

**Wellesley Advisory Committee
Juliani Room, Town Hall
April 25, 2018, 7:00 PM**

Those present from the Advisory Committee included Jane Andrews, Todd Cook, Rose Mary Donahue, Tom Fitzgibbons, Mike Hluchyj, Mark Kaplan, Paul Merry, Lina Musayev, Alena Poirier, Betsy Roberti, Tom Skelly and Andrea Ward.

Mike Hluchyj called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

7:00 p.m. Citizen Speak

There was no one present for Citizen Speak.

7:00 p.m. School Committee/Board of Selectmen re: Warrant Articles for June 5 Special Town Meeting

Sharon Gray, School Committee (SC) and Chair, School Building Committee (SBC); Tom Goematt, Vice Chair, Permanent Building Committee (PBC); Matt Kelley, Vice Chair, SC; David Lussier, Superintendent, Wellesley Public Schools and Member, SBC; Joe McDonough, Director, Facilities Management Department (FMD); and Jack Morgan, Vice Chair, Board of Selectmen (BOS), and Vice Chair, SBC, were present.

Town has been busy with School facilities projects since the late 1990s, when Town needed not just to upgrade schools, but also to expand to accommodate then-surge in enrollment

- Sprague substantially rebuilt 2002 and Bates in 2004
- Some Middle School work done in mid-2000's
- New High School built in 2012 with assistance of Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA)
- Conditions assessment in 2012 of all School buildings by architectural firm Symmes, Maini & McKee Associates (SMMA)
 - Fiske and Schofield identified as schools that could be renovated relatively simply over course of two summers, with work subsequently done on those two schools in 2015 and 2016
 - Hardy, Hunnewell and Upham (HHU) schools seen as having more extensive needs than could be addressed in manner of Fiske and Schofield

Multiple committees since then have worked on HHU issue

- HHU Master Plan Committee (HHU MPC) made recommendations in 2017 that School Committee adopted as basis for its HHU Facilities Project Position Statement
- SBC formed in June 2017 by BOS/SC
- After a number of stops and starts – including surprise invitation by MSBA to potentially partner on construction of one K-5 building – Town ready to take next steps and enter feasibility process

Building Conditions

- Each of HHU schools have many common deficiencies: windows, heating, plumbing, electrical, ADA compliance and fire safety, poor traffic circulation and parking, modular classrooms that have greatly exceeded service life
- Buildings built for different era in education – don't meet today's needs (undersized classrooms, multi-purpose rooms, staff doing gymnastics every day to make facilities work); services being

provided in halls and former closets; need spaces to serve small groups of students to be served and to conduct team and collaborative work

- Hunnewell: incredibly undersized gym (one-third of MSBA standards); sprawling layout from serial additions
- Hardy: lack of space for English as Second Language (ESL) learners program, which continues to grow
- Issues at Upham with lack of space for District-wide autism program (30+ students) – red-flagged by state for lack of appropriate space

There was a question as to when on timeline it was first brought up that these three schools should be looked at: In 2009-10 time frame, first of committees formed to look at all School buildings. As part of process in looking at elementary schools, there was a kind of triage: Bates/Sprague essentially new; became clear that Fiske and Schofield were close enough to being functional that could make great improvements through working through summers on those buildings; conscious decision made that HHU schools would require a lot more work. What Town is doing now with respect to Middle School, along with HHU schools, should complete “catch-up” on School Facilities. There was a follow-up question as to whether it is fair to say that Town has had knowledge about need for HHU projects since 2010: Yes, could firm up exact date, but it’s been a long time.

There was a comment that the dates of the state assessing/red-flagging conditions should be included on timeline.

There was a question as to why, given that Schofield also has a multi-purpose gym/cafeteria/auditorium – and that is considered a building deficiency that needs to be addressed in HHU schools – that was not addressed when renovations were made to Schofield, and/or whether it might be addressed in the future: Without luxury of building a new building, no way to address that deficiency, though gym is full-sized.

Elementary Enrollment

- Recent peak (2008-09): 2,481 students
- Current (October 2017): 2,209 students
- Decline of 11% in less than ten years
- Enrollment for next year projected to decline to 2,156 students
- Annual internal projections – long term enrollment trend corroborated by two outside consultants (Cropper 2013 and FutureThink 2016)
- Very aware of and tracking progress of 40B projects in Town; very early phases; given strong statewide trends and declining birthrates, do not anticipate 40B having impact, but will continue to monitor progress and where in Town projects will be located

There was a question/comment that you might find that empty nesters go from four-bedroom homes to 40B developments; could lead to addition in students: Just depends on the type of 40B developments.

