

Draft minutes
SBAC
October 21, 2014
Hartwell Multipurpose Room

Present: B.McFall, D. Adams, T. Christenfeld, G. Taylor, O. Beenhouwer, B. Creel, S. Perlmutter, K. Bassett, M. Pietrapaolo, J. Richardson (D&W), D. Walter (D&W), J. Boone (D&W)

Absent: H. Russell, P. Sugar, V. Cannistraro

The meeting was called to order at 7:04.

I. Upcoming meetings

The Committee discussed the D&W plan for SBAC “internal charrette” at 5:00 p.m., Tuesday, October 28, 2014. There was a tentative agreement to proceed with this plan, pending confirmation of member availability. The D&W team will distribute materials for the meeting in advance so that those who cannot attend will be able to contribute comments.

The focus of the SBAC meeting on November 4 will be on the content of the presentation for the State of the Town (SOTT) meeting. On November 5, D&W will review this content with members of Town boards. On November 12, the SBAC will review the SOTT presentation and logistics.

II. Preparation for SOTT

Renel Fredriksen provided information about process for SOTT. J. Glass pointed out that there will be more people at SOTT than at the SBAC forum on December 2, so the Committee should do as much as possible to get feedback from town residents at the SOTT. The Committee discussed whether there would be enough time to present all the current project options so as to get valuable feedback.

D&W asked what the objective for the SOTT is. J. Boone asked if the plan is to get some approval for the submission of a SOI to MSBA – but the strong feeling of the Committee is that any such discussion is more appropriate for the Town Meeting in March.

The Committee then proceeded to a discussion of its goals for the March Town Meeting. There was a conclusion that the paramount task is to present viable building options at TM, and that the SBAC should not worry too much about what MSBA might think about the Town discussion. The only important factor from the MSBA point of view is that the Town can communicate that it would stand behind a comprehensive building project with state support. Absent such a consensus, it is very likely that the Town would have to proceed without state funding.

Approved 11/18/14

If the aim is to present 3-5 comprehensive options at the TM, then what does the Committee need to accomplish at SOTT, and how can it be accomplished in 80 minutes? The important task for the SBAC is to explain the logic of any single plan, including a detailed 'baseline' plan. If the basic truth of the condition of the buildings is that the only viable 'baseline' plan costs something on the order of \$30-40 million, then the Committee has to make that case to the town as simply and as strongly as possible.

There was a suggestion that, at least as an option for elucidation, the presentation could focus on Option 1B to try to establish what is possible without triggering the codes. Another important focus is the demonstration of the cost advantages of doing capital improvements as one project, as opposed to a multi-phase project. The Committee agreed that D&W should classify the list of items that form the Capital Improvement Plan into necessary and optional components. There was also a suggestion that the presentation should emphasize the degree to which code upgrades represent improvements and not simply burdens.

III. Results of October 16 public meeting

The Committee had a debrief on the previous week's public forum. One important piece of positive feedback from last week's meeting: Costs were presented, but attendees at meeting quickly moved past the numbers to discuss how the town could invest in programmatic improvements. One focus of discussion at the forum was the need for multiple cafeterias/kitchens. The Committee feels that it is important to emphasize the multi-purpose aspect of cafeteria spaces, including the possibility of more extensive community use.

One conclusion from the public forum is that the Committee needs to develop a better baseline option, particularly because the education piece is clearly secondary as a driver of the overall project cost.

Several attendees of the public forum had stressed the importance of SBAC collaboration with the Community Center Study Committee. There is no school building option under consideration that precludes the siting of the Community Center on the school campus, so the SBAC can continue to work collaboratively with the CCSC. For the moment, the Community Center should not be a focus of D&W's efforts. The main focus has to be ensuring that the town understands the needs of the schools.

Based on the feedback from the public forum, it is not yet possible to eliminate any of the options currently under consideration. Some attendees had argued for a complete tear-down and rebuild of the L-shaped building. The attendees had also expressed more openness to two-story construction than expected, and a greater willingness to move beyond options 1A-C.

IV. Preparation for October 28

D&W doesn't need to generate new options for SBAC consideration. If there is clear consensus in read-outs from October 16 discussion on the option #2 range, then D&W should condense those options. (It is unlikely that there will be adequate clarity.) When the Committee discusses that range of options, it is important to emphasize that the goals are to increase opportunities for collaboration, to include more multi-use learning spaces, and to minimize wasted space. Those are the priorities, not specifically hubs or breakout rooms.

V. Adjournment

T. Christenfeld moved to adjourn. D. Adams seconded. The meeting adjourned at 9:05.