

## **ADOPTED MINUTES OF SBAC AUGUST 14, 2013 MEETING**

Present: (Hartwell Multi-Purpose Room) -- Steven Perlmutter (chair), Doug Adams, Loretta Arthur, Owen Beenhouwer, Tim Christenfeld, Jen James, Maggy Pietropaolo, Hathaway Russell, Peter Sugar, Gary Taylor.

Public attending: 2.

Meeting called to order at 7:31pm by chairman Steve Perlmutter.

Last draft of minutes for 7/24 meeting approved.

Latest draft minutes for 8/7 were discussed, a few revisions made -- then approved.

On tonight's Agenda: (1) finish the review of needs as listed in the latest SOI at pp. 25-30 (Statement of Interest as filed with the MSBA) , (2) set up the subgroups.

### High Energy Use in Lincoln Public Schools

Buildings overall made should be more energy efficient. The Town has adopted Energy 2030, so this should be considered as part of the Town's strategy for all its building, especially since the school complex is the single largest energy user for Lincoln. Committee gives high priority to energy efficiency.

### Building Envelope

Improvements to the building envelope are also a high priority: walls, window areas, roof. Some of the roof structures may not support the extra load of, e.g., heavy snow, new solar panels, if they are included in any project.

### HVAC Systems

The library, computer room and offices are the only spaces in Smith with AC. Air quality, noisy and inefficient unit ventilators, and out-dated HVAC controls remain the prime issues -- perhaps the one needing most attention probably is the unit ventilators, which are noisy, erratic, controls are out-dated.

Are central systems better than individual area ones? Cooling is not the main benefit desired -- ventilation and air quality improvements are, especially important in the tight building-envelope design necessary to reach energy efficiency and code requirements. Becky stressed the importance of improvements of these for learning effectiveness. Air quality and ventilation improvements are therefore a high priority, however that can be achieved. Individual room control is very desirable, including operable windows.

### Elec. equipment and lighting

Lighting everywhere should be good -- again as a high priority -- however that is achieved. This problem should be easier to fix than the HVAC problem. Controls again should be operable/adjustable in each classroom.

In any possible low-level just-repair option, what happens to needed air quality and lighting improvements? SC would not countenance not addressing these. The SOI lists the importance of air quality and lighting improvements as essential, e.g., so whatever solution is chosen, those have to be addressed.

That appears to finish our discussion of the needs under Building Systems as referred to in the SOI.

#### Sub-Groups To Help Committee Prepare for Its September 11, 2013 Charette

The Committee agreed to move forward with the two sub-groups (Repair Only and L-Shape subgroups) described in the Chair's August 13, 2013 email for the purpose of preparing for the September 11 charette, a copy of which is annexed hereto. The only change in the make-up of the sub-groups from that described in the Chair's email is that Jen James and Hathaway Russell will switch sub-groups, since there should be one School Committee member on each sub-group.

In order to prepare for the September 11 SBAC charette, the two sub-groups will meet separately on August 21 and August 28 at 7:30 p.m. in the Hartwell Multi-Purpose Room and the adjoining room. On September 3, 2013 (please note that this is a Tuesday), the full Committee will meet in the Hartwell Multi-Purpose Room at 7:30 p.m. to discuss the work of the sub-groups and plan further for the September 11 charette.

#### Discussion About Repair Only Option

As previously noted, the numbers in the Maguire Report are not the main issue to be discussed here. Still, questions may come up regarding Maguire's use of statistical averages for costing. Individual cost areas may well be high. Specific allowance should be made for this, or, as previously noted, for a general cost reduction of perhaps as high as 15-25% plus an addition or possible reduction in time-expectations for system failures in predicting the overall cost impacts of repairs. This whole area should wait for closer inspection by the repairs subgroup. However, as noted above, the committee doubts that it is a good use of its or any sub-groups to go through each cost estimate in the Maguire Report and test its accuracy. We do not have the time or budget to do so. It may be a better use of time to assume that if the Maguire numbers are high they may be off by 15%-25%. If the repair subgroup wishes to look into some of the Maguire numbers, it should focus on a few big ticket items, since this may give a flavor for whether the Maguire numbers are unreasonably high or not. We should keep in mind that even if the Maguire numbers, or some of them, may be high, the passage of time between when those estimates were made and when repair work would be done will add to the cost of repairs.



Discussion ranged over partial repairs, code compliance, costs possible to postpone. Repair option(s) need to address such issues. Can the Town be convinced of limiting the project to a \$6M fix where that would get the schools and the Town very little? The Committee thought it would be irresponsible to limit a repair option to an amount under what would trigger Code compliance.

#### The Old "Preferred Option"

The Committee considered whether the old "Preferred Option" deserved a second look. It virtually unanimously felt that this option should no longer be pursued. Although many good people worked on this option and many voted in favor of it at Town Meeting, it turned out to be highly divisive for the Town. Any attempt to resurrect this option would likely only increase this rancor. The Committee does not believe that this is in the Town's interest or that the members of the community want this to occur. The Committee observed that subsequent to the Town Meeting, the Town, through the charette process, expressed support for an L-Shaped option. The support for this approach was such that many believe a town-wide consensus around such an option is possible. The possibility of this consensus has been communicated to the State.