There was a question whether the kindergarten round-up was below projections: Pretty close to projections; important to wait til October snapshot, because of multiple round-ups. There was a follow-up question as to how far out the enrollment studies go: Ten years each for Cropper and FutureThink. There was a follow-up comment that enrollment looks like it’s about forty years offset and that forty years from low point is about 2025, when these schools go on line – so predict that enrollment will go up: At the moment, gentle but persistent decline that SC/School Department expects to last for another couple of years.

- In terms of the four schools where needs have been addressed already, Bates and Sprague have 19 classrooms, and Fiske and Schofield have 18 classrooms each

- Three classrooms per grade
- All built with capacity for 400 to 425 per school
- Bates, Sprague and Schofield currently in 350-400 actual enrollment range; Fiske just under 300 students
- HHU schools are very small by any standards
 - Hardy is 15 classrooms
 - Hunnewell is 15 classrooms (though not using all for grade levels)
 - Upham is 12 classrooms
 - Just under 800 students in those three schools combined
- Will have peaks and troughs in particular grade levels and within particular neighborhoods/schools, but that does not change the overall K-5 elementary picture – 106 classrooms overall in system

There was a question as to what kinds of issues arise when there is a school with only one classroom per grade level: Have been dealing with that at Upham for past few years (just tipped over to two sections, but very small sections). Problems exist on all fronts – as a teacher, no peer to coordinate with; very isolating. In terms of staffing, can have yo-yo element of shifting from one to two to back to one section. For students, they go from a “micro” experience in the elementary school to one of the largest middle schools in the state (1,100 students); also issues with grade level diversity (e.g., number of girls vs. boys in those grade levels). Suggestion that Advisory members/viewers go back and look at HHU MPC meeting at which elementary principals spoke to these issues and strongly recommended targeting three sections per grade level. MPC was unanimous in recommending 19 sections per school (except for one member who advocated for 21 sections).

School Committee Position Statement

- MPC existed from April 2016 through March 2017
 - Took in a lot of data; got lots of community input; many public speak opportunities; worked through various pieces of this problem for the Town
 - Strong agreement/consensus on most issues
- SC received final MPC report and took time to deliberate on findings – put forward a voted Position Statement to community last May; SC continues to go back to that frequently as it works on these issues
 - Talking about updating Position Statement to reflect MSBA invitation
- Key elements of SC Position Statement
 - Commitment to neighborhood school model
 - Agree that Town should rebuild two of the HHU schools now and a third when enrollment goes back up and exceeds 2,350 on a long-term basis or the buildings no longer meet educational needs
 - Schools should be 19 classrooms each (three per grade level) – same as Bates and Sprague, which hold 425 students
 - Agree with every other committee to study this issue that Hunnewell should be rebuilt because it is the only school in southwest corner of Town
 - Only issue MPC did not agree on was whether Upham or Hardy should be other school (in addition to Hunnewell) that is rebuilt
 - Go back and watch March 9, 2017 HHU MPC meeting where members talked about their thoughts on this issue
 - SC decided that it needed more information to determine the Hardy/Upham (H/U) question – agreed that all three schools needed further study
 - SC and BOS created SBC in June 2017 to handle feasibility process
 - SC committed to retaining any school that is closed for future K-5 use

There was a request for more information as to how MPC reached the 2,350 trigger enrollment number: Compromise/consensus; some felt you could go to 2,400 or more; others felt that 2,200 was the right number. If you use idea that each of six schools will have 400-student capacity, at some point north of 2,400 you are at full capacity. MPC and SC recognize that 2,350 number is out there not because it will be determinative of what will be done in 2028 but because it is a stake in the ground that if enrollment starts to go back up the Town needs to seriously look at what situation is. Town needs to be ahead of the curve. Part of this work is trying to have consistency in and to “right-size” our buildings/schools: wildly inconsistent to have 15 and 12 classroom schools with others at 18 classrooms. Part of MPC discussion was that 400 students per school is “sweet spot”; three classrooms per grade; Bates and Sprague as models.

