessment shall include:

- (i). Calculation of the required minimum outside air ventilation rates for each occupied area based on the anticipated occupancy and the minimum required ventilation rate per occupant set forth in Table 120.1-A of the 2019 Title 24 California Building

Energy Efficiency Standards. Calculations shall be based on maximum anticipated classroom or other occupied area occupancy rates and determined by the performing technician. Natural Ventilation shall be designed in accordance with Section 402.2 of the 2019 California Mechanical Code and shall include mechanical ventilation systems designed in accordance with Section 403.0, Section 404.0, or both. Additionally, any room relying on Natural Ventilation shall have a continuously operational CO<sub>2</sub> monitor as prescribed in section 7a of this document.<sup>18</sup>

(ii). Measurement of Outside Air per Section B of NRCA-MCH-02-A – Outdoor Air Acceptance and verification of whether the system provides the minimum outside air ventilation rates calculated in subsection (i).

(iii). Verification of coil velocities and unit discharge air temperatures required to maintain desired indoor conditions and to avoid moisture carry over from cooling coils.

(iv). Verification that separation between outdoor air intakes and exhaust discharge outlets meet code requirements.

(v). Confirmation that the air handling unit is bringing in outdoor air and removing exhaust air as intended by the system design.

(vi) Measurement of all exhaust air volume for exhaust fans, including restrooms. Document any discrepancies from system design. Per ASHRAE Guidance for Reopening and Operating Schools exhaust fans operate whenever HVAC systems are in operation.

(vii) Energy Recovery Ventilation (ERV) system operation and leakage concerns should be addressed according to the recommendations of the ASHRAE Building Readiness document.

**3. Economizer.** For systems with economizers, Qualified Testing Personnel shall test system economizer dampers per Section B of NRCA-MCH-05-A – Air Economizer Controls and repair any economizer dampers and controls that are not properly functioning shall be recorded in the HVAC Assessment Report. Recommendations for additional maintenance, replacement or upgrades shall be recorded in the HVAC Assessment Report.

**4. Demand Control Ventilation.** If installed, demand control ventilation shall be adjusted to a CO<sub>2</sub> set point of 800 ppm or less and tested by per Section B of NRCA-MCH-06-A – Demand Control Ventilation Systems Acceptance<sup>19</sup>. If the demand control ventilation system does not maintain average daily maximum CO<sub>2</sub> levels below 1,100 ppm, it shall be disabled until such time as the LEA determines that the COVID-19 crisis has passed, unless disabling the control would adversely affect operation of the overall system. When disabling a demand control ventilation system, the system must be configured to meet the minimum ventilation rate

---

<sup>18</sup> California Building Standards Commission. (2019). *California mechanical code*. Sacramento, CA.

<sup>19</sup> The CO<sub>2</sub> set point of 800 ppm is recommended by the UC Davis Western Cooling Efficiency Center. The purpose of the 800 ppm set point for demand control ventilation systems is to prevent the automated control system from overshooting a maximum 1,100 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> concentration.

requirements and tested and adjusted in accordance with section 3. Recommendations for additional maintenance, replacement or upgrades shall be recorded in the HVAC Assessment Report.

#### **5. Air Distribution and Building Pressurization**

(i). Survey readings of inlets and outlets to verify all ventilation is reaching the served zone and that there is adequate distribution. Verify if inlets and outlets are balanced within tolerance of the system design. Document read values and deficiencies. If the original system design values are not available, document available information and note unavailability of system design values in the HVAC Assessment Report.

(ii). Verification of building and space pressure to ensure:

- Building pressure is positive relative to the outdoors.
- Pressure differential is within tolerance of design.
- Building is not over pressurized.
- Contaminant rooms to be temporarily occupied by sick students or staff, maintain a negative pressure, as designed.

**6. General Maintenance.** Qualified Testing Personnel or a Skilled and Trained Workforce shall verify coil condition, condensate drainage, cooling coil air temperature differential (entering and leaving dry bulb), heat exchanger air temperature differential (entering and leaving dry bulb), and drive assembly. Recommendations for additional maintenance, replacement or upgrades shall be recorded in the HVAC Assessment Report.

**7. Operational Controls.** Qualified Testing Personnel shall review control sequences to verify systems will maintain intended ventilation, temperature and humidity conditions during school operation. Previously unoccupied buildings shall perform the recommended practices of reopening a building as covered in the ASHRAE Building Readiness document. Verify a daily flush is scheduled for 2 hours before and after scheduled occupancy or demonstrate calculation of flush times per ASHRAE Guidance for Reopening and Operating Schools and Buildings or otherwise applicable local or state guidance. Verify that HVAC system operational times, exhaust fans operation times, setpoints, and enabled features meet ASHRAE Guidance for Reopening and Operating Schools and Buildings or otherwise applicable local or state guidance.

**8. CO<sub>2</sub> Monitoring.** To ensure proper ventilation is maintained throughout the school year, all classrooms shall be equipped with a CO<sub>2</sub> monitor that:

(1) Is hard-wired or plugged-in and mounted to the wall between 3 – 6 feet above the floor and at least 5 feet away from the door and operable windows.

(2) Displays the CO<sub>2</sub> readings to the teacher through a display on the device or other means such as a web-based application or cell-phone application.

(3) Notifies the teacher through visual indicator on the monitor (e.g. indicator light) or other alert such as e-mail, text, or cell phone application, when the CO<sub>2</sub> levels in the classroom have exceeded 1,100 ppm.

(4) Maintains a record of previous data which includes at least the maximum CO<sub>2</sub> concentration measured.

(5) Has a range of 400 - 2000 ppm or greater;

(6) Is certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within 75 ppm at 1,000 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> concentration and is certified by the manufacturer to require calibration no more frequently than once every five years.

If a classroom CO<sub>2</sub> concentration exceeds 1,100 ppm more than once a week as observed by the teacher or the facilities staff, the classroom ventilation rates shall be adjusted by Qualified Adjusting Personnel to ensure peak CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the classroom remain below the maximum allowable CO<sub>2</sub> PPM setpoint. Verification of the installation of CO<sub>2</sub> Monitors in all classrooms shall be included in the HVAC Assessment Report.

**9. HVAC Assessment Report.** Qualified Testing Personnel shall prepare an HVAC Assessment Report for each school facility. The HVAC Assessment Report shall include the following information:

- (1) Name and address of school facility and person/contractor preparing and certifying Report.
- (2) Description of assessment, maintenance, adjustment and repair activities and outcomes.
- (3) Document HVAC equipment model number, serial number, general condition of unit, and any additional information that could be used to assess replacement and repair options given potential for increased energy efficiency benefits.
- (4) Verification that all requirements of the program have been satisfied.
- (5) Either verification that MERV 13 filters have been installed or verification that the maximum MERV-rated filter that the system is able to effectively handle has been installed and what that MERV-rating is.
- (6) The verified ventilation rates for facility classrooms, auditoriums, gymnasiums, nurses' offices, restrooms, offices and other occupied areas and whether those rates meet the requirements set forth in the 2019 Title 24 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards. If ventilation rates do not meet applicable guidance, then an explanation for why the current system is unable to meet those rates should be provided.
- (7) The verified exhaust for facility classrooms, auditoriums, gymnasiums, nurses' offices', restrooms and other occupied areas and whether those rates meet the requirements set forth in the design intent.



