



Natick Finance Committee

Pursuant to Chapter 40, Section 3 of the Town of Natick By-Laws, I attest that the attached copy is the approved copy of the minutes for the following meeting:

Town of Natick Finance Committee

Meeting Date: February 6, 2018

The minutes were approved through the following action:

Motion:	Approval (as amended)
Made by:	Mr. Hayes
Seconded by:	Mr. Pierce
Vote:	8 - 0 - 2
Date:	2/13/18

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Evans

Clerk

Natick Finance Committee

NATICK FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

February 6, 2018

Natick Town Hall

School Committee Meeting Room 3rd Floor

This meeting has been properly posted as required by law.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dirk Coburn, Member
David Coffey, Member
Bruce Evans, Clerk
Patrick Hayes, Chairperson
Michael Linehan, Member
Robert McCauley, Member
Jerry Pierce, Member
Philip Rooney, Member
Daniel Sullivan, Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Cathleen Collins, Vice-Chairman
Cathy Coughlin, Member
David Gallo, Member
Jim A Scurlock, Member
Kristine Van Amsterdam, Member
Linda Wollschlager, Member

AGENDA:

1. Public Concerns/Comments
2. Meeting Minutes
 - a. Meeting Minutes for January 25, 2018 – Review and Approve
3. Old Business
 - a. Finance Committee and Sub-Committee Process and Scheduling
4. Town Administrator’s FY2018 Budget – Public Hearing
 - a. Natick Public Schools – FY 2019 Preliminary Budget
5. 2018 Special Town Meeting #1 Warrant Articles – Public Hearing
 - a. Article 1 - Appropriate, borrow or transfer from available funds, an amount of money to be expended under the direction of the School Building Committee to design, construct, equip and furnish the new John F. Kennedy Middle School
6. Adjourn

CALL TO ORDER:

Meeting called to order at 7:09 p.m. by Chairman, Patrick Hayes

ANNOUNCEMENTS/CITIZENS CONCERNS:

None.

Public Hearing: Town Administrator’s Preliminary FY 2019 Budget

MOTION

Move to re-open the Natick Finance Committee Public Hearing of FY 2019 Town Administrator’s Preliminary Budget

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Coburn
Seconded by:	Mr Evans
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	9-0-0

MOTION

Move to open 2018 Special Town Meeting #1 Warrant Article Public Hearing

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Coffey
Seconded by:	Mr Linehan
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	9-0-0

Finance Committee Presentation - Kennedy Middle School

The Finance Committee will NOT hear specific information on the FY 19 Operating Budget under this agenda item, but the agenda item is provided to allow certain questions and discussion during the KMS Project agenda item to be allowed, in order to facilitate a more comprehensive discussion.

There will be no motions entertained or voted on the FY 19 operating budget.

- Peter Gray, Finance Director, Building Committee
- Dennis Roche, Director of Technology
- Anna Nolin, Assistant Superintendent, Building Committee
- Tim Bonfatti, Compass Management, Project Manager
- James Jordan, Ai3 Architects
- Justin Tibeau, Ai3 Architects

Anna Nolin, Assistant Superintendent Natick Public Schools
 Identified School Committee members Firkins Reed and Donna McKenzie in the audience. Future Community Forums are planned for 2/13/18 and 3/10/18. By the time the new Kennedy opens in 2021, the current middle schools will each be overcrowded by approximately 300 students. If Natick were to replace all the systems that have reached life end at Kennedy today the capital funds expended would be significant.

Ms Nolin summarized the Kennedy Middle School project. Documents provided on NovusAgenda to support the presentation:

- 134-page document Natick Public School FY19 Budget Information “Imagining a New Kennedy Middle School” as well as a Power Point presentation. Chair

passed out the written questions from the FinCom and written answers from the Superintendent.

- Chair requested that the focus be on the aspects of the building project that can be answered by architects present. Questions around the financials of the funding mechanisms, the Proposition 2 ½ Debt Exclusion and/or other thoughts around funding the project will be left to the end of the evening or on Thursday night because they would not require all members of the building project team to attend.

Points in favor of new Kennedy school highlighted by Ms Nolin:

- Expansion of Special Education Programs at each school – Natick Public Schools have been successfully reducing the number of students out-placed for Special Education because of in-house programs created that serve the needs of special education requirements for students – this allows students to stay in their neighborhood schools and reduces costs for the school district. Additional space would allow expansion of those programs.