MSBA Invitation

- Last summer, as SBC was about to send out Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for feasibility studies, the MSBA called
 - Town had been submitting Statements of Interests (SOIs) to MSBA for five years but had been told that other towns had higher needs/priorities
- MSBA Senior Study Site Visit took place in August 2017
- SBC continued to work on swing space issues over the fall
- December 2017, MSBA issued invitation for Upham School into Eligibility Period for Core Program – based on SC/BOS agreement in April 2017 to list Upham as “priority,” in acknowledgement of work of MPC

There was a question as to whether there is any concern that MSBA will only fund an Upham site: SC/BOS/SBC committed to working through process with MSBA; they are very familiar with Town’s intentions; this is not a traditional MSBA project, insofar as it involves redistricting across schools; Town has been crystal clear from day one that path forward has to include exploration of viability at both H/U sites – bedrock principle that has been mentioned in all conversations with MSBA; Town is at the very beginning of the process with MSBA and very much trying to clarify points like that; if Town gets an answer that is counter to one of those bedrock principles then Town will have to reconsider that partnership.

There was a question as to why the MSBA would care whether it was one site or another: Focus of MSBA is on the student population within that building; for Town, issue is more complicated than just those students; MSBA has very prescriptive process – they want to see that you have funding before you get into all the options. There was a follow-up question as to whether project would include feasibility at both Upham and Hardy: Draft warrants are seeking \$2.5 million for H/U feasibility and schematic design; Town very much wants to work in partnership with MSBA and have them agree and reimburse 30%, but not asking for \$2.5 million to commit to MSBA.

- According to MSBA process, Town is not committing now to any particular scope of feasibility process – that’s not going to be decided until much later; difficult for Town to make appropriation decision well before commitment/decision to scope of feasibility, but that is MSBA process; if Town doesn’t follow process, not eligible for the grant.

There was a question whether feasibility study would be for a particular location: First step is you document educational program – what we need in Wellesley; then initial space summary; after that, then collaborative discussion (Town, project design/Owner’s Project Manager (OPM), MSBA) as to potential solutions to address needs; that’s point in time where Town would say it would like to study these two sites with new construction; OPM and MSBA will say, maybe should also study possibility of simply renovating a building, or studying an additional site – all of this will be part of the feasibility process.

There was a follow-up question as to whether MSBA will have a vote as to final location: Yes, everyone has to agree.

There was a question as to whether MSBA is aware of June 5 STM and whether that is in alignment with their process: Yes; Town has sent exact language of Article 2 (Hardy/Upham) to MSBA and awaiting their confirmation; residents should be very confident that Town is focused on and following this process.

There was a question seeking to clarify that initial step will be to develop a program for a school that will be the sixth elementary school/meet Town needs (perhaps Skills program at Upham caught MSBA's needs), then do feasibility study for each of the sites to see where that school/program will best fit, but that Town must do all this work in order for MSBA to come along: Yes, if Town wants MSBA money, that's exactly what it must do; for process to be successful, must reach agreement among all the parties.

There was a question as to whether MSBA feasibility process is reasonable: Process at a high level tracks what Town is familiar with; there is a lot of documentation and sign-off and procedure that takes time, but Town determines that partnering is not in interests of the Town, it can pull out: Yes, if we find that MSBA is pushing us in direction that would compromise any of the core commitments we have made to the Town, we can pull out, though think that is really a worst case scenario.

SBC

- Town already had an SBC in place when Town got the call from MSBA
- Needed to make a few tweaks for compliance with MSBA process
- SC/BOS voted last night to add additional members – now 18 members (14 voting)
- Focused on educational needs and technical aspects of building schools and how those come together
- Committee charged with engaging with community on many issues

There was a question as to how the distinction was made between voting and non-voting members: Non-voting members are the principals of the three HHU schools and the incoming Assistant Superintendent of Finance and Operations (as of July 1) – staff members who can come in and out to assist SBC with staffing and financial questions.

There was a comment that SBC members have long and deep experience in terms of working with the MSBA.

