

FINAL MINUTES SBAC MEETING SEPT. 25, 2013 --(Hartwell MPR)

Committee Members Present: -- Steven Perlmutter (chair)
Doug Adams, Ken Bassett, Owen Beenhouwer, Vince Cannistraro, Tim Christenfeld,
Maggy Pietropaolo, Hathaway Russell, Peter Sugar

Public attending : 1

Call to order by the Chairman @ 7:40pm

Minutes of last meeting (9/11/13) adopted, unanimously.

AGENDA for tonight:
Continue discussion of options being developed
Implementation
Performance-based contracting

Should we reverse the numbering of the pathways we are considering, swap 3 and 4 with the 4 the most open and as yet unspecified. "Comprehensive" should be abandoned as label -- find another word. 3 had been intended to include more limited benefits, but what if this hamstrings further SC use or improvements of the buildings?

Perhaps 3 should be the one called all-in, the complete SOI as re-submitted and what the SC has determined just what it needs. -- then to definition of 4 would be by letting air out of that total, if the Town cannot support the full cost of 4. Can this Com. make those choices for deletions -- that would seem to be much involved with educational programming and thus really the responsibility of the SC. There would seem to be many possible alternates for this new 4: e.g.

- no rebuilding of 2nd and 3rd grade classrooms
- breakout rooms, how many do we really need?
- connector between Brooks and the Reed Gym

Are we just kicking the can down the road? Is this an intelligent way to go? We cannot be everything to everybody. Do all Lincoln people know all the issues?

We need to take a stand, for the SC -- with explanation of course of that stand.

The cost of reconfigurations to make educational improvements seems to be what is blowing up the costs, going from just repairs to the fuller solutions.

If we only build something under \$30 million, we need to leave room for the further improvements that will inevitably come up. Of course, whether or not the MSBA will support Lincoln in anyway with a much reduced project this second time remains a big question.

FINAL MINUTES SBAC MEETING SEPT. 25, 2013 --(Hartwell MPR)

We do have a list of educational needs and the prioritizing of those as well as the repair priorities -- we need to help identify a solution that addresses those for the SC.

Note that the buildings are tired, in need of significant maintenance or improvement. The mid-scheme is very difficult to come to conclusion on, and has some deficiencies. Can we present that honestly to the Town as a good scheme?

Is scheme 1 really a total non-starter? Some control of the acceptability of this scheme rest with the Building Inspector and the Fire Chief. If we trip the code(s), some judgment should be made regarding which items to add in, including educational improvements.

Scheme 2 needs a lot of work still, and the solution would be here if MSBA says no....

There are not realistically un-limited set of choices/ options. Also, if the state will not support a full scheme, where do we go???

If we hear the state will support us (in Jan.?), would we not go for the full scheme? But we would not come back to the TM with a \$50m project -- need to hold a straw vote (or more than one) sometime beforehand.

The pared back scheme(s) all have problems. If MSBA says yes, will the Town still be willing to accept a \$40m+ project with all the reductions in educational benefits -- there is the dilemma.

We still need to let the Town know that there is an incremental way to do this.

What if we recommend that the SC receives \$2m per year for several years, with the exact focus of the repairs or improvements left to the SC to decide, and wait with the major expenditures until Town can “decide” what to do ultimately regarding the fuller repairs and improvements -- this of course is not without its own difficulties of phasing etc.

What if the work is limited only to Smith, then Brooks in 10 years.? Even though it is obvious that high on the needs list are cafeteria and Brooks connector?

The most compelling needs regarding classrooms seems to be at the 2nd and 3rd grades. Could we rejuvenate them enough with just renovation? Note MSBA has made clear it will not support renovation Smith -- the classrooms are not in good enough condition .

Any “air-out” model has dangers -- the Town likes lesser expenditures but does not recognize (or accept that there are) problems left unsolved and the magnitude of future

FINAL MINUTES SBAC MEETING SEPT. 25, 2013 --(Hartwell MPR)

costs that will be incurred. Thus should this Com. take a stand against this reduced model(s) ?

The way to elaborate on a reduction of the new 4 model: (best educational within the physical facility we have, and then let some air out how? :

no cafeteria(s),

no connector

half CRs w. breakout rooms

We must remember that the Superintendent's educational priorities are :

Air, light and noise quality > breakout spaces (all grades) > cafeteria(s) > Brooks connector > bigger space for meetings (which may be accomplished by the cafeterias).

Note that there are 2 versions needed here until we hear from the MSBA: i.e. with and without MSBA support.

Can we better define for the Town what are the educational benefits and how to achieve each -- are there alternatives? -- even under 1 and 2? One problem here is that this Com. does not have the resources to get more accurate cost numbers that would probably hinge heavily in the Town's mind in making any evaluations.

The Committee unanimously agreed that if the town will receive MSBA \$\$, the School Committee should pursue the educational and facilities improvement project set forth in the Statement of Interest "(SOI)" in a cost conscious manner; no "blank check" or "gold-plated" building.

The Committee unanimously agreed that if the town is not to receive MSBA \$\$, it would not recommend to the School Committee a project limited to repairs that trip the relevant Codes because such a project would have limited, if any, educational benefits. Such a project would be a "fix the building," not an "improve education" project. Although the Committee would not recommend such an approach to the School Committee, it would advise the School Committee of such an option.

The Committee discussed some possible pathways in the event of no state funding but reached no resolution on any particular pathway. This issue is to be further discussed at the Committee's next meeting. The one point of agreement at this point is that any project undertaken without state funding should include an educational improvement component in addition to facility repairs/improvements.

The Committee discussed the situation where the town receives state funding but the state tries to hold the town to a budgetary level which is not acceptable to the town. The Committee discussed the possibility of the town proceeding without state funding on a project that would be scaled back from what is in the SOI. The Committee did not discuss what would be scaled back in such a project.

FINAL MINUTES SBAC MEETING SEPT. 25, 2013 --(Hartwell MPR)

Next meeting: Wednesday Oct. 2, 7:30pm again the Hartwell MPR.

It should focus on :

- a no-State-support scheme.
- implementation and associated problems
- the shape of the final report.
- performance-based contracting

Adjourn 9:58pm.

Respectfully submitted by Owen Beenhouwer