Jim Jordan, Ai3 Architects

Highlights of site plan.

Reviewed the site plan and discussed the particulars of site access and timelines and overview of the Kennedy Middle and Brown Elementary school traffic patterns. Reviewed design of the spaces and their relationship to how school system plans to group and distribute students relative to the overall academic plan and curriculum for grades 5 through 8.

Tim Bonfatti, Compass Project Management

Hand-out and slides for summary re the financial aspect.

Currently the MSBA is reserving \$37.3 million dollars in funding for Kennedy Middle School. Only 10 to 15% of the districts in Massachusetts get admitted into the MSBA program and it can take years to get into it. Feasibility study options were:

- a) renovations to bring the existing building up to code would cost between \$50 and \$55 Million Dollars and under the current program Natick has been admitted to that would not be reimbursable. This is a comprehensive renovation which wouldn't address overcrowding or program changes it would just bring building up to code and replace expired systems. Comprehensive renovations and additions that would come close to meeting the approved (reimbursable) conditions and that would cost roughly the same amount as the new school and would disrupt the learning environment between the phasing for four or five years.
- b) Design and build a new school. The Town has already appropriated \$3.7 Million Dollars to get to where we are to date. The cost of a new Kennedy Middle school would only rise each year as construction inflation outpaces consumer inflation.

Tax Impact: As it relates to the appropriation in this town meeting article \$105.8 Million Dollars the Town of Natick portion of that being about \$70 Million the grant portion of that \$36 Million. The tax impact from an average household value at the maximum point on the debt scale of about \$393 per year averaging out to \$295 per year over the course of the 20-year bond. It's important to note that the cost per taxpayer declines each year as the town must pay less interest due to lowered principal as time goes on. Once the bond is paid off, this tax exclusion is off the books.

Cost of Kennedy Project as it relates to other previous projects: This is on the MSBA website. From 2010, average cost of construction during high school construction was most of the cost of the school was subject to being reimbursed. Over the years, the construction economy has recovered and so MSBA funding relative to the town's percentage of funding has a larger gap with more burden on the town. MSBA tries to distribute a set amount of money across many districts and keep their funding program at a constant amount. The Natick High school project cost in July 2010 was \$249/ sq. ft., which was average at that time. Projects that are currently in design or under construction specifically those in the Kennedy Middle School's grouping are projected to cost \$483 / sq. ft. (Kennedy is coming in at \$480 / sq. ft.). Similar to 2010, we have a school that is designed within the average of what the MSBA costs / sq. ft. are for school construction projects.

Controlling Costs: Four-story academic core reduces foundation requirement and therefore cost. Pre-fabricated panels for exterior are cost effective vs. typical masonry. We are planning to achieve Silver LEED certification (energy efficiency and sustainable features to building) which entitles project to 2% reimbursement incentive in the reimbursement rate.

Questions submitted to Ms Nolin:

FinCom Question related to what are the cost of salaries, benefits and fringes for the professional staff and professional development related to that? Same question for Custodial Staff? This comes out of the capital budget – professional staff it's about \$1.1 Million. Custodial staff it's about \$240 - \$260, 000. This would be the first year the school is open.

Question regarding the project based learning labs. The cost of specialized learning labs vs. generic lab space is total approximately 160,000 or about \$40,500 per lab on average.

Ms Nolin: Pointed out the link between the project-based learning labs and the overall education plan schools in the MetroWest area have made a commitment to ensure that students have college to career pathways that set them up for success beyond grade school. Also there has been a complete change in the science and technology and engineering curriculum (STEM) – so Natick has seized the opportunity with the Kennedy Middle School to design the space to accommodate for the hands-on portion of those learning experiences – actually doing the science that prepares students for the work place of the future. We already spend money moving students to different places to get this experience. We've really kept this a low-cost version with high-impact results.

Question – how can we make parity at Wilson with the project based learning?