Special Town Meeting – June 5

- Article 2: \$2.5 million for Hardy/Upham feasibility study and schematic design
- Article 3: \$1 million for Hunnewell feasibility study

Working with MSBA

- Town is currently in Module 1 (Eligibility Period); June 5 STM will fund Modules 2-4 (Forming Project Team, Feasibility Study, Schematic Design); Module 5 (Funding the Project) will require a debt exclusion vote and will fund Modules 6-7 (Detailed Design and Construction); Module 8 is final one (Completing the Project)
- Base reimbursement rate for this year is 31% of eligible costs – overall reimbursement varies from district to district depending on affluence of Town, as well as some additional points for things like maintenance and capital planning (up to an additional two percentage points – average is 1.4%)
 - Additional incentive points for green design for building (assuming new construction) – up to two percentage points

There was a question as to Module 5 (Funding the Project), whether we will have enough information at that time to ask for funds for both detailed design and construction: Yes, based on estimates, but that is how it worked for new High School; our estimate for HS detailed design and construction was higher than actual cost turned out to be.

MSBA Eligibility Period

- Started on April 2; Town has 270 days (until December 28, 2018) to get through all the steps
- Just completed Initial Compliance Certification; have created the SBC already; number of other detailed requirements (e.g., educational profile, enrollment projections, maintenance practices summary that will be submitted)

There was a question whether enrollment numbers affect MSBA funding: No.

There was a question whether the enrollment certification is a process that MSBA engages in: Agreement with MSBA as to the enrollment that Town is designing the building for.

- Funding for feasibility and schematic design required by MSBA – shows Town ready to engage

Hardy/Upham Next Steps

- Module 2: Forming the project team (OPM and designer)
- Module 3: Feasibility study – defining scope, conducting study, deliverables (preliminary design program and preferred schematic report)
- Module 4: Schematic design (on selected and approved solution)

There was a question as to what the factors should/will be for deciding on preferred solution, since that solution will be chosen prior to schematic design: Initial compliance certification document has some language on that – says that Town agrees to consider cost/environmental factors, site development costs, transportation effects, dislocation of site occupants and relationship to other community facilities – Town talked about a lot of different criteria during MPC process, including historic nature of buildings, where on site building could be located. Draft RFQ that SBC was almost ready to issue before MSBA invitation came in outlined in considerable detail what the Town considered important during feasibility study – still represents the Town’s thoughts, and of course agreement will need to be reached with MSBA. There was a follow-up question as to “whose” decision this will be (BOS, SC, etc.): MSBA looking for SBC to make all these decisions, but they expect collaboration/agreement between SC/BOS, as well as community support.

There was a question as to when the land recently acquired by STM will come into decision-making process: Any feasibility study going forward will be able to consider those parcels of land; exactly what happened with land acquired for High School.

Hardy/Upham Appropriation

- Seeking \$2.5 million for Hardy/Upham feasibility and schematic design
- Seeking \$1 million for Hunnewell feasibility only (normal Town process)
- These amounts have been approved by SBC and SC
- MSBA requires both feasibility and schematic design be approved at same time
- FMD was asked to put these numbers together; methodology consisted of
 - Using existing detailed SMMA numbers and updating them
 - Cross-referencing with MSBA data
 - Looked at new special design elementary schools and determined that feasibility and schematic design averaged 3.44% of overall construction costs

- Estimates made using MSBA data came within 10-12% of updated SMMA numbers
- Agreement between PBC, SBC and FMD on estimates

There was a question as to whether consultants need to be hired for educational/programming assessments: Those are done internally.

There was a question regarding traffic assessments under both H/U feasibility and schematic design, along with other similar line items during both processes (e.g., architectural services): You are going from a study (feasibility) to preparing plans/specifications for one site (schematic design). There was a follow-up question as to what feasibility is “getting” us: Under MSBA process, when you finish feasibility you make recommendation for preferred schematic design; feasibility will consider many different options (consolidation, renovation, etc.).

There was a comment that feasibility will look at existing site, but schematic is looking at what might be needed or might occur: They’re not redundant studies, it’s different depth of studies; not doing the same work twice.

There was a comment that there is almost \$600,000 of contingencies during both phases, as well as “escalation” figure: Reason for escalation is that work is not going to start until 2020. These are budgets; not necessarily what Town is going to agree on with designer; will need backups from architects, etc. to document these line items.

There was a question as to what the number was to which some percentage was applied to get to \$146,000 as the Project Contingency for H/U feasibility: The \$960,000 subtotal (\$146,000 is roughly 15%).

There was a question on process, given that at the end of feasibility study a recommendation will be made as to particular school/site, and whether Town Meeting will be able to participate in that decision: To get into MSBA program, Town is required to vote money now for schematic design; asking STM to agree to process of Town board alignment/agreement with MSBA in selection of preferred design; will not go back to Town Meeting for further agreement on that point; however, will go back to Town Meeting for funding for detailed design and construction.

