

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE LINCOLN SCHOOL BUILDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Reed Gym, Ballfield Road Campus, Lincoln, MA

OPEN SESSION

School Building Advisory Committee Present: Becky McFall (Co-Chair and Superintendent), Doug Adams (Co-Chair), Owen Beenhouwer, Tim Christenfeld, Buck Creel (Administrator for Business and Finance), Steven Perlmutter, Maggy Pietropaolo, Peter Sugar, Gary Taylor.

School Building Advisory Committee Absent: Ken Bassett, Vincent Cannistraro, Hathaway Russell.

School Committee Present: Jennifer Glass (Chairperson), Tim Christenfeld (Vice Chairperson), Al Schmertzler, Jena Salon, Peter Borden.

School Committee Absent: Preditta Cedeno (METCO Representative).

Dore & Whittier Architects Present: Jon Richardson, Jason Boone, Emily Rae.

Dore & Whittier Architects Absent: Donald Walter.

PM & C Absent: Peter Bradley.

I. Greetings and Call to Order

Dr. McFall, Co-Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 7:18 pm. She thanked everyone for being involved in the process, and she thanked the SBAC members for their work. Dore & Whittier will review their summary of their work, which is a prelude to the final report that they will present to the SBAC and to the School Committee in early February. She noted that Dore & Whittier had some new information to present this evening. Jennifer Glass, Chairperson of the School Committee, will present this evening on warrant articles on the school buildings for the Annual Town Meeting on Saturday, March 28, 2015.

II. Agenda

Document: None.

Mr. Richardson reviewed the evening's agenda:

- A. Review Study
- B. Summary of Options
- C. Public Outcomes
- D. Massachusetts School Building Authority [MSBA] options/non MSBA Paths
- E. Next Steps
- F. Feedback

A. Review Study

Mr. Richardson said that Dore & Whittier were asked to build a community understanding of the school buildings' needs. Their study involved identifying the buildings' needs and educational requirements, develop detailed cost estimates and different options to present to the Town without narrowing down to one option.

B. Summary of Options

Mr. Richardson said that Dore & Whittier developed three families of options. Option one addresses the facility needs only at an estimated cost range of \$12 to \$29 million. Option two addresses a la carte educational enhancements at an estimated cost range of \$29 to \$47 million, and they include different numbers of the facility repairs. Option three addresses comprehensive educational enhancements at an estimated cost range of \$54 to \$66 million.

Mr. Richardson reviewed that for the first set of options, there are 148 facility needs, which they defined and separated into immediate needs, near-term needs, and deferrable needs. They defined deferrable needs as paving, septic fields, and other items. He presented a slide that showed the current buildings' layout and how the layout compared with the MSBA's guidelines on spaces. The 2nd grade classrooms in the Smith Building have the greatest needs.

Mr. Richardson said for the second set of options, there are 33 educational enhancements. He said that as a result of the December 2 forum, they have added another option, 2G, which took out the deferrable needs from option 2F. Option 2G combines options 1B, 2A, 2C, and 2D.

For the third set of options, they range from the highest amount of renovation and lowest new construction for option 3A to option 3D, which is new construction. Mr. Richardson noted that option 3C basically retained the buildings' big boxes but made the rest of the school brand new, which besides the entirely new building, is the best way to get the most energy efficient buildings.

C. Public Outcomes

Mr. Richardson noted that the results of the feedback for the options from the November 15 State of the Town Meeting are:

Option 1, Facility Repairs only: 3.7%

Option 2, A la Carte Enhancements and Facility Repairs: 20.0%

Option 3, Comprehensive Project: 76.3%

At the December 2 forum, when the audience was asked to choose their top key variable in the project, "maximize educational enhancements" received 120 votes. "Minimize cost" received 27, "return on money spent" received 19, "meet 2030 energy bylaw" received 18, "preserve existing building" received 10, and "other variables" received less than 10.

Mr. Richardson said the audience evaluated the options presented and chose the one they wanted if the Massachusetts School Building Authority [MSBA] invites the Town into the funding pipeline, and the one they wanted if the Massachusetts School Building Authority [MSBA] does not invite the Town into the funding pipeline. Options

1A and 1B garnered one vote; options 2A through 2D, 3A, and 3D (new construction) did not garner any votes; option 2E received 17 votes without MSBA funding, option 2F received 7 votes with MSBA funding and 17 votes without MSBA funding, option 3B received 10 votes with MSBA funding and 19 votes without MSBA funding, and option 3C received 44 votes with MSBA funding and 0 votes without MSBA funding.