Redistricting students from Wilson to Kennedy frees up some space in that facility and we are studying ways to create the parallel programs there. The hydroponics/aquaponics lab the set-up we are looking at has been tested for the last two years at the high school and we can set up that parallel scenario at Wilson. The adaptive PE and Fitness Center – Wilson already has a small fitness center there because of the depth of the Adaptive PE adaptive education would mean expanding that fitness center and adding some equipment for that population of students. Wilson already has an outdoor garden program an outdoor greenhouse kit and materials totaling about a \$5 to \$7,000 costs would need to be added. The only programmatic difference that would exist between Wilson and Kennedy would be the planetarium – the Wilson students would use the Kennedy facility. Bussing students from Wilson to Kennedy for this purpose would depend on the STEM curriculum needs of the teachers but the current assumption is that Wilson students would be bussed to Kennedy 2 times per month and that cost would be approximately \$30,000

per year. Class time lost would be approximately 40 minutes per visit. Currently we lose 5 days of instruction every time a class goes to the McAuliffe Planetarium. The total plan allows us to create more parody between the schools than we have had in the past.

Question – specific costs of hydroponics, greenhouse, planetarium and adaptive PE and turf field with lights?

For the new features that don't exist currently at either school – lab costs were explained above – Adaptive Fitness Center approximately \$55,000 more than a similar space if it was just outfitted for classrooms – however the students that we keep in district who have the special needs would then need outsourced services that would cost money not included in this estimate. The performance studio combination multi-media performance space (theater, music, and other arts) is \$220,000 more than a similar space outfitted just for classroom space. Synthetic Turf Field would cost approximately \$1.2 Million Dollars with lighting and the Outdoor Basketball Court \$120,000 with lighting.

Question – What are the five-year operating costs for those scenarios?

Adaptive Fitness Center (with caveat of exact equipment unknown -) we figure \$2,000 per year on the maintenance contract – 5-year \$10,000 cost. Performance Studio – cannot determine at this time as special technical equipment upkeep is an unknown. Just to keep up a black box space would be a small cost. The Turf Field with Lights would be weekly inspection 5 year cost \$3,000; Grooming and Cleaning 5-year cost \$26,000; Contracted Services over 5 years (rubber not sand-based as the Kennedy field would be) \$20,000; Impact Testing over 5 years \$4,000. Life of the field is about a 10 to 12 year lifespan for the turf carpet on average. Outdoor basketball court with lights – there wouldn't be significant maintenance over a 5-year period – there would be electricity costs which could be approximately \$2,000 over 5 years.

Question: List of Capital Repairs of Kennedy if not replaced:

Highlights a 5 year look would be potentially \$8.5 Million Dollars for capital improvements should the new Kennedy not be built – includes installing temporary modular units, relocating other modules to Memorial, (discussing up to the 2021 period only – we have projected district wide increase of students of 100 per year over the entire district) security cameras, exterior doors, univents, HVAC units, sprinkler systems, re-tile floors, replace boilers, all exterior windows, replace science and Tech Ed classrooms to fit new curriculum requirements, entire roof, VCT floor tiles – encompassed in the \$8.5 Million number.

Question: Incremental Operating Costs at Kennedy if new school is not built?

Enrollment need carry on even without a new building – Specialists for art, music, PE fitness, health, technology and engineering classes still need to be added given the enrollment growth and redistribute the middle school population as needed. So the operating costs for teachers, nursing, administrative support staff – that type of operating cost doesn't go away. Hidden costs to crowding is the travelling teacher expense – it reduces teacher preparedness and results in lost teaching time.

Dennis Roche, NPS Director of Technology
Section 1 of the spreadsheet:

The Main Data Center (MDC) has two major risks concerning redundancy. Technology is a necessity there is a MDC comparable to the high school designed for Kennedy – dependence on a single internet connection for the entire school system is a risk i.e., the expanding technology use without a contingency plan. We need connectivity to the internet at another location besides Kennedy. In my opinion, the best option to do this is to take advantage of some fiber trunks we have at all of our schools. The upgrade in the

schools telephone system has freed up a pair of fiber trunks at each school. In the new Kennedy we would take advantage of that extra fiber when hooking it up to the school network. Some of the ticket items in the budget are high because they are based on assumptions without having enough data to drive the costs down. I don't expect them to be any higher than those numbers – I expect the numbers may be lower than today when it comes time to actually buy them. Tech Budget \$2.4 Million.

Questions from Finance Committee on IT:

Why are the costs of IT items being incorporated into this project? Is there a specific reason why these were not presented in the FY19 or future year school budget or capital plans?

