

High School Space Task Force Meeting

January 7, 2016

Attendees: Bob Czekanski, Lynn Coletti, Jodi Specht, Parry Graham, Kathy Codianne, Heather LeBlanc, Dave LeBlanc, Don Hawkes, Mark Jones, Maureen Busch

Absent: Bill Cleary

Call to order 7:15 p.m.

Continue Categorizing Space Needs. Completed ranking of identified issues from spreadsheet. Some of the HVAC/Mechanical issues were not ranked; annotated with “Defer”. Not clear what the impact of these items is, and in all likelihood, Bill should rank those. In addition, some of them might better be addressed by a building committee, if the project should move forward. Lynn questioned how some of the HVAC/Mechanical issues could have happened – the engineering/design of these systems should have addressed some of the issues. In addition, some of the problems could probably be addressed by balancing the systems.

The current programs were all prioritized.

In the category of Future Programs, Parry will expand on these programs and what they might entail before the next meeting, and we will discuss them at that time. “Reframing” the need: In the areas of Wellness and Alternative Programs, we currently offer something, but our offerings are limited by the lack of appropriate space. For example, there is currently a dance class among the Wellness offerings; a dance studio space would allow for a lot more offerings. Similarly, there are limited journalism offerings, but they could be expanded with dedicated space and equipment, such as video studio space. In the case of Early Childhood Education, that is something that we can’t offer unless we have dedicated/specialized space, which we don’t currently have.

Athletic Director’s office: After discussion about displaying vs. archiving the trophies and plaques, and the need to address some of the display/storage issues, the committee agreed to defer the prioritization of the A.D.’s office issues because more conversation is needed. Storage has been an overarching theme which impacts the A.D.’s office as well as many other areas. Addressing the storage issue in general will help address some of the other issues. As part of the final report, storage should be highlighted as an item/issue on its own.

Discussion about the format of the final report: What will the final report look like? The report should include the content of the interim reports. Bob proposed the following format:

Executive Summary, which will include a discussion of Critical, Important, Recommended, and Desirable improvements that should be addressed as part of a building project. Each of these priority levels would have bullet points of identified issues with references to the appropriate places in the appendices. The appendices, in turn, would contain more explanation and supporting information. Appendix A and Appendix B would contain the same information organized two different ways. Appendix A would be organized by priority. Appendix B would be organized by area (e.g. Science labs, computer needs, etc.)

Bob will start working on a draft of the final report, with the goal of having a first draft by our next meeting. Jodi asked how we are going to present the information on space utilization so that other

people will understand the issue and the importance. Will the population be growing? Is it stagnating? How do we incorporate this information into the report? The graduating senior class has 266 members and will be replaced by the current 8th grade class with has “only” 223 members. However, the next several classes after that will be larger.

Approval of Minutes of 12/10/2015: Parry made a motion to accept the minutes, Dave seconded the motion. The motion passed 9-0-1 (All voted yes except Lynn, who abstained)

Set Schedule of Future Meetings. The last two meetings are scheduled for *January 21* and February 11. However, the February 11 meeting conflicts with a rescheduled School Committee meeting, so we need to move that meeting. After discussion, it was agreed that the February 11 meeting should be moved to *Thursday, February 4*.

The next meetings will be:
Thursday, January 20
Thursday, February 4.

Vote on Reorganizing Task Force. Jodi made a motion that Bob be named the chairman of the task force. Maureen seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Don expressed concern that this (re)organization discussion is process backward. Quorum discussion: where does the 8 come from? The “official” list of the members identifies members by role (selectmen, finance, capital planning, school councils, etc.) on the Task Force Members link. Don concerned that someone could show up at the last meetings who has not been attending the meetings and would expect to be allowed to vote. How would the consistent members feel about that person voting? Several said they would have no problem excluding a latecomer. Don expressed concern that we are setting the quorum to suit our needs now. Bob verified that the quorum has been established as 8 for several months.

Bob made a motion naming Maureen secretary. Jodi seconded the motion. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Dave made a motion that the task force reaffirm that a quorum is 8. Parry seconded the motion. The motion passed 9-0-1 (All voted yes except Don, who abstained)

SOI: Don reiterated his concern about how we demonstrate that the district has reasonable belief that the communities support a project. Bob shared more/new information about the SOI timeline, which could have an impact on when such a document is filed by the School Committee. The invitation to file Statements of Interest opens January 8, 2016 and runs until April 8, 2016. The MSBA will not make a decision on which projects to offer to fund until late 2016 (November/December), and will notify the selected districts/projects at that time. The 270-day period for the district to decide whether or not to move forward starts at that time. This means that if NRSD filed an SOI this winter, they would not be notified of selection until late 2016, and would then have until August/September 2017 to accept or decline. That would afford them the opportunity to go to town meetings in Spring 2017 to request funding for a feasibility study and gauge the level of support for a project from the three communities. There were questions about how the School Committee would appropriate the money for a feasibility study given that it might span multiple fiscal years. Also, final design plans are different than the feasibility study. Various school committee members have expressed reluctance to move forward with

an SOI at this time because they have a lot of issues to address and the district is in a period of transition.

Another part of the picture is the Minuteman project. The towns will be having special town meetings for the amended Minuteman Regional agreement. Then the vote for the money for their project will be part of regular town meetings. Minuteman has to get approval for their project by 6/30; they have run out of extensions. If it appears that one or more towns will vote down the project, Minuteman could call a district-wide (all 16 towns) vote to be held on a date that they (Minuteman) set and have the project decided by the total vote (as opposed to the vote of each individual town).

Kathy pointed out that if the Minuteman project is approved, our member towns are looking at \$300,000/year for 30 years. However, in the next few years, Lancaster (for example) will be retiring some debt. The district cannot really look at this project in isolation from the other projects that the towns are facing.

There was some more discussion about membership. In the end, there was agreement to leave things as they stand. At this point, the group only needs to approve a final report.

Adjourn. Don made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Dave seconded it. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 9:45.