- (8) Clearly define system deficiencies and provide recommendations for additional maintenance, replacement or upgrades, such as upgrading systems to allow for additional ventilation and filtration and/or to improve energy efficiency. Deficiencies to include:
- i. Discrepancies between supply, return, exhaust, and outside air summations which signal duct leakage.
  - ii. Discrepancies between designed total airflow and actual airflow which signal leakage, excessive resistance, or faulty operation.
  - iii. Low cooling coil air temperature differential (entering and leaving dry bulb), in comparison to design, which signal improper refrigerant charge.
- (9) Reports shall clearly document initial operating verifications, adjustments, and final operating verifications and document any adjustments or repairs performed.
- (10) Verification of installation of CO<sub>2</sub> Monitors, including make and model of monitors.

(11) Verification that all work has been performed by qualified personnel, including the provision of the contractor's name and license, acceptance test technician name and certification number (where applicable), TAB technician name and certification number (where applicable) and verification that all construction work has been performed by a skilled and trained workforce.

The LEA shall maintain a copy of the HVAC Assessment Report and make it available to any member of the public upon request.

**10. Licensed Professional Review.** A licensed professional shall review the assessment report and determine what, if any, additional adjustments or repairs would be necessary to meet the minimum ventilation and filtration requirements, determine whether any cost-effective energy efficiency upgrades or replacements are warranted or recommended, and provide an estimated cost for this work.

Factors to determine HVAC replacements and upgrades:

- Consider the general condition of the unit and the cost to repair the unit versus cost to replace. Consider equipment service life and maintenance costs with the ASHRAE Service Life and Maintenance Cost Database.<sup>20</sup> Replacement costs should consider potential energy savings.
- Consider energy usage over life of unit by a comparison of the unit's Seasonal Energy Efficiency Ratio (SEER) to that of potential replacement options.<sup>21</sup>
- Improper airflow and temperature differentials determined in the assessment should be diagnosed as they signal reduced energy efficiency.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> "ASHRAE: Service Life and Maintenance Cost Database." *ASHRAE*, <http://xp20.ashrae.org/publicdatabase>

<sup>21</sup> 2017 Standard for Performance Rating of Unitary Air-Conditioning & Air-Source Heat Pump Equipment. AHRI, 2017.

<sup>22</sup> Kim, Woolhyun and Braun, James E., "Impacts of Refrigerant Charge on Air Conditioner and Heat Pump Performance" (2010). International Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Conference. Paper 1122. <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/iracc/1122>

- Units containing R-22 refrigerant or has a history of refrigerant leaks to be considered for replacement.
- Units with manual thermostats shall be upgraded to programmable thermostats.
- Units without a functional economizer to be considered for repair or economizer upgrade.
- Units with indoor fan motors not meeting the NEMA Premium Efficiency Electric Motor standard should be considered for a replacement with a NEMA Premium Efficiency Electric Motor.
- Units with a Fixed Orifice (FXO) to be considered for replacement with a unit with a Thermostatic Expansion Valve (TXV).

**11. Repairs and Adjustment.** If the system does not meet the minimum ventilation rate requirements set forth in Table 120.1-A of the 2019 Title 24 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards, Qualified Testing Personnel shall review the system airflow and capacity to determine if additional ventilation can be provided without adversely impacting equipment performance and building Indoor Environmental Quality (IEQ). If additional ventilation can be provided, qualified personnel shall adjust ventilation rates to meet the minimum ventilation rate requirements set forth in the 2019 Title 24 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards to the extent feasible. After adjustment, re-test and document outside air readings, proper unit operation, and building/room pressures.

If minimum ventilation rate requirements set forth in Table 120.1-A of the 2019 Title 24 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards cannot be met with adjustment, the system shall be repaired, upgraded or replaced as necessary to meet these requirements. Such repairs, upgrades or replacements shall be considered a critical repair and shall be eligible for additional funding under this Program. Priority recommendations for additional HVAC system maintenance, replacement or upgrades to improve ventilation outcomes or ventilation efficiency shall be completed.

If installed HVAC systems or system components are broken, fail to meet minimum ventilation requirements, or are unable to operate to the original design and intent, corrective work must be completed prior to resumption of school operation.

All repairs or installation of upgrades or replacements shall be performed by a Skilled and Trained Workforce.

**12. COVID-19 Reopening Ventilation Verification Certificate.** Upon receipt of a copy of the HVAC Assessment Report, the Licensed Professional shall provide the LEA a COVID-19 Reopening Ventilation Verification Certificate for posting in the verified school building that states that the school meets the minimum 2019 Title 24 California Energy Commission requirements for ventilation.

### **Qualified Personnel Definitions**

**Certified Testing, Adjusting and Balancing (TAB) Technician.** A technician certified to perform testing, adjusting and balancing of HVAC systems by the Associated Air Balance Council (AABC), the National Environmental Balancing Bureau (NEBB), or the Testing, Adjusting and Balancing Bureau (TABB).

**Qualified Adjusting Personnel.** Qualified Adjusting Personnel shall either be: (1) a Certified TAB technician; or (2) a skilled and trained workforce under the supervision of a certified TAB Technician.

**Qualified Testing Personnel.** Qualified Testing Personnel shall either be: (1) an HVAC acceptance test technician certified by an Acceptance Test Technician Certification Provider (ATTCP) that is approved by the Energy Commission to provide such certification; or (2) a certified TAB technician.

**Skilled and Trained Workforce.** A skilled and trained workforce is a workforce that meets the definition requirements set forth in California Public Contract Code section 2601

---

Christopher Ruch is a field experienced Testing Adjusting and Balancing (TAB) technician and supervisor who is currently working for the National Energy Management Institute (NEMI) as the Director of Training. NEMI serves by providing valued education of emerging markets, new technology and advances in manufacturing and construction processes in the sheet metal industry. Inquiries can be made to [cruch@nemionline.org](mailto:cruch@nemionline.org).

Theresa Pistochini is the Engineering Manager at the UC Davis Energy and Efficiency Institute with 12 years of experience in applied research in energy efficiency and building operation, primarily in the areas of Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning. Theresa earned her M.S. degree from UC Davis and is a registered professional mechanical engineer in California. Inquires can be made to [tepistochini@ucdavis.edu](mailto:tepistochini@ucdavis.edu).