There was a question on additional items that seem to be duplicated in Hardy/Upham feasibility and schematic design: Degrees/depth of study get deeper once you determine where you are building the school.

Hardy/Upham Expected Timing with MSBA

- Fall 2018 – complete Eligibility Period
- Winter/spring 2019 – form project team
- End of 2019 or beginning of 2020 – complete Feasibility
- First half of 2020 – complete Schematic Design
- Late spring or fall of 2020 – debt exclusion vote
- Mid-2021 – complete Detailed Design
- Fall 2023 – complete Construction and open new school

There was a question as to when the site will be chosen: Will complete feasibility around end of 2019 – that is when decision will be made by the boards, with engagement with Town.

Hunnewell

- Entirely funded by the Town; did not submit additional SOI's this year; do not anticipate MSBA funding
- SBC will be operational body
- Only asking for feasibility at this time, per traditional Town process
- RFQ for OPM was published today; plan is to assemble project team by mid-July, with OPM coming on first and assisting with architect selection

There was a question when feasibility study would be completed: Late March of 2019; assuming Hunnewell feasibility study finished and voted by SBC at end of March, will engage further with boards and public and will need an STM probably in fall 2019.

There was a question whether Hunnewell design funds would be funded within the levy or via a debt exclusion vote: Traditionally Town has done design within the levy, but would need to evaluate based on size of project.

There was a question whether schematic design and detailed design would be separated out: Think we would ask for full design funds, enough to take it to bids in hand.

There was a comment that, with escalation line of 2.5% annually, the cost of delay on a \$50 million project suggests that we think creatively about accelerating the timeline on the project we know we are going to do: We have to explore what can be done on the site, we don't yet have swing space; that's purpose of feasibility study; will be thinking creatively about swing space.

St. Paul School

- Have had many discussions about possibly using this as swing space
- SBC engaged with SMMA (\$9,500 study cost) about possibilities at St. Paul: you can actually fit Hunnewell students there, but code and other issues exist
 - Cost estimate was disappointing/shocking – depending on how far you go with renovations, ranged from \$4.7 million - \$7.3 million for a building that the Town does not own
 - Recommended not going further on this until Town gets through feasibility process
 - Building is not for sale

Hunnewell Appropriation

- Numbers are similar to those included on H/U project; smaller because only studying one school

HHU Financial Planning

- Funding for both projects reflected in Town-wide Financial Plan (TWFP), which is reprinted in ATM Advisory Report
- Plan for within the levy borrowing for project components presented here (H/U feasibility and schematic design and Hunnewell feasibility)
- Detailed design will be debt exclusion for H/U and likely for Hunnewell, as well
- Potential for borrowings at this STM to be folded into debt exclusions later – straightforward for H/U but contingent on timing for Hunnewell project
- MPC estimated \$55 million cost for each school; SC/BOS/SBC made conscious decision not to change that number, because nothing to be gained from re-estimating a number without additional new information; feasibility and schematic design will provide better estimates
- TWFP carries assumption that debt exclusion for H/U will come in in FY21 at \$55 million; TWFP assumes that not able to proceed immediately with Hunnewell School, so that additional

two years of cost escalation (5%, which construction managers on SBC say is current rate) for that school (\$61 million vs. \$55 million)

There was a comment that swing space is complicated (maybe modulars would be easier), but 2010-2023 is 13 years to build Hunnewell; moon landing was eight; we can try to do better than this: Modulars are complicated; trying to minimize disruption to Hunnewell students.

There was a question whether, if it turns out that Hunnewell can be built concurrently, then it's not an issue of Town resources: Financial preference would be to do both simultaneously; but don't want to minimize concern of experienced people in Town on bandwidth question of two elementary schools + Middle School + Town Hall interior project all taking place at once; would need to be very serious as to how we address this bandwidth question.

There was a question on the use of the parking lot adjacent to Hunnewell and Library (Cameron Street lot): Getting the St. Paul estimate from SMMA encouraged creative, outside-the-box thinking; two hundred foot required setback from Fuller Brook, and location of school on the site, does limit what you can do on Hunnewell site; after looking at St. Paul costs, however, SMMA and Joe McDonough during same weekend independently thought maybe Cameron Street lot could work; architect and OPM may be able to make something work on the site.

There was a question whether \$55 million figure is before MSBA reimbursement: Yes.