Mr. Richardson noted that the results showed that the Town residents seem to be organizing around the price points of \$35 to \$40 million with or without MSBA funding.

D. Massachusetts School Building Authority [MSBA] options/non MSBA Paths

Mr. Richardson said Dore & Whittier's experience has shown that the first set of options—the repairs only—would not receive financial support from the MSBA, the second set of options—the a la carte options—might receive financial support from the MSBA at the higher end of those options, and the third set of options—the comprehensive ones with educational enhancements—are the most likely to receive financial support from the MSBA. The Town would need to submit a Statement of Interest [SOI] and be invited by the MSBA into the funding pipeline. He noted that the MSBA process requires a full range of options to be developed once a school district is invited into the MSBA process.

Dore & Whittier's slides showed the considerations for a MSBA process versus a process that does not include the MSBA.

MSBA project

A potential 40% reimbursement for the project

The project would need to address facility and educational needs

There is the uncertainty of whether the MSBA would invite the Town into the process

There would be a delay of approximately 18 months

The project would need to comply with the MSBA process

The school and community center projects would be separate as the MSBA would not pay for a community center

A full feasibility study would be required and not be reimbursed by the MSBA

Town-only funded project

No reimbursement from the MSBA

The project could address facility and educational needs

There would be no timing delay

The process would be Lincoln-driven

The school and community center projects could be considered together

No additional feasibility study would be required

Mr. Richardson showed a slide that compared two of the options, 3A with the MSBA grant funding, and 2G fully funded by the Town, to show two potential timelines.

E. Next Steps

Ms. Glass thanked Dore & Whittier and the SBAC as they have put much thought, energy, and time into this work. Now the Town must focus on how to turn these concepts into an actionable project. She noted that the School Committee was wrestling

with what information was needed to present at Town Meeting on March 28, 2015. She presented three ideas for how to approach the issue at Town Meeting and proposed that they ask two questions: 1) Which pathway or option will the Town support? And 2) Should the Town submit a Statement of Interest [SOI] to apply to the MSBA?

Ms. Glass said that if the Town decides to apply to the MSBA, they need to demonstrate the Town's to the MSBA for a project. To demonstrate the support, she suggested that they ask for a 2/3 vote at the Town Meeting and a majority vote at the ballot, and there would be a Special Town Meeting to vote on a preferred project before submitting the project to the MSBA.

Ms. Glass said there are three ideas for warrant articles. The first is will the Town commit to renovation of the school buildings? She said the cost of a project could be in the range of \$30 to \$48 million. She also noted that the upper limit of feasibility study money would be \$750,000. She asked for feedback on how to approach the questions, which are concepts. She wanted to get a clear answer at Town Meeting which way the Town will go to address the school buildings' needs.

The second approach would be a one-step approval for applying to the MSBA and for the feasibility study money, and if that question does not get approved, they move on to the other choices if the Town votes no on applying to the MSBA. The third approach is to determine the support for an option, ask whether to apply to the MSBA, and then ask for money for the feasibility study.

The tables had sheets for the feedback on the approaches and asked the audience to discuss the options and to indicate which approach seemed most logical to them and to place a sticker on which flow chart they liked.

F. Feedback

Some audience members were concerned about the cost range of \$30 to \$48 million, they thought the decision tree was too complex, the warrant articles would have to be specific and worded correctly. They also wanted to know whether they would find out how would the amount of money to be spent would break down to a per pupil cost, and what the implications and amounts of money that would be included in the property taxes would be. The Finance and Capital Planning Committees will be addressing those issues later. Finance Committee Chairman Peyton Marshall noted that in total, the Town's bonds cannot be above \$50 million. Others liked the method of the 2/3 vote to show the Town's support for a project.

G. Adjournment

Dr. McFall thanked the audience for their commitment, feedback, and time.

The forum adjourned at 9:15 pm. The next School Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 22 at 7:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah G. Marcotte
Recording Secretary