Brand Name	Model Name	Average CADR per EnergyStar	Average CADR/Wa it per EnergyStar	CARB Qualified?	Estimated Price	Estimated Cost per CADR	Manufacturer Reported Noise Level	Link
LEVOIT	LV-H133	282	5.7	Yes	\$200	\$0.71	54 dB max	<a href="https://www.levoit.com/allproducts/iv-h133-hepa-air-purifier-for-large-room">https://www.levoit.com/allproducts/iv-h133-hepa-air-purifier-for-large-room</a>
Whirlpool	WP500*	324	3.1	Yes	\$247	\$0.76		<a href="https://www.whirlpoolairpurifiers.com/product/whirlpool-wp500-whispure-air-purifier-slate-black/">https://www.whirlpoolairpurifiers.com/product/whirlpool-wp500-whispure-air-purifier-slate-black/</a>
Honeywell	HPA3300B	339	3.1	Yes	\$270	\$0.80		<a href="https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-powerplus-tm-hepa-air-purifier-for-extra-large-rooms">https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-powerplus-tm-hepa-air-purifier-for-extra-large-rooms</a>
Honeywell	HPA300 Series	307	3.2	Yes	\$250	\$0.82		<a href="https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-hepa-air-purifier-for-extra-large-room">https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-hepa-air-purifier-for-extra-large-room</a>
Whirlpool	WPT80*	153	3.6	Yes	\$130	\$0.85		<a href="https://www.whirlpoolairpurifiers.com/product/whirlpool-wp180-whispure-large-tower-air-purifier-pearl-white-wp180/">https://www.whirlpoolairpurifiers.com/product/whirlpool-wp180-whispure-large-tower-air-purifier-pearl-white-wp180/</a>
Honeywell	HPA5300*	332	3.1	Yes	\$290	\$0.87		<a href="https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-insight-hpa5300-hepa-air-purifier-for-extra-large-rooms">https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-insight-hpa5300-hepa-air-purifier-for-extra-large-rooms</a>
AIRTHEREAL	AGH550	296	5.2	Yes	\$260	\$0.88	22-46 dB	<a href="https://airthereal.com/collections/air-purifier/products/agh550">https://airthereal.com/collections/air-purifier/products/agh550</a>
Honeywell	HPA5200*	243	3.1	Yes	\$230	\$0.95		<a href="https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-insight-hpa5200-hepa-air-purifier-for-large-rooms">https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-insight-hpa5200-hepa-air-purifier-for-large-rooms</a>
Blueair	3431101000	249	7.9	Yes	\$240	\$0.97	23-53 dB	<a href="https://www.blueair.com/us/blue/pure-311-auto/2217.html">https://www.blueair.com/us/blue/pure-311-auto/2217.html</a>
Honeywell	HPA8350B Series	307	3.1	Yes	\$300	\$0.98		<a href="https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-blueoothr-smart-hepa-air-purifier-for-extra-large-rooms">https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-blueoothr-smart-hepa-air-purifier-for-extra-large-rooms</a>
Honeywell	HPA200 Series	190	2.9	Yes	\$200	\$1.05		<a href="https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-hepa-air-purifier-for-large-rooms">https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-hepa-air-purifier-for-large-rooms</a>
Coway	AP-1019C	178	5.7	Yes	\$190	\$1.07	48 dB max	<a href="http://www.coway.com/Product/Detail?prod_disp_no=148">http://www.coway.com/Product/Detail?prod_disp_no=148</a>
LEVOIT	LV-H134	342	6.9	Yes	\$400	\$1.17	54 dB max	<a href="https://www.levoit.com/allproducts/iv-h134">https://www.levoit.com/allproducts/iv-h134</a>
Honeywell	HPD300	152	4.3	Yes	\$180	\$1.18		<a href="https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-airgenius-3-air-purifier">https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-airgenius-3-air-purifier</a>
Blueair	5431111000	258	6.3	Yes	\$330	\$1.28	31-50 dB	<a href="https://www.blueair.com/us/air-purifiers/dustmagnet-5410i/2419.html">https://www.blueair.com/us/air-purifiers/dustmagnet-5410i/2419.html</a>
Honeywell	HPA250B Series	190	2.9	Yes	\$250	\$1.32		<a href="https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-blueoothr-smart-hepa-air-purifier-for-large-rooms">https://www.honeywellpluggedin.com/honeywell/honeywell-blueoothr-smart-hepa-air-purifier-for-large-rooms</a>
HATHASPACE	HSP002	252	3.5	Yes	\$370	\$1.47		<a href="https://hathaspace.com/collections/air-purifier/products/smart-true-hepa-air-purifier-2-0">https://hathaspace.com/collections/air-purifier/products/smart-true-hepa-air-purifier-2-0</a>

CleanForce	MEGA1000	433	4.3	Yes	\$699	\$1.61	35-64 dB	<a href="https://cleanforceair.com/collections/frontpage/products/cleanforce-filter-for-mega1000-air-purifier">https://cleanforceair.com/collections/frontpage/products/cleanforce-filter-for-mega1000-air-purifier</a>
ORANSI	MDD01	352	4.6	Yes	\$600	\$1.71	20-60 dB	<a href="https://oransi.com/products/mod-hepa-air-purifier?variant=37157381996725">https://oransi.com/products/mod-hepa-air-purifier?variant=37157381996725</a>
Blueair	7711371000	429	5.6	Yes	\$800	\$1.86	25-53 dB	<a href="https://www.blueair.com/us/air-purifiers/healthprotect-7710i/2210.html">https://www.blueair.com/us/air-purifiers/healthprotect-7710i/2210.html</a>
Blueair	7411371000	275	5.7	Yes	\$600	\$2.18	22-45 dB	<a href="https://www.blueair.com/us/pdp-2207.html">https://www.blueair.com/us/pdp-2207.html</a>
Hunter	HP980	304	3.5	Yes	\$800	\$2.63	37-58 dB	<a href="https://hunterpureair.com/collections/air-purifiers/products/hunter-hp980-air-purifier">https://hunterpureair.com/collections/air-purifiers/products/hunter-hp980-air-purifier</a>
ORANSI	EJ120	338	6.4	Yes	\$900	\$2.66	19-59 dB	<a href="https://oransi.com/products/oransi-ej-air-purifier?variant=37157370790069">https://oransi.com/products/oransi-ej-air-purifier?variant=37157370790069</a>

Theresa Pistochini, M.S., P.E.

John Borsos  
California Teachers Association

Re: Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation (UVGI)

Dear John,

I am responded to your question on how the ultraviolet (UV) lamp contained inside the UVDI V-PAC devices compares to CDC documentation on the effectiveness of Ultraviolet Germicidal Irradiation applied to upper rooms<sup>1</sup>. These two situations are very different.

Ultraviolet light of the appropriate wavelength has been demonstrated to inactivate certain airborne microorganisms as long as the intensity of the light and the exposure time requirements to the air are met, which is described in the CDC document. Upper room UV systems are designed to light the upper half of room (so there is no direct exposure on occupants) where the air is moving slowly and the light is contact with the air for a significant period of time.

In contrast, the UVDI product packages a UV-C lamp in a portable air cleaner. The air is moving fast inside the portable air cleaner and I would expect minimal benefit because the exposure time is so short (a fraction of a second). This is **not comparable** to approach described by the CDC in the cited paper. In addition, the UVDI product uses a UV-C lamp to activate a Photocatalytic Converter, which may create harmful byproducts. A recent guide on in-room air cleaners published by ASHRAE<sup>2</sup> states:

“Technologies such as ionizers, UV-PCO, and many called by other names may claim to remove or destroy multiple types of contaminants but may convert them to other compounds that might be harmful. These technologies are designated by CDC as emerging technologies **without an established body of evidence** reflecting proven efficacy under as-used conditions.”

I recommend that SCUSD not use the UVDI product and instead:

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/docs/2009-105/default.html>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.ashrae.org/file%20library/technical%20resources/covid-19/in-room-air-cleaner-guidance-for-reducing-covid-19-in-air-in-your-space-or-room.pdf>

- Test, adjust and balance outdoor air ventilation rates using a certified TAB technician to meet Title 24 2019 requirements
- Install MERV13 filters
- Install CO2 sensors to monitor ventilation system function
- Use cost-effective portable air cleaners that have mechanical filtration only to supplement central filtration where needed, where cost effectiveness is determined by the cost of the air cleaner and the clean air delivery rate (CADR), as measured by AHAM standard AC-1.

I am happy to answer any questions or discuss this further.

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Natasha Martin Lerner
Comment:	I am writing in support of the districts plan to reopen schools. Although I would like to see students return to school sooner and for more hours a week, I think the current plan is a very important first step. Please vote to approve the plan and to get our students back in the classroom where their academic, social, and emotional needs can be better met. In addition, I believe that it is important that school reopening continue to be discussed by the board at each meeting. There is important work to plan for the return of our students and to prepare to return full time.