MSBA gives us money through the Tech FFE budget to equip the building. We are also equipping the lab. The average life of a device is 3 to 5 years and some devices are kept for 10 years. We do our best to repurpose devices.

Ms Nolin: In speaking with Chenard, those types of purchases are bonded differently and for different numbers of years so he will be exploring those different options. So you're not paying for 30 years for devices that last 5 years.

Should we expect to see a decrease in the school budget in following years if these are folded into the construction budget?

Mr Roche: Yes, if you look on page 78 in the budget book there's a sustainability line included up to six fiscal years and if you look under the column for FY21 when Kennedy would be open I have a line item for replacing devices as Wilson assuming that Kennedy will be bundled in as part of the construction process so there's no additional requests for Kennedy there because they will have been purchased here.

What percentage of these costs is being reimbursed by the MSBA?

Total tech budget for this project is \$2.4 million the MSBA reviews and will be taken up later this month. MSBA will reimburse up to \$1,200 per student as a maximum for the technology plan. So Natick will pay \$1.2 million for the technology plan and \$1.2 million will be reimbursed by the MSBA.

Question: Assuming a 4% interest rates what would the cost to the average taxpayer be for the laptops – This will be a take away for Ms Nolin.

Question: What is the warranty on the synthetic field?

Ms Nolin: The warranty on the acrylic coated sand product is 16 years. The actual components of the synthetic turf field are re-used – the only thing that's replaced every 10 to 12 years is the turf carpet. The cost of that replacement is \$325,000 - \$350,000 every 10 or 12 years. The annual maintenance specifies that for every 100 hours of use it needs to be groomed. Ms Nolin will get more detailed information from Mr Goodhind of LFNR.

Question: Exterior cladding – approximate cost of standard exterior masonry is \$38 psf. This product can range from approximately \$30 psf.

Mr Jordan: Material has a 15-16 year warranty from the manufacturer. Because it is cement-based it will last longer than that.

Questions from members

Mr Coburn: Will there be solar panels on this building? How will it work?

Mr Bonfatti: Plan is to design building to be able to accommodate them but they're not in the budget. The infrastructure will be there to accommodate the weight.

Mr Coburn: Where would expansion is planned if we need to have that in the future plan?

Mr Jordan: MSBA does ask for future building expansion area (Jordan shows on slide) – on the northeast side of the building indicated the green space in back of the “New Kennedy School” design would be the expansion area.

Mr Coburn: In the impact per household – would those previously approved funds for analysis and design be rolled into the debt exclusion?

Ms Nolin: Mr. Chenard indicated that particular cost had been put in the “bond freezer” and they will seek the best rates and way to address either the total cost of the project or parcel it out based on options that are available to him. It depends on how he intends to structure that debt and debt structure is a big part of what he does each year to control costs.

Mr Coburn: This committee would like to know the answer when it is known to town administration.

Mr Rooney: Is the capacity for the Wilson School 800 students?

Ms Nolin: 850. Both schools will be 850.

Mr Rooney: How many students are going to be in the Wilson and Kennedy school in 2021?

Ms Nolin: 850 each but there is room to expand at Kennedy to 1,000.

Mr Rooney: How many students in 2022?

Ms Nolin: 70 to 80 district wide.

Ms Rooney: The school will open in 2021 and be maxed out in 2022?

Ms Nolin: No because the additional numbers are district wide. We think there will be 10 year lifespan for the Kennedy after 2021. My prediction is 10 years after the Kennedy is built we will again reassess enrollment numbers.

Mr Rooney: Regarding technology - does the MSBA \$1,000 per student stand whether we spend the money or not? Roche: The reimbursement is \$1,200 – yes if you spend \$2 million you will still get the \$1.2 million.

Mr Coffey: Is our existing hardware being scrapped or are we reinventing the wheel?

Mr Jordan: We track things over a ten year period – when we look at Kennedy it’s an opportunity to outfit the building with new equipment – but if there is anything in the existing building that can be redeployed somewhere else we do that. If it cannot be reused it gets recycled.

Mr Coffey: Not being a fan of turf fields – a 20-year cost is \$62,000 per year and another \$50,000 for the maintenance so \$112,000 per year for a turf field – what would it be a cost for a grass field?

