



Penn Brook School Building Committee Meeting Notes

March 27, 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	
Glenn Clohecy	Citizen	
George Comiskey	Citizen	X
Peter Durkee	Highway Surveyor	X
Tillie Evangelista	Planning Board	X
Rob Hoover	School Committee	X
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	
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. Ellie Sinkewicz called the meeting to order at 7:05 and invited any public participation. There was none. The chairs recognized Selectmen Stuart Egenberg as in attendance.

2. **Approval of minutes:**

March 15, 2012 – Rob indicated that he had comments to the minutes that he would like noted. It was discussed that the meeting minutes are a representation of what was discussed and votes taken and not a literal “word for word” description of the meeting. Rob will forward his comments separately they can be attached to the minutes as correspondence when they are posted on the web site. A motion was made to accept the meeting minutes as is by George, seconded by David. All presented voted approval of the motion with Michelle and Kerry abstaining.

February 28, 2012 – The corrected minutes will be sent to the committee members for approval at the next meeting. Municipal noted a few corrections that will be included with any other corrections the committee sees when they consider the minutes.

- 1st line change “tri” to “quad”
- 4th bullet – remove “add” after “140,000 sq.ft.” and change last sentence to “DRA agreed with MSBA that enrollment is declining slightly for the whole state.”
- Delete last bullet in its entirety

3. **Correspondence:**

None

4. **New Business:**

- DRA presented that the main issue this evening is to get a vote on a preferred alternative
- DRA reviewed the completed additional feasibility study work at the MS/HS. The following are highlights of the presentation:
 - Reviewed (3) types of deficiencies that may exist in the building that they studied; NEASC identified issues, MSBA Facility Sub-Committee Issues and Space and Facility deficiencies identified by the administration
 - Reviewed each of the options and general comments/issues with each
 - Issue of floating teacher comment made by high school principal at previous school committee meeting. DRA explained that most high schools designed today still have a few “floating” teachers as it becomes cost prohibitive to provide a classroom for every teacher. Due to scheduling most classrooms are open at least 1-2 periods a day. A k-6 options will leave the school with 2-3 floating teachers that will have access to planning rooms and offices. Rob asked that the principal’s comments be clarified.
 - Rob mentioned that another comment made by the principal was the lack of storage space. DRA offered that although the K-6 option does not solve all of the storage space issues the realigning of the classrooms and the 6th grade moving out does free up storage areas that were being used for educational spaces. The move out of the Perley basement will also allow some of the items stored at the MS/HS be moved to the basement of Perley.
 - DRA reviewed the list of construction/renovation items that would be required for the realignments. They also presented an initial list of capital projects. This list would have to be considered to be done regardless of grade configuration.
 - Peter Durkee offered that he is reviewing the FEMA grant application with Mike Anderson of the school department as a possible source of funding to address the drainage problems at the Perley and MS/HS.
 - The committee discussed the possibility of leaving the Kindergarten in Perley. The committee was reminded by DRA and MBC that the educational plan accepted by the MSBA demonstrated the education reasons for combining the K with the rest of

the elementary grades. MBC also mentioned that the MSBA had indicated the conditions at the Perley concerned them and reopening this discussion could jeopardize the approval of the Preferred Alternative.

- George reminded the committee that there were (2) primary reasons for the studies; Penn Brook Facility Issues and Overcrowding at the MS/HS.
- Rob expressed concern that a school committee issue that will have to be addressed is the expenditure of costs on the new building could take away from funds to do other things in the district.
- David Surface offered that in some cases newer buildings can actually generate growth in a community which helps the overall bottom line.

Motion was made by George to select a 1-7 option for the Penn Brook School preferred alternative. Motion seconded by Rob. After discussion around the committee a vote was taken and by a vote of 3 to 7 the motion failed.

Motion was made by Jeff to select a K-6 option for the Penn Brook School Preferred Alternative. The Motion was seconded by David. After discussion around the committee the vote passed by a vote of 7 to 2 with 1 abstention.

- MBC passed out a schedule of the upcoming meetings and submissions for discussion. It was agreed that an interim meeting will be held next week on 4/3 at the Penn Brook School at 7:00 PM.
- DRA presented site plan options showing the previously approved plan and site layout and a new plan and new site layout. The second layout addresses the concerns raised by a few members. The new layout should not cost anymore in construction but SRA indicated there may have to be a fee increase as they were essentially complete with the submission materials on the approved plans.
- MBC also presented a fee increase for their services to bring the project to the board meetings later than originally scheduled. MBC did not ask for a fee increase to assist with the MS/HS work but the extended time frame and additional meetings time was used from the original contract.
- The committee asked MBC and DRA to look at their fee proposals to see what work could be done with the funds remaining in the original appropriation.
- DRA presented an additional service request to have the site analysis consultant walk the site to look for any suspected wetlands areas. The conservation commissioner requested this work. The committee felt that since it was not on the agenda it should not be considered. DRA will bring it next week.

5. Motion to adjourn:

- Motion to adjourn made by David, seconded by George, all present voted approval.