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/2/2021 3:32:12 PM



Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Melissa Jernigan
Comment:	<p>Thank you to all the board members etc. for your work and dedications during this difficult time. We all know this is a big issue to solve, getting our children back in the classroom. I would however really like to know how it is possible for a teacher to teach students in person and on zoom at the same time. This choice appears to me that it is setting both Teachers and Students up for failure. Teaching over Zoom is difficult and asking teachers to do this while they are also teaching students in person does not seem to be a good solution to a difficult situation. Is the district considering other options of split distance learning/in person ideas? There are other districts/schools around the state that are doing hybrid learning plans that do not require teachers to have to split focus via zoom and in person instruction. I would like to see the district offer up a few other ideas/solutions. Are the teachers fully on board with this zoom/in-person split? Please provide more information regarding the reasoning behind this choice and how it will be possible for both Students and Teachers to be successful in this model. Thank you.</p>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/2/2021 7:13:24 PM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Tiffany Colasanti
Comment:	<p>Good evening,</p> <p>I am writing to ask you to please look at the instructional model proposed and make choices that are best for students. The only real way to make the "concurrent" model work is to have the teacher sit in front of the computer and teach to the students in the classroom and at home at the same time. I am a kindergarten and 1st grade teacher. This cannot be an acceptable way for the students I serve to attend class while on campus. Students should be able to do activities outside, hands-on, with manipulatives, use chalk, dig in our neglected garden, etc. That's what early childhood education is about. Elk Grove and Folsom Cordova aren't doing concurrent in TK-1st and TK-5th, respectively. We need to provide choice for families and appropriate levels of instruction. Let's get creative and make the best out of this opportunity for the students we serve to attend class in person.</p> <p>As a parent of a 4th grader, I'd love for him to return to his classroom on campus. I'd like to have him go back if the instruction and interactions are not concurrent. It just doesn't make sense to me to add the layer of risk and disruption to our routine/childcare if what he'll be doing is the exact same as if he's at home.</p> <p>Please talk to educators that are currently doing this. There are endless Facebook groups full of burnt out teachers from around the country that are struggling with this model. If you're open to some ideas of how to make this work check out what San Juan and Washington Unified are currently proposing and exploring.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/2/2021 10:03:34 PM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

<b>Name:</b>	Carrie Claremon
<b>Comment:</b>	<p>I am writing to support reopening SCUSD schools now. Every day matters. Students should already be in the classrooms - science has shown it is safe.</p> <p>I also want SCUSD to modify it's reopening plan to prioritize more in person instruction. The default should not be distance learning. Schools is five days a week - students should be in person more than at home. Perhaps a hybrid model where group A attends Mon/Tues for a full day and group B attends Weds/Thurs and they alternate Fridays would be better. That way there is less need for daily cleanings and students have more time in the classroom. Our President and Governor want schools open now. Make it happen.</p>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/3/2021 9:10:36 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Jennifer Martin-Gallardo
Comment:	<p>As a parent of two elementary-aged children who have been struggling greatly through distance learning, I strongly encourage the school board to reopen schools as fully as possible as soon as possible. There is no more time to waste in getting the structures in place to support our children. Under these circumstances, I simply cannot provide the same excellence that our teachers provide in helping my children learn and grow. My kids' teachers are phenomenal, and I am so thankful that they have been prioritized for vaccinations so they can feel safe. I will be so grateful when my children can engage with them again in a way that simply cannot be achieved over a screen. And thank you for providing the option to maintain distance learning for those families whose risk-profiles require additional protection.</p>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/3/2021 9:32:01 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Tiffany Colasanti
Comment:	<p>Good evening,</p> <p>Across California, school districts are making investments to enable the safe reopening of schools to in-person instruction. SCUSD has acknowledged it has a ventilation/filtration problem in our schools.</p> <p>Isn't it worth a \$2 million investment recommended by national experts to install portable HEPA air filters and CO2 monitors that will greatly improve the air quality in our classrooms and pave the way for the safe reopening of SCUSD schools?</p> <p>Please invest \$2 million of the \$128 million in coronavirus relief funds from the federal government to protect the safety and health of students and staff.</p> <p>If Twin Rivers Unified and San Diego Unified can do it, so can SCUSD.</p>

Speaking as: Employee

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/3/2021 4:25:09 PM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Aimee O'Brien
Comment:	<p>With students returning to campus, I have concerns about the demands on the wifi at our sites. This year, our campus has held two Learning Hubs with a maximum of 20 students online at a time. Even with only 20 students, they are dropped out of Zoom regularly and cannot load videos or pages that we are using to learn. When we head into concurrent learning, this could pose a problem for the learning of all students, as teachers might be removed from Zooms as well as students throughout the day. In my 4th grade class, students will need to log into Zooms daily for Speech, RSP, PE, and leveled reading groups whether they are at home or on campus.</p> <p>What are we doing to make sure that our sites are ready to support the wifi demands that both concurrent or hybrid learning would demand?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Speaking as: Employee

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/3/2021 6:27:38 PM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Stephanie Seery-Murphy
Comment:	I would be delighted to send my child back to school. Please provide a schedule for my child's vaccinations, as well as official assurances that all faculty and staff have been vaccinated. Then you will be doing due diligence.

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/3/2021 7:20:39 PM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	peter castles
Comment:	<p>i have a special needs son, mainstreamed, a junior at rosemont high, only child, who has struggled mightily during this pandemic. in the past few months, he has reached the point of hopelessness and giving up on life, not believing things will ever return to normal. school is his life, and without it, he is empty, emotionally starved, and rudderless. all his friends and social life--school band, sports, etc.--are missing from his universe, and no amount of good news in recent weeks has helped turn his mood around. the district needs to be ready to reopen school, even if it's only for the last month of the year. another six months of waiting could be a life and death matter for us. i'm not exaggerating, and i know many other families are in the same boat. the problem is, based on the administrative chaos and infighting i have witnessed during his lifetime attending SCUSD schools, i have little faith the kids' emotional welfare will be put first--i fear the teachers union and administration will foresake what's best for the students as they resume their endless bickering and finger-pointing and find a way to avoid reopening, even if all the other districts around us do so. i have become so fatalistic that i even have started to think the state taking over the district wouldn't be such a bad thing after all. that's a sad conclusion to come to after all these years. i wish for nothing more than for all of you to prove that conclusion wrong. i've never questioned the individual teachers who are my son's biggest champions, nor the RHS staff who have gone above and beyond to help him. but farther up the ladder, things need to change, and soon. please rise above the perpetual institutional acrimony and get the kids back to living and learning as soon as possible. the time will soon be right, hopefully, and all systems need to be ready to go when that time comes. thank you.</p>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/3/2021 7:31:32 PM



Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	David Rice
Comment:	<p>Dear Board of Supervisors,</p> <p>I am a parent of first and third grade students who attend school within SCUSD. I fully support the position and requests of the Open Sac City Schools coalition. While I can appreciate the complexity involved in reopening schools, this needs to be done as soon as possible. I am gravely concerned that it appears SCUSD is lagging other similarly situated schools in Sacramento County, not to mention elsewhere in California (and the nation). Despite incredible efforts by their teachers, my children are understandably less engaged in learning this year.</p> <p>Additionally, I am becoming increasingly concerned about the nature of the instruction that will occur once the children return. Students need real in-person instruction, not just zooming from their desks.</p> <p>We have stuck with SCUSD so far during this pandemic as our children really love their school. However, we are lining up options for next school year should SCUSD fail to provide a satisfactory learning environment for our children.</p> <p>Regards.</p> <p>David Rice</p>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 6:50:40 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Amy Geiser
Comment:	I respectfully ask SCUSD to consider investing more Covid-19 funds to improve the HEPA filtration infrastructure within our schools. This would provide long term protection against Covid-19 and other illnesses in our schools, and provide a much needed investment in the future health of our teachers and students.