Mr Jordan: It’s important to note the \$1.2 Million didn’t get off-set by the cost of a regular grass field – A grass field although I’m using approximate numbers is going to be about \$200 to \$300,000.

Mr Coffey: What about cost during following years? Take Away requested from the school.

Ms Nolin: There are drainage issues in that field that would need to be rolled into the number as currently the field is not used because of drainage issues.

Mr Coffey: What type of specialized equipment will you have to buy to maintain the field?

Mr Jordan: The cost of that equipment is included in the budget.

McCauley: How much of a contingency do you have built in if the trend line goes higher.

Mr Bonfatti: The design contingency is 10% and the construction contingency is 5%. It’s there to carry the rest of the design process until we get a bid and start the construction process.

Mr Sullivan: So taking a look at the cost structures and elevating costs if you look at the last 20 years would it be fair to say the high school was built during an outlier economic recession circumstance?

Mr Bonfatti: The market dropped much more than the recession predicted at that time and that's why you're seeing the kind of recovery that's happening is people were taking jobs at cost to keep things going at that time.

Mr Sullivan: Will we look back at this and see that it is at an outlier high?

Mr Bonfatti: You can't predict that.

Mr Sullivan: What in your opinion is driving the doubling of per square foot costs since we built the high school?

Mr Bonfatti: The MSBA is looking into this – but I think they're going to find that some of the things we're doing in code expectations now versus when the high school was built is driving some of that. Natick was a model school as you know – but the model school program has changed significantly. They no longer allow you to change the project as we did with the high school.

Mr Evans: The high school had a builder new to the MSBA project world – so they came in low; the model school thing came in low and the recession cost structure came in low. Now we're kind of hitting the opposite – the MSBA model school program is defunct; and real estate building economy is booming, it's a different set of circumstances today.

Mr Linehan: The technology reimbursement is this in addition to the building reimbursement?

Mr Bonfatti: \$1,200 tech money is for tech – on top of the building money.

Mr Linehan: Is there a listing of all the debt exclusion funding for Wilson MS?

Mr Hayes: Go to your budget binder it's in the appendix or debt section it shows a list of all the borrowed projects and I believe all the information you are seeking.

Mr Linehan: RE: Cement skin – cladding – is it well-designed to interact with water behind it?

Mr Jordan: Yes.

Mr Linehan: What is the flooring for most of the classrooms?

Mr Jordan: there are two products that we can use – it is to be determined by the Building Committee.

Mr Linehan: Why is there no technology cost for the planetarium?

Mr Jordan: We are carrying that in the building costs.

Mr Roche: We don't have the final technical plans – these are preliminary numbers when we don't have drawings yet – plans are still changing – these are estimates based on preliminary drawings.

Mr Linehan: Is the fee structure for non-municipal users?

Ms Nolin: We have a rental structure and fee schedule for any renter who rents the Natick Public School space. It's a generalized fee structure for the school system.

Mr Linehan: But does it cover the marginal cost of using the space?

Nolin: Yes it does over time. It covers the use of the space and additional services that might be necessary to service the space. We use our staff and ask an outside vendor to use our staff as part of the agreement.

Mr Linehan: For the new field – natural turf is limited in usage because it doesn't recover quickly is this new turf field going to be more robust and get more school and non-school usage? Are there fees for use of school playing fields and do they reflect the long-term cost of keeping that field?

Ms Nolin: Yes there are fees and they help to address wear and tear and usage needs that come up.

Mr Hayes: Are the fees set by the school committee or administration?

Ms Nolin: By the School Committee.

Mr Linehan: If we wanted to ensure that wear and tear in addition to maintenance is covered we should talk to the school committee?

Mr Jordan: Yes.

Mr Pierce: Regarding the adaptive P.E. component – will the physically challenged kids have a separate area to work in and will there be a separate teacher.

Ms Nolin: We already have the staff to handle the adaptive P.E. It's in place at Wilson and Kennedy and many of our elementary schools as well.

Mr Pierce: Will the planetarium require any new staff?

Ms Nolin: Not at this time our science teachers are training to teach the earth and space standards and any new standards that have come through the new frameworks.

Mr Coburn: Turf Field – the usability factor was 12-to-1 to natural grass. Is that factor still a good one or has technology changed that factor?

Mr Bonfatti: Lighting is also a factor you get more time and usage per day out of it.

