



Penn Brook School Building Committee Meeting Notes

February 28, 2012 - 7:00 PM

Georgetown Town Hall, 3rd Floor Meeting Room

Committee:

<u>Voting Member</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Present</u>
Ellie Sinkewicz	Building Committee Co-Chair	X
Michelle Smith	Building Committee Co-Chair	X
Alan Aulson Jr.	Citizen	
John Bonazoli	Finance Committee	X
Glenn Clohecy	Citizen	
George Comiskey	Citizen	X
Peter Durkee	Highway Surveyor	X
Tillie Evangelista	Planning Board	X
Rob Hoover	School Committee	
Kerry Stauss	Citizen	X
C. David Surface	Chairman, Board of Selectmen	X
Eric Zadina	Citizen	X
Jeff Wade	Citizen	X
<u>Non-Voting Members</u>		
Carol Jacobs	Superintendent	X
Michael Farrell	Town Administrator	X
Dr. Donna Tanner	Principal, Penn Brook School	
<u>Other Attendees:</u>		
Carl Franceschi	DRA	X
Courtney Ufnal	DRA	X
Pat Saitta	Municipal Building Consultants	X
Chuck Adam	Municipal Building Consultants	X

1. Introductions :

Michelle Smith opened the meeting and made introductions of the Building Committee members in attendance as noted above.

David Surface opened the meeting of the Board of Selectmen, with the following members in attendance; Philip Trapani, Stephen Smith, Gary Fowler, & Stuart Egenberg.

Sandy Gerraughty opened the meeting of the Finance Advisory Board, with the following members in attendance; Reginald Tardiff, Andrew Belliveau, Jim Lacey

Anne Blythe commented that the School Committee would not be in session as they did not have a quorum but did recognize David Bjork as being in attendance as well.

Ellie Sinkewicz opened the meeting to public comment – NONE

Senator Bruce Tarr was recognized as he arrived.

2. **Presentation from MSBA:**

Jack McCarthy, Executive Director of the MSBA opened his comments by introducing Mary Pichetti, Director of Capital Planning. Mr. McCarthy thanked the committee for inviting them to attend; he commented that they do not usually come to building committee meeting but felt it as important to come and address the progression of the project. Comments from Mr. McCarthy and Ms. Pichetti included the following:

- The Facilities Subcommittee Meeting (FAS) of the full MSBA board did generate some questions and concerns that they felt were important to ask the design team to look into.
- The MSBA agrees and supports a new building to replace the existing Penn Brook School.
- The additional study work will help the MSBA understand the effects the new building will have on the entire district.
- They also acknowledge that it is rare that the MSBA may be suggesting that a larger building may help alleviate other issues in the district.
- The MSBA letter in December expressed concern with some of the maintenance issues the submission report but understood the changes the district has made over the past few years and did express concerns with the Districts ability to
- The MSBA staff felt that looking at other grade configurations; K-6, K-7 and K-8 will help provide a better understanding of how this can help the educational needs of the middle school/high school.
- The staff is very aware of the schedule and budget constraints on the district and has committed to continue to work closely with DRA and Municipal.
- The tour they took with a member of the Board and the FAS was very beneficial in understanding the issues in the (3) buildings.
- MSBA staff, after viewing the high school, understands why adding 7th and 8th grades to the Penn Brook new school is an option to be considered by the school building committee. A bigger building is warranted. Moving 6th grade out of the high school is not enough. Viewed 3 and 4 classes in one space.
- Maintenance is a concern and grade reconfiguration also needs to be relooked at

Various committee members and public in attendance asked the following questions to which the MSBA representatives supplied answers with assistance from DRA, the Building Committee and Municipal. The party responsible for providing the answer is in (parentheses).

- Q. – If the study identified project needs for the MS/HS would that be reimbursable?
A. – Only the Penn Brook project is eligible for reimbursement under this project but the district would be free to submit for another project. (MSBA)
- Q. – Would any identified work in the MS/HS be a pre-requisite for approval of the Penn Brook Project?
A. – No but a plan would have to be in place that addresses how these issues could be resolved. Any existing Capital Maintenance projects planned should still be

undertaken. Agreed that the current plans could be held up for a long term plan for the district, and a report by June. (MSBA)

- Q. – Is a 1-7 option that would leave the Kindergarten at the Perley be an option?
A. – The education plan developed in the submission identified that the Kindergarten being moved to the Penn Brook School was recommended by the Building Committee and School Committee and accepted by the MSBA. If that position has changed the submission should be changed. (DRA)
- Q. – If the K leaves the Perley would the MSBA entertain a project for improvements to the Perley if they are needed?
A. – Yes the MSBA has approved projects that have Pre-K classrooms in the building. The MSBA also indicated that they would not be looking for any refund of funds spent to date on the previous Perley School project. (MSBA)
- Q. – Is the option of moving 7-8 to Perley being considered?
A. – This should be looked at as part of the additional study work. (DRA)
- Q. – Does the MSBA have any data available to assist the town in budgeting for the additional costs in the operational increases for a new building?
A. – The first of the new buildings under the control of the MSBA are just coming on line so no hard data is available yet. Suggested that the OPM may be able to assist in finding information from other industry sources as well. (MSBA)
- Q. - How can the Town be protected better by the bad design and construction issues that occurred at the Perley and MS/HS renovations?
A. Under the new program the MSBA reviews all information, as well has the requirement of having an OPM with this experience, which Municipal has, and the MSBA now retains a commissioning agent, at no cost to the town, that reviews the design, engineering and the installation of major systems. (DRA, SBC & MSBA)

Senator Tarr addressed the meeting with his full support of the project, committed to help in any way his office could and thanked the MSBA for being at this meeting and for the work they do.

Peter Durkee suggested that the town/building committee look into FEMA mitigation grants to assist in funding on any potential projects at the Perley and MS/HS. David will review with Municipal and the Building Committee again.

3. **DRA progress on Additional Feasibility Study Work:**

DRA and their consultants have begun reviewing the existing conditions in the MS/HS.

Meetings with teachers and staff will begin next week after vacation

Initial floor plans were developed with very preliminary identification of rooms/spaces that have issues with space, orientation, appropriateness of being educational spaces, lighting/construction. As study progresses the spaces will be further analyzed.

A schedule of expected progress was distributed that follows the scope of work for the additional services.

DRA explained that their study will identify (3) types of issues; accreditation issues; MSBA regulation issues (size, location, orientation, number of spaces, etc..) and physical issues at the school.

Although DRA had already started walking around the building and meeting with staff before the MSBA and the Town had come to an agreement on the scope, there will be additional visits with engineering consultants.

DRA gave numbers of students for each grade option as follows" K-8 would have 1020 students with 158,000 sq. ft. K-7 890 students with 141,000. sq. ft. and total 7 &8 would be 140,000 sq. ft. add. DRA agreed with the MSBA that enrollments are declining slightly for the whole state

DRA presented a very preliminary set of floor plans shaded and color coded that begins to identify spaces that are too small for their existing use, spaces that will be made available after 6th grade leaves and spaces that should not be classroom or teaching spaces.

DRA presented very rough and preliminary plans showing how a potential larger (K-7 or K-8) building would fit on the Penn Brook site. At first glance the building may be better suited for the existing field's area of the site. Much more involved study is required in order to make any recommendations.

4. **Adjournment:**

Motion to adjourn made by Jeff, seconded by David and all voted to adjourn. All other boards motioned to adjourn as well. Meeting concluded at 9:30 PM.