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 7:37:06 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Kevin Jacobsen
Comment:	If students will just be on the computer while back in class while others will be on the computer from home, it would be no different than keeping students home. Therefore students should just be home until it is safe to go back without restrictions. Also, as an Elementary Physical Education Teacher, it would not be possible to teach in person and online at the same time. Thus, maybe the elementary Pe teachers should continue to teach from home over zoom. Furthermore, if students are not allowed to touch equipment this would greatly cripple Physical Educators and students would rebel just doing 45 minutes of calisthenics. Thank you.

Speaking as: Employee

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 7:46:59 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Alison Alexander
Comment:	"Board members and Sup. Aguilar, thank you for your time. I am writing to strongly encourage you to consider alternative hybrid models for our reopening plan. The concurrent model requires teachers to provide instruction to online students and in-person students at the same time. Although I desperately want my children back in school, I do NOT want to send my child to the classroom with a chromebook to continue sitting in front of a screen. I want my child to be in person so he can look at his teacher; a teacher who can move around, make eye contact, and provide her full attention to the children in front of her. I understand the district's desire to not shuffle students and teachers around at this stage in the school year, and I appreciate and agree with that decision. However, the concurrent model is not the only hybrid model that supports this choice. Please consider options such as what is being implemented in San Juan and Twin Rivers, a combination of am/pm cohorts of in person and zoom, along with an A/B model that alternates which mornings students come to school. The options being implemented in our neighboring districts still allow for the fully remote students to stay with their current teachers. We all want students and teachers to be reunited, but we need to do so in a way that encourages the highest quality of in-person instruction possible. One that allows teachers to be truly present with their in-person students. One that doesn't tether a teacher to a computer screen. That human connection, and disconnection from technology, is possibly the most important aspect of getting these kids back to school. Thank you!"

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 9:01:40 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Yvette Castro
Comment:	We do not wish for schools to reopen this school year. Every child's safety is priority as well as their education, sending students to school while Covid is still harming many would be very worrisome for us and many others.

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 9:07:45 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Rowena Gray
Comment:	Please try to open for in-person, 5 days per week this school year, or modify the school calendar to push back the end of the year and provide holidays now so that in-person is more likely. Families are making decisions about Fall now and are waiting to see how the district and union handles reopening. SCTA, how many pink slips do you want to see this Summer? Enrollment is way down and the uncertainty and intransigence that parents see is pushing more away from public schooling. Currently public education is dead in the city of Sacramento-- let's try to breathe some life into it as soon as possible.

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 9:17:15 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Jennifer Baker
Comment:	<p>The process for reopening schools, given that we are still experiencing a pandemic, is not easy. As a parent, I recognize we are all challenged and just a little burnt out. I would like to ask that you provide our schools with enough support to ensure that the students of families that choose to remain in distance education will have the same support and quality education as students who are able to return to the classroom this spring. I would like to thank all of the wonderful staff at David Lubin Elementary for the outstanding work they have done to help our students over this past year. I am so proud and appreciative of the work they have done to provide support to our kids and families. This next step to reopen schools for in-person learning may prove to be very complex to implement. I would like to ask that you continuously monitor how the return to school rolls out and, if you find gaps emerging, you provide adequate communication with school sites and parents in a timely manner so that we can also try to fill in the gaps as we have over this past year. This may not be easy but we are all in this together. Please don't leave the families that, due to a number of circumstances, must opt to keep our children in distance education until everyone, not just teachers and school personnel, but all families have the opportunity to get vaccinated. Thank you for the important work that you do.</p>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 9:19:39 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Andrea Mummert
Comment:	<p>Dear SCUSD,</p> <p>I am the parent of a now 3rd and 6th grader who have been in distance learning since March of their 2nd and 5th grade years.</p> <p>I first want to recognize that the pandemic has been a challenge for everyone. I appreciate the unprecedented efforts that everyone from government leaders and legislators, to school administrators, teachers, and staff have been making all year to try to get society and education to function. My family especially appreciates our teachers who have had to move mountains to invent new ways to teach.</p> <p>That said, I have been disappointed throughout the pandemic at the sectors of society that have been allowed to open, while our schools stayed closed – leading to increasing virus rates and less ability for schools to open. I recognize that is not under SCUSD’s control, but to the extent possible, I would like to see SCUSD advocate for and work toward in-person education as one of the very most ESSENTIAL functions our society should maintain.</p> <p>I am very glad to see school re-opening finally getting attention from government leaders and the District. In order to maintain focus on this issue, I urge SCUSD to keep in-person reopening on every Board Meeting agenda until full time in-person learning is accomplished for all grade levels.</p> <p>I also urge the District to focus on completing preparations needed for in-person instruction so that schools can open for in-person instruction within a week of California public health officials moving Sacramento County into a tier that allows for it. Thank you for working towards teacher and staff vaccinations – this will help our educators to be safe.</p> <p>Finally, from a personal perspective, I want to share the message that distance-learning has not been an adequate solution for many students. My two children have responded very differently to the situation, with one of them tolerating it reasonably well, and the other becoming far less motivated and engaged and discouraged. It is my older child who has struggled more, so while I understand the emphasis on younger students, I also</p>



want to note that there are many older children also hurt by the lack of in person instruction. I can only imagine what the situation is like for children with essential worker parents required to work away from home during distance learning time, and how wayward many of those young people must be.

Thank you for moving toward re-opening options for THIS YEAR. I was afraid that educators had written this year off entirely as we moved closer to the school year's end. For those students for whom distance learning is a struggle and taking an emotional toll, I think the opportunity to get back into the classroom for ANY AMOUNT OF TIME this year will help get them back into social-emotional balance and will help orient them towards a successful 2021-22 school year.

Finally, I am sure it is a complex puzzle to create distancing and other precautions in classrooms/school buildings, and also to accommodate students whose families want to remain virtual. I have heard from teachers that trying to teach in the classroom and remotely at the same time is very difficult. After this year that teachers have dealt with, please try to find ways to make their return to in-person teaching successful and revitalizing for them, too. Although I understand there may be an initial adjustment time, please do not settle for a scenario in which our students spend hours at school on their chromebooks as they have this entire year. The ability to interact (even at a 6 foot distance) with their teachers and peers is critical to what gives in-person learning its tremendous value. I am sure many ideas are being considered, but as a thought, I wonder if it would be possible to aim to return in-person students to an interactive teaching environment as close as possible to what was successful before the pandemic, while perhaps create a district-wide alternative online school(s) for those families that choose to remain virtual, rather than expecting our teachers and administrators to do both.