Mr Coburn: What are the capital costs for comparable usage between grass and turf fields?

Hayes: Mr. Coburn the information you're looking for substantive to your ability to vote on Thursday night?

Coburn: No. Unless there's been a major change in that comparison factor.

Ms Nolin: We'll be meeting with the Building Committee later in February to discuss these very aspects. Procedurally, I'd like to discuss that with the Building Committee before I disburse that information at large. We'll get those to you as soon as procedurally we've going through the right channels.

Mr Evans: I saw this post by one of the abutters "many neighbors that abut the Kennedy field or are putting up additions have been monitored quite closely by the wetlands team and have been held to the letter of the law regarding wetlands regulations, I understand that the map was shown on a recent post is not super accurate. Clearly had wetlands on the field – I'd love to have someone officially declare that the field is not in the wetlands."

Mr Hayes: Is there anyone here tonight who is in a position to be able to make that declaration?

Nolin: We're not far enough in the permitting and conservation commission scenario to tell you exactly where things lie, but we know our obligations in terms of replication of wetlands and the entire sensitivity of the site design is to avoid hitting those areas whenever we can. So as soon as the appropriate boards "bless" us I'm happy to share that information.

Mr Linehan: Have you had any interaction with the neighbors regarding the lighting of the field?

Ms Nolin: Those will be discussed February 21, 28, March 6th so those discussions are ongoing a member of the Planning Board is our building committee so we're tracking pretty carefully what we need to do. We've taken many of the abutter concerns and we're in constant dialogue with our abutters.

Mr Linehan: When do you anticipate meeting with the Conservation Commission specifically regarding the field?

Mr Jordan: Thursday we're having a meeting with the departments in Natick – we're going to map out a plan going forward with meeting with all those department heads – so a date hasn't been finalized yet.

Mr Hayes: On one of the birds-eye-views you showed of the campus the soccer field at Brown is missing – there was a field at Brown there was a field at Kennedy so we're going from two to one as you continue to go through and design – is there a possibility that a field will come back into the campus or are we definitely at one field?

Ms Nolin: I think we will end up with one field but it can be used by both.

Mr Hayes to Mr Roche: The fiber – you said there's one fiber line now and we're going to pick up the extra line that's coming in to have two because it's there and gives us some sense of redundancy – is that right?

Roche: We currently depend on a single pair of fiber in every school – so when we designed the new Kennedy we worked into the plans to bring a spare pair of fiber into Kennedy so in effect we had two hubs in the Kennedy instead of just one.

Mr Hayes: Is the addition going across the same poles or using the same trenches as the ones that exist today. Roche:

There are some similar paths closest to the buildings but there's some diversity the further away the buildings you get it depends on a building by building basis. It would cost a lot more money to make them completely independent runs which wouldn't make a lot of sense it would be as expensive as to hire another vendor to come in and run new fiber.

Mr Hayes: Does the data center concept you're putting in the middle school is not just to support that school but is part of the distributed systems and data center that we have for the district?

Mr Roche: It would add resiliency to our infrastructure by giving us some redundancy which we don't have today.

Mr Hayes: Can it be offered as a possible takeaway to look for a better risk management redundancy plan?

Roche: I can share more details on the analysis that I did – what I came back with was the most cost effective that would give us the kind of bandwidth we would need.

Mr Hayes: I would just like to know if we're talking about a \$2.5 million budget – can we look at that again.

Mr Roche: Yes.

Mr Hayes: What is the running list of potential value engineering opportunities that you always look at and are still in play?

Mr Jordan: We can get you that answer from the Building Committee.

Mr Hayes: There was a slide in the presentation that had costs & affordability –What's the data or assumptions that are driving that? Is the \$81 Million as an example, for Wilson, is that using the \$483 cost factor for the Kennedy project or using the original cost of Wilson with an inflation rate or cost of construction increase from the date it was finished to current dollars? Did we use the same approach and assumptions for the high school? How are we doing this comparative?

Jordan: It's based on the cost it would cost to build those facilities with today's dollars. The cost psf of \$483 for a middle school would be a slightly higher cost for a high school and Wilson is using the same data that Kennedy is being built upon today.

Mr Hayes: Can we do an analysis that takes the actual cost of Wilson was when it was completed and determine what the cost in today's dollars are either using an annual cost adjustment or construction index increase on an annual basis?