#### The New School Option

What about considering an entirely new building? The Committee discussed this option. The virtually unanimous consensus was that such a project would be too expensive for the Town, would be unnecessarily expensive because much of the current school buildings can and should be used, and would be too disruptive because there would be no place to house the entire school during construction or after the current school buildings are demolished and while construction is ongoing. It was observed that the Lincoln Schools campus is not like the L-S campus, where the old high school could be used while the new high school was under construction.

Motion to adjourn with carried with little objection at 9:28pm.

*Respectfully submitted by Owen Beenhouwer.*

**steven p. perlmutter**

---

**From:** steven p. perlmutter [spperl@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 3:20 PM  
**To:** 'owen beenhouwer'; 'Loretta Arthur'; 'Vinny and Maggy Pietropaolo'; 'Jen James Sanj Kharbanda'; 'Vincent Cannistraro'; 'Hathaway Russell'; kbassett@sasaki.com; 'Douglas Adams'; 'Tim Christenfeld'; 'Gary Taylor'; 'Peter Sugar'  
**Cc:** 'Becky McFall'; 'Sarah Cannon Holden'; 'Jennifer Glass'; 'Steven P. Perlmutter'  
**Subject:** Sub-Groups For SBAC Charette Preparation

All: An agenda item for tomorrow night's meeting at 7:30 p.m. is the sub-groups that will assist the Committee to prepare for our charette on September 11. My thinking on the composition and charge of the sub-groups at the current time is as follows:

There will be two sub-groups. One will focus on repair only "pathways". The other will focus on the renovation/construction "pathways" for of the L. Both sub-groups should focus on possible "pathways" in the following circumstances: when there is state reimbursement; and when there is no state reimbursement. After tomorrow night's meeting, we should have completed our review of the Statement of Interest ("SOI"). Promptly thereafter, I will circulate my summary of the Committee's priorities on the SOI, as expressed during our meetings and reflected in our minutes since July 17. (I will provide a short period of time for feedback from Committee members about whether I inadvertently assigned a priority to an item which is inconsistent with the priority we gave that item during our meetings, as expressed in the minutes of our meetings.) Each sub-group should adhere to the final list of priorities, since they reflect the priorities of the Committee.

In the case of the repair only options sub-group, it shall work with Buck Creel and Michael Haines to determine what work set forth in the SOI has already been done and, therefore, need not be addressed by the Committee. It shall also work with Buck and Michael to develop possible pathways in both the state reimbursement and no state reimbursement scenarios. This sub-group is certainly free to have Gustav Beerel (and other knowledgeable persons) attend its meetings. However, it should have Buck and Michael at any such meetings, so he/they get the benefit of those with first-hand knowledge of the condition of the buildings' systems.

The sub-groups are to notify me of the date(s) for any of its meetings so that it can be posted in a timely manner for compliance with the Open Meeting Law. I will then arrange for the timely posting. Although it is not clear to me that a meeting at which less than the full majority of the Committee is present is subject to the Open Meeting Law, I believe we should err on the side of transparency when it comes to the meetings of the sub-groups. There will be no written minutes of the meetings of the sub-groups. In lieu of written minutes, each sub-group will report to the full Committee and those reports will be reflected in the minutes of those Committee meetings.

A strength of our Committee is its diversity of points of view. The sub-groups should also reflect this strength. The sub-groups are to present reasonable possible pathways in their areas, not advocacy pieces. I therefore want each sub-group to reflect both Committee members who seem to favor the approach being further investigated by that sub-group and Committee members who are skeptical of that approach. I believe that this type of balance and diversity of ideas on each sub-group will result in a better work product. Since there does not appear to be an equal number of Committee members with interest in the repair only and L-shape options, it will be impossible to have an equal number of persons with similar and dissimilar apparent points of views on each sub-group.

I am not going to appoint persons to lead the sub-groups. Each sub-group can determine how it thinks it will best operate.

Based on my thinking about the makeup of the sub-groups, my thoughts on the members of the sub-groups are as follows. This is subject to change if anyone believes they are in the wrong sub-group, so long as we can still achieve the desired balance on each sub-group.

Repair Only Pathways Sub-Group

Vin Cannistraro

8/22/2013



Gary Taylor  
Jen James  
Tim Christenfeld  
Maggie Pietropaolo

L Renovation/Construction Pathways

Doug Adams  
Ken Bassett  
Owen Beenhouwer  
Loretta Arthur  
Peter Sugar  
Hathaway Russell

I will serve as a member of both sub-groups. If the sub-groups meet at different times, any member of the Committee is welcome to attend any meeting of any sub-group. There is also nothing that prevents members of one sub-group from reaching out to discuss matters with members of the other sub-group. I would encourage this.

At our meeting on August 7, Hathaway mentioned that she was in favor of exploring the option of building a new school or a project like the old "Preferred Option." She mentioned that others in town felt similarly. We cannot ignore this point of view in the town. (I take responsibility for previously not paying more attention to this. My sense of the Committee, based on our initial thoughts about possible pathways, was that it was not interested in going in that direction. I previously should have encouraged more discussion on this topic.) Therefore, I would like Hathaway and all other members of the Committee to address this approach at our meeting tomorrow night. If there is sufficient support on the Committee for pursuing this option further, we may establish a separate sub-group to examine that type of pathway.

Thanks everyone. Steven