Thank you again for working towards ESSENTIAL in-person reopening AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

Respectfully,

Andrea Mummert

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 9:30:36 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Janet Miller
Comment:	<p>As an elementary teacher, I want to thank the district for all of their efforts to ensure a safe return for staff and students. I appreciate what a huge undertaking this has been, and what a struggle this has been for district staff, teachers, students, and parents. Distance learning has not been ideal for anyone, but it is clear that it has saved many, many lives.</p> <p>Our county continues to be in the “Purple Tier”, which is the highest level of infection spread. Please carefully consider if it makes sense to reopen under these conditions. If we are lucky enough to receive a second dose of the vaccine, it should be about 95% effective against most variations of the virus, but not the most prevalent ones, and there is no evidence the vaccine will prevent spreading the virus to or between our students.</p> <p>As teachers, we want what is best for our students. With the propensity for transmission when students congregate, reopening should be based on being fully ready, not on financial incentives from the state. We lack proper ventilation, and I am concerned about having to teach with open windows and doors or outside all day, given ongoing security concerns – not to mention weather fluctuations. I urge you to please consider carefully if it is worth the risk to all parties, in order to have some students return in person for 6 hours per week, for a few weeks of “live” instruction, formatted for both in-person learning and Zoom.</p>

Speaking as: Employee

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 9:59:08 AM

Agenda Item:  
7.2 Conditions for Readiness for School Re-Opening Update & Adopt Re-Opening Plan

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Nessa H
Comment:	I have heard that if students go back they will still be doing school on a computer in one class room for a few hours. How is this any different than sitting at home doing work? students should be able to go to different classes and interact or have the teachers rotate while students stay in one class specifically towards high schoolers

Speaking as: Student

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 10:08:28 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Shirley Landis
Comment:	<p>As a parent, I believe everyone in our Sac City Unified family is doing their best to support our students and also care for our families. I want us all to succeed and have the support necessary to choose the option that is best for our particular situation. I hope we offer unbelievable grace and understanding as we navigate this because each person has circumstances that should be recognized.</p> <p>For those families choosing in-person instruction, is before/after school care going to be available for students? Are the learning hubs going to be expanded to all schools?</p> <p>If the instruction will be concurrent for both the in-person and distance learning students, I wish to support those teachers than have small children or complicated family structures by allowing them to choose to continue to teach from home and have a substitute in the classroom.</p> <p>My understanding is the district will be receiving funds that could pay for substitute teachers, child care and any other supports necessary to take care of all members of our community during this transition back to the classroom.</p> <p>Secondly, I hope the district is beginning to research what positive parts of the distance learning experience could be incorporated permanently. I have heard about other districts opening a permanent online academy for those students that want to continue in a distance learning format. I also hope the district is also considering permanent telework options for staff like the state is doing. These options would not be for all, but as we focus on those that need the in-person support, I don't want us to loose sight of those that have excelled in this digital format. Thank you.</p>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 10:10:09 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Amy Strimling</p>
<p>Comment:</p>	<p>We have seen over the last couple of days that surrounding school districts have reached agreements to return to classrooms. Our children deserve no less than any other children in our area. It is a disgrace that our district leaders cannot successfully negotiate a deal with the children’s needs placed first. While there may be families who choose to remain in a distance learning format (and possibly teachers as well for health reasons), children and teachers who are ready to return must be given this opportunity.</p> <p>I ask you to consider the hybrid cohort models that San Juan Unified School District and Twin Rivers School District will be using. Teachers and students deserve the opportunity to engage intentionally. By offering a hybrid model with cohorts, children and teachers will be able to actively participate in reflective learning opportunities. The concurrent model currently proposed will not be effective in meeting students’ needs, particularly for the youngest children. In addition, using this type of hybrid format will allow teachers more opportunities to use outdoor areas for learning and for play. This will also give children the much-needed opportunity to socialize and have time for recess. Recess is just as important for children as in-class academic time, particularly for the youngest children. There are very simple ways that are not time-consuming to provide proper cleaning and disinfecting routines aligned with CDC guidelines. Playground equipment should be made available as a part of the re-opening as playgrounds in our county are also open. In addition to social and emotional learning, essential brain develop occurs when children are moving their bodies and engaging in outdoor play.</p> <p>Teachers and school staff have begun to receive their vaccines. Most will have their second dose by the time schools can re-open (whether that is before spring break or after spring break). Even with the first dose, read world data already shows positive results in reducing COVID-19 infection rates and symptoms with the first dose of both the Pfizer and the Moderna vaccines. While it would be ideal if children were vaccinated as well, this is not even an option at this time. As we know, studies have not even been completed on children under the age of 16.</p> <p>In regards to ventilation, CDC guidelines should be sufficient. We are currently in the best season of Sacramento weather to return to school with doors and windows open. As indicated, fans and portable HEPA fan/filter systems can be cost-effective options to help provide proper ventilation in the classrooms.</p> <p>Research is suggesting that SARS-CoV-2 may eventually be an ongoing endemic such as the annual flu. It will never be 100% safe. But with proper mitigation strategies in place guided by research and science (not emotions and feelings), children, teachers and school staff can safely return to school campuses as soon as is allowed by state guidelines.</p>

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Melissa Noble
Comment:	The proposed concurrent learning model for re-opening will be a disservice to all students (whether participating in-person or entirely online) and teachers. I encourage the Board to seek alternative solutions, such as those currently used in Folsom and planned for use in Twin Rivers and Natomas, that do not require teachers to simultaneously provide synchronous teaching to both in-person and distance learning students. The proposed concurrent model entirely negates the benefits of in-person learning and presents logistical challenges for students, parents, and teachers.

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 10:46:52 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Sunny Lombardi
Comment:	SCUSD Board Members and Sup. Aguilar, I am writing to ask you to consider other models as part of our returning plan. The concurrent model that looks to keep kids on computers, even during in person instruction fails to address the needs of children who plan to return to in person instruction by continuing to keep their eyes glued to a screen. Please consider alternate models being used at neighboring districts like San Juan and Twin Rivers. Their models support am/pm cohorts of in person and zoom, thereby keeping kids with their teachers and allowing the teacher to dedicate the time to each learning type separately. We need to support the best learning environment for both fully remote and in person learners. For those that choose and desperately need in person connection with their teachers anything that only serves to keep them on a computer will fall very short of our call to action to safely reopen schools. Thank you!

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 11:04:12 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District

**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Alina Cervantes
Comment:	<p>Good evening, board and superintendent. We are in a crisis so I will keep this brief. As a parent I would like to see:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) School Re-opening on every board agenda until all children return to full-time in person learning.</li><li>2) Re-open K-6 by Monday March 22nd 2021.</li><li>3) Be ready to open all grades to full-time, 5 days a week in-class instruction within one week of being allowed to do so by public health.</li><li>4) Please consider a true hybrid model as other local districts have adopted. I prefer a hybrid version (at least for k-6) as it is more pedagogically sound, SEL driven, gets the kids off the screens, and requires no additional special equipment, but I support any proposal for reopening, including concurrent teaching models.</li><li>5) Please conduct a new parent survey within the next week to see how many families want to return. The old surveys that were given while Trump was still in office and before vaccines were available are not reliable.</li><li>6) Please remember that Black and Brown families want our children back in school too. Treating us as a monolith to further a political agenda is not only racist, but it discounts the voices of the many families who are not able to speak at these meetings. Thank you</li></ol>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 11:05:11 AM