Mr Bonfatti: We can provide that for you.

Mr Hayes: The cost of Kennedy if we did nothing was \$8.5 Million – and there was a \$55 million cost to bring Kennedy up to code – can you tell me the difference between the things that are on the \$8.5 list and the \$55 list? What would be the time horizons on that spend?

Mr Bonfatti: The \$8.5 million were high priority items that need to be repaired promptly – from the Town Manager's List of Capital Improvements. The \$55 Million was from an analysis that is required for each MSBA project that asks what would it cost to bring an existing building up to code in every way and replace all infrastructure systems. Once you hit a third of the assessed value of the current building if you aggregate those projects, you trigger the whole handicap/accessibility code. But that's the basic difference the \$55 million was done as an exercise to comply with the MSBA requirements.

Mr McCauley: Are there any savings that we would recognize from the present Kennedy regarding the emergency maintenance currently being done?

Ms Nolin: I can give you some potential savings that would come out of that but they may be taken up by the new building in different areas.

Mr McCauley: The additional cost of running the new Kennedy figure in response to some questions and it came out to an additional – the \$260 here – that's forgetting about any additional savings you might realize?

Mr Bonfatti: Yes.

Mr Linehan to Mr Roche: Is the only fiber going to Brown school coming from Kennedy or is there another fiber coming into Brown?

Mr Roche: I believe they are both independent coming in from the street.

Mr Hayes: To help us understand the cost comparison, can you to break down the high school project and the projected cost of the Kennedy School by large categories like expected costs of labor vs. cost of materials vs. soft costs, overhead, and contractor profits and things like that? Because understanding that the prevailing wage hasn't changed much is true, square footage is driving a lot of things but so would be different types of materials. So I think it would help the members of the community understand why the cost comparisons are what they are.

Mr Bonfatti: The number that showed the \$249 psf for the high school and the number that shows the \$480 psf for the Kennedy school both come from Form 3011 which was filled out for the MSBA which has a very detailed breakdown of those costs. It does not break them down by labor and material but it breaks them down by trade. I don't have the one for the high school but I assume we could find it somewhere.

Mr Coffey: In addition to the wetlands concerns, I'm also a little concerned about the area that the new roadway is going in – isn't that wetlands also – do you know how that looks in comparison?

Ms Nolin: I'm going to have to give you the same answer that until we go through the appropriate boards for that piece we don't have definitive answer.

Mr Linehan: The sheeting if that's guaranteed for 16 years does that include installation?

Mr Jordan: I think it's a guarantee that guards against manufacturer's defect in the product itself.

Mr Linehan: What kind of warranty on the construction if any is available?

Mr Jordan: I think one or two years on installation and I think that's true on any product that's installed in construction.

Move to close the Special Town Meeting #1 Warrant Hearing

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Evans
Seconded by:	Mr Pierce
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote: Carried	8-0-0 (Mr. Coburn left meeting)

OLD BUSINESS

Article 2 on the Special Town Meeting: Mr. Chenard had the Article correct and Town Counsel gave us an incorrect motion at the last minute. What we voted was the wrong motion. So we will have a request for reconsideration by the Acting Town Administrator on Thursday. Article 3 we continued which is the Medical Marijuana we will hear that on Thursday night. Article 4 is one that we had no recommendation on – I have it on the agenda for Thursday, I have a new motion from the sponsor which I emailed to you today. There are two changes to it there is the change that was made on the fly regarding “east of Oak Street” and there's the language regarding sub-division of lots. In the interest of trying to get this done I made the suggestion to the sponsor of Article 4 that – the sponsor can't be here on Thursday night – if the members believe that they would be inclined to support a favorable motion with no other motions being made then I would consider letting us hear it on Thursday night without the sponsor being here. If members want to retain the right to make any other motion then I would prefer to wait until the sponsor can be here on Tuesday night. This is procedural. Article 1 for the most part the discussion will be however long it takes Mr. Chenard to walk us through the financial aspects.

MEETING MINUTES:

None

ADJOURN

MOTION

Motion to adjourn.

Moved/Motioned by:	Mr Pierce
Seconded by:	Mr Linehan
Motions or Debates:	None
Vote Carried	8-0-0

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.