7.2 Conditions for Readiness for School Re-Opening Update & Adopt Re-Opening Plan

Sacramento City Unified School District  
Board of Education Meeting

March 4, 2021 Public Comments

Name:	Rebecca Cunningham
Comment:	<p>I am writing today as the parent of a Sutter Middle School student and a pediatrician practicing in our community.</p> <p>At the beginning of the pandemic, we pediatricians were bracing for an onslaught. A pandemic respiratory virus seemed like a sure fire way to make a bad flu season seem like a walk in the park. Through the oddities of evolution, children have largely been spared significant illness. This silver lining of the pandemic, however, is obstructing our view of a sinister rising storm.</p> <p>All of us in primary care pediatric practice, and likely the vast majority of parents, have in the past year seen our children go through a staggering disruption. When schools closed in March, only the most prescient would have forecasted us approaching a year of no in person education for the vast majority of California’s 6 million children. In the first full year of the pandemic, we have seen staggering increases in symptoms of depression and anxiety, eating disorders, and truly shocking increases in pediatric overweight and obesity. And these are the families who have sought our care. Studies have shown that for populations facing inequities, including children living in poverty, black, LatinX, and American Indian/Alaskan native, disparities will likely worsen. Academically, we don’t even know how far behind our students are falling. Students who used to or should be receiving special needs services have been absolutely left behind. While our children face staggering rates of depression, anxiety, eating disorders and suicidality we have seen a drop in child abuse reporting. This is, of course, not because families are more resilient but because kids no longer have the protective eye of their teachers watching over them.</p> <p>I could list the myriad studies published recently proving the safety for students and teachers of in person learning with reasonable public health safety measure in place, but it was summed up best when the American Academy of Pediatrics updated its interim guidance for school reopening in January. The guidance states that “opening schools generally does not significantly increase community transmission, particularly when guidance outlined by the WHO, UNICEF, and CDC is followed.” The AAP is clear in its position: All policy considerations for school COVID-19 plan should start with the goal of having students physically present in school.</p> <p>Teachers and pediatricians share the unique role of helping families raise children. We all share the same objective--healthy, well educated, and safe children and communities. The evidence-based safety of in person school has been demonstrated in studies, teachers are receiving vaccinations, our community transmission rates have dropped precipitously and the time to return our kids to campus is now.</p>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 11:15:58 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District

**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	JENNIFER Pierre
Comment:	<p>Please reconsider both the timing of returning to campus and the teaching approach. In terms of timing, SCUSD should do everything it can to ensure SCUSD maximizes its access to AB86 funding that will be made available to our district. I am hopeful that labor partners, especially SCTA, will share in that goal. That means that grades 4-12 need to back in the classroom far sooner than the April 15 and May 6 dates previously proposed by SCUSD.</p> <p>In terms of teaching mechanisms, I implore you to reconsider the concurrent learning model and instead adopt the approach SJUSD and other surrounding districts' approach to ensure kids are receiving NON-ZOOM instruction for at least a portion of the week. SCUSD should also reconsider whether Wednesday is a more appropriate all-online day than Monday and group A should attend in-person Monday, Tuesday and Group B attends in person Thursday and Friday. Afternoons are for zoom and full-time DL.</p> <p>Please, please reconsider the concurrent approach.</p>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 11:19:37 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Ben Gravitz
Comment:	Across California, school districts are making investments to enable the safe reopening of schools to in-person instruction. SCUSD has acknowledged it has a ventilation/filtration problem in our schools. Isn't it worth a \$2 million investment recommended by national experts to install portable HEPA air filters and CO2 monitors that will greatly improve the air quality in our classrooms and pave the way for the safe reopening of SCUSD schools? Our school board should invest \$2 million of the \$128 million in coronavirus relief funds from the federal government to protect the safety and health of students and staff. If Twin Rivers Unified and San Diego Unified can do it, so can SCUSD!

Speaking as: Employee

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 11:20:06 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Kara Synhorst
Comment:	<p>You have 100 million dollars in Covid-19 relief funds. Upgrading the ventilation would cost about 2 million dollars. Figure it out. Students, teachers, and staff need clean air, and not just during this pandemic, but when wildfires inevitably continue to occur.</p> <p>If this is the primary hurdle to getting everyone back on campus safely, it feels like you should be devoting all your attention to this instead of just saying no. Being against clean air is a stupid hill to die on.</p>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 11:43:42 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Julie Souliere
Comment:	<p>I support opening Sac City schools for in-person learning as soon as possible. Reopening discussions by this board should occur at every meeting until all children in the district are able to return to full time in person learning. Reopening elementary schools should occur sooner than the proposed April 8th date and preferably by March 22nd. Every day matters that the school district does not reopen its school campuses. The proposed plan of distance learning and in-person/concurrent learning should be treated as a TEMPORARY fix to get kids back in the classroom and the goal should still be to get kids back 5 days in the classroom as quickly as possible. Please reconsider the teaching approach to in person learning. Kids attending class in person should be doing so in a non-zoom format. The district should look to neighboring districts that are not doing concurrent learning and instead allow teachers to dedicate separate time (am/pm) to kids attending in person or via zoom.</p>

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/4/2021 11:51:36 AM

Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**March 4, 2021 Public Comments**

Name:	Jennifer Lahr
Comment:	When are we going to get these High schoolers back in classrooms? My AB student is getting C's and Ds. They are in 3 AP classes the distance learning is NOT working for them.

Speaking as: Parent/Guardian

Email

Tel:

Date/time Stamp: 3/3/2021 6:51:03 PM

---

**From:** Dustin Heron  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 10:38 AM  
**To:** SCUSD Public Comment  
**Subject:** Reopening (March 4th meeting)

Warning! This message originates from OUTSIDE the District's email system. Please verify the sender and contents before opening attachments or clicking any links. Contact the Technology Services Help Desk at 916-643-9445 with any questions.

It is unconscionable to force schools to reopen at the end of spring semester for just a few weeks before summer. This is nothing more than further disruption. With vaccinations steadily rolling out this is not the time to force reopenings and let our guard down. Especially if teachers cannot be guaranteed a vaccine before reopening and especially if the union hasn't agreed to the reopening plan. Our children's lives are not playthings. Keep schools closed until the fall when it will actually be safe to return.

Dustin Heron  
Parent at AM Winn.

---

**From:** Sonya Moreno  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 10:37 AM  
**To:** SCUSD Public Comment  
**Subject:** Question about distant learning

Warning! This message originates from OUTSIDE the District's email system. Please verify the sender and contents before opening attachments or clicking any links. Contact the Technology Services Help Desk at 916-643-9445 with any questions.

Hi i received an email to fill out asking if my child will be returning to Tahoe for the upcoming school year 2021/2022, my question is will the school still offer distant learning for parents and students who wish to continue to stay home.



---

**From:** Talyn Wong  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 28, 2021 6:11 PM  
**To:** SCUSD Public Comment  
**Subject:** Hybrid instruction model.

Warning! This message originates from OUTSIDE the District's email system. Please verify the sender and contents before opening attachments or clicking any links. Contact the Technology Services Help Desk at 916-643-9445 with any questions.

As a parent I am completely unsatisfied with the hybrid options as described. Distance learning requires an entirely different set of skills, an entirely different type of preparation, and entirely different methods in the moment. The Roomie/Zoomie model expects teachers to do two completely incompatible things at once. Things that are necessary on Zoom will create chaos in the classroom. (Monitoring the chat. Manning the waiting room. Engaging body language for the camera.) Things that are invaluable in the classroom will make the Zoom instruction worthless. (Moving from student to student in physical space, quietly offering help so as not to embarrass a student. Wearing a mask.) Site administrators and district officials do not understand this, because they have very little or no experience in providing distance instruction. That's why it's so disappointing to me that these instructional models are being created by exactly the people who don't know what to consider. Christine Baeta is talented, empathetic, skilled, knowledgeable, creative, well-intentioned, and optimistic but she lacks experience in distance learning.

Because I am a teacher, and have experience providing virtual instruction, I know that the options that are being offered to my children in the Roomie/Zoomie model are:

1: Attend school for 6 hours a week to receive mediocre (at best) in-person instruction, received 2 days a week of worthless virtual instruction. (One person CANNOT provide quality in-person and virtual instruction simultaneously. No matter how creative, enthusiastic, skilled, or willing to work themselves into the ground.) Receive 1 day a week of quality virtual instruction from a stressed out and overworked teacher who has been completing 2 full time jobs the other 4 days.

2. Choose to continue virtual instruction 100%. Receive unintelligible (teacher in mask with subpar laptop microphone), unengaging, (methods of engaging students are impossible to perform while managing students in person) virtual instruction 4 days a week, and 1 day of quality virtual instruction from a stressed out and overworked teacher who has been completing 2 full time jobs the other 4 days.

I think the district is rightfully proud of what they have been doing in the learning hubs, but somehow they are willfully ignorant of the fact that these hubs are using two people to do the jobs of two people. One to provide quality virtual instruction, assessment, and feedback. Another to provide classroom management, individual help, and the ability to step away from the computer. They are acting as though cutting the workforce in half and expecting the classroom teacher to do all of it simultaneously will achieve the same results. **It will not.** It is my fear that the results will be to fail not just some of our students, but all of them.

Trustees, please demand that district officials consult with our in-house experts on distance instruction, namely classroom teachers, before creating any more impossible plans that will hurt my children. **Teachers** must be the ones creating the instructional models. Administrators, despite their good intentions, lack necessary experience.

Talyn Wong

---

**From:** laura randles  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 12:39 PM  
**To:** SCUSD Public Comment  
**Subject:** public comment for today

Warning! This message originates from OUTSIDE the District's email system. Please verify the sender and contents before opening attachments or clicking any links. Contact the Technology Services Help Desk at 916-643-9445 with any questions.

Board members and Sup. Aguilar, I am writing to strongly encourage you to consider alternative hybrid models for our reopening plan that do not require concurrent teaching. I do not want to send my children to the classroom only to engage in the same type of learning they are experiencing now. I want my children to be in person to be able to actively engage with a teacher who is not teaching to Zoom as well. Please consider options such as what is being implemented in San Juan and Twin Rivers. We all want students and teachers to be reunited, but we need to do so in a way that encourages the highest quality of in-person instruction possible. One that allows teachers to be truly present with their in-person students. Thank you!

Laura Randles-Little (parent of a 4th and Kinder student)

---

**From:** G A Tubo  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 11:02 AM  
**To:** SCUSD Public Comment  
**Subject:** 3/4/21 item 7.2

Warning! This message originates from OUTSIDE the District's email system. Please verify the sender and contents before opening attachments or clicking any links. Contact the Technology Services Help Desk at 916-643-9445 with any questions.

Dear Board Members:

As a parent of a MS student and a HS student, I welcome them having any time back in the classroom with peers and teachers. I am not attached to a particular model or timeframe, what I am attached to is having an agreed upon plan with solid dates that we can countdown to.

I do not expect perfection but I do have some concerns.

- 1) The ventilation needs of a classroom at 25-50% capacity for 3 hours at a time are not the same as full capacity for a 6 hour day. What is in place for partial re-opening this spring doesn't have to be the limit of what can be put in place for next fall.
- 2) Start times/lunch time/transportation. As much as they might enjoy it, I don't want my kids unmasking to eat lunch in a group. Therefore I don't want the 3 hour schedule to overlap lunch time, the 3 hour schedule needs to be before or after the pickup times at which Nutrition Services will need to offer meals for the kids on full DL or not at campus that day. I also don't have the flexibility at work to transport my kids at two mid-day times, i.e. 10 am and 2 pm. Even though my kids won't like getting up earlier it is more realistic to revert to "before times" morning schedule for transportation.
- 3) If teachers will be teaching remotely while in the classroom, they need the district to provide technology that will let them move around the classroom such as remote mikes and a second camera or device with built-in camera. I see teachers making comments on social media asking for these things but I'm not aware of SCTA including specifics or examples in their proposals, so that is confusing but regardless I expect the district to use CARES funds on that type of equipment.
- 4) My children were privileged enough to already have desktop computers prior to covid-19 so that is what they have been using for remote schooling, but we don't own chromebooks or similar portable devices so if the teaching model is "zoom in the room" they will need district-issued chromebooks to participate. I hope a question about this will be part of the return survey.
- 5) I don't think the "zoom in the room" model is ideal but considering that teachers are reporting via social media that they currently spend a lot of time adjusting or recreating lessons, it seems that it's the best choice available considering previous decisions. It's my understanding that last June SCTA turned down the district proposal to pay small workgroups for each grade or subject do the work of analyzing and adjusting what/how to teach in the shortened instruction time of DL, so it could be shared out, which has left teachers to do the work individually or by site. Since we can't go back in time to revisit that decision we have to go forward with what currently exists. Again, what is in place for partial re-opening this spring doesn't have to be the limit of what can be put in place for next fall. I would hope that SCTA and SCUSD could agree to have paid workgroups for this topic in summer 2021, because it is likely that fall 2021 will not look just like fall 2019.
- 6) All assumptions for fall need to include the possibility for continued social distancing and masking, and some families choosing to continue full DL, because public health experts are telling us vaccinating protects from severe covid-19 disease but is not proven to eliminate transmission.

Respectfully, Alison French-Tubo

---

**From:** David Drelinger  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 2, 2021 11:23 AM  
**To:** SCUSD Public Comment  
**Subject:** Public Comment

Warning! This message originates from OUTSIDE the District's email system. Please verify the sender and contents before opening attachments or clicking any links. Contact the Technology Services Help Desk at 916-643-9445 with any questions.

This comment is directed at agenda item 7 regarding preparedness for re-populating the schools.

The national COVID 19 daily contraction numbers were 2,883, with a 7 day average of 3,177 on October 12th 2020. Those same contraction figures were 4,190 on March 1st 2021 with a 7 day average of 5,248. This simple math shows that the threat of contraction is not at an all time low but instead is nearly double what it was in October.

As of today, March 2nd 2021, in my community there has been no option to vaccinate either myself or my child yet, nor is there an actual plan in place or deadline for when this might happen.

There have been no major renovations at the neighborhood schools that would mitigate the risks inherent to close quarters contact which ultimately has been shown to be the main factor in virus transmission.

When we compare the circumstances of October 12th to those on March 2nd a few differences are apparent. One is the larger daily national contraction rate of COVID as discussed above and the second is that the State has agreed to pay 6.6 billion to schools and districts who resume in person class despite the risks to the children and their families.

Please do not allow what can amount to nothing more than greed, to jeopardize the health and safety of our families and the community.

If even a single child, parent or grandparents life can be saved through simple patience until vaccines are available to them, then this payoff offered by the State is not worth the risk. The loss of a single life, due to school boards accepting bribery from the State to engage in risky practices with other people's lives is at a minimum criminally negligent and perhaps even criminally malicious considering your motives, documented premeditation and knowledge of these readily available numbers mentioned above.

Please do the right thing and don't let money entice you into risking our lives when an actual solution (vaccination) is on the horizon.

Sincerely,

David Jay Drelinger