- As to median tax bill impact: Existing debt exclusion (primarily High School) going down at a steady pace; Middle School and Town Hall interior add a significant amount; primary impact on median tax bill is compounding of 2.5% levy growth every year

There was a question as to what the borrowing period would be for HHU debt: Believe Finance Department has modeled at 30 years, level principal, but will confirm that.

There was a question as to whether the Town must front the costs and then will get MSBA reimbursement later: Yes; there is a lag in reimbursement.

There was a question whether feasibility and schematic design funds are ultimately eligible for reimbursement: Yes, for H/U project; MSBA reimburses "things," then it becomes a matter of what those things are worth; would not necessarily assume they will reimburse in full the figures we have on the H/U sheets. There was a follow-up question as to, based on past experience, what items on those lists will not be reimbursed: They might say that some of our feasibility numbers are high given that we are looking at two schools; schematic design should be fine, as that's completely benchmarked against what we are seeing for other schools.

There was a question whether some of \$55 million obtained via debt exclusion will go back and pay off what Town borrowed for feasibility/schematic design: Not the way this model was constructed; Finance Department presently intending to finance the \$3.5 million through Bond Anticipation Notes.

Community Engagement

- Have been talking about this project very publicly for a couple of years; will continue this process
- Project has already evolved based on community feedback – original idea had 24-section school being built at Upham
- SBC charge requires that Town stay engaged with various constituencies around issues like sustainability, historical, neighbors, playing fields/gyms

Project Goals

- At end of day, want to be sure that students are learning in facilities that meet 21st century standards
- Meet student needs in fiscally responsible manner

There was a comment that it is ambitious to think that everyone will be on the same page; there will be differing points of view; will be question of getting a “clear enough” consensus.

9:30 p.m. Discussion on STM Warrant Articles

An Advisory member voiced support for the projects; one project dictated by MSBA and it is what it is; other project follows normal Town process – no reason not to get started.

Another Advisory member noted that we need feasibility studies so that we can decide what to do.

An Advisory member expressed desire for Hunnewell to move forward quickly, since Town is in charge.

Another Advisory member concurred about moving forward quickly on Hunnewell; has toured schools and seen environment in which teaching/learning is occurring; extreme level of commitment and professionalism on part of teachers to make current conditions work; owe it to community to get moving on this.

An Advisory member expressed support; wished that MSBA process didn't require schematic design to be combined with feasibility, as believes that people in Town would like to make that kind of decision; however, work needs to get done.

Another Advisory member very supportive of moving forward, impressed with all the work that has occurred to date to get us to this point; has concern/interest in short term about conveying this information in a clear manner to STM, given complicated/confusing MSBA process and some questions that have occurred around wording of warrant articles and whether any options are precluded by MSBA.

An Advisory member noted that this is something that clearly needs to be done, and as quickly as possible. With Hunnewell, issue is how you balance desire/need for speed against swing space; will be two or three years where those kids will be in a difficult position.

Another Advisory member expressed support for moving forward; when daughter left Hardy 20 years ago the school was deteriorating and there were modular classrooms that are long past shelf life.

An Advisory member expressed support for going forward; believes this has been studied enough, to detriment of students – eight years is sufficient; pleased to see consideration of use of other Town land for swing space.

Another Advisory member expressed view that feasibility studies are necessary and will provide a lot of information that will be used to make decisions going forward; process has been very transparent and believes it will continue to be.

An Advisory member expressed hope that when feasibility study is completed, there could be a community meeting of some sort to explain what happened and reason why one site was selected.

Another Advisory member expressed the view that between now and June 5 conversations with MSBA will likely continue.

An Advisory member encouraged the Town to continue looking at FMD staffing needs – ATM approved a project management position within FMD, but will be additional custodial/maintenance positions, etc., that will be needed.

9:45 p.m. Minutes Approval

Andrea Ward made and Tom Skelly seconded a motion to approve the minutes for March 14 and March 21. The motion passed unanimously.

9:46 p.m. Adjourn

Jane Andrews made and Tom Skelly seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.

Items Reviewed During Meeting

- *Hardy, Hunnewell and Upham Facilities Project*, Presentation to Advisory Committee by School Committee, School Building Committee, Board of Selectmen, and Permanent Building Committee, April 25, 2018
- *HHU Feasibility Study & Schematic Design Fee Estimates (REVISED)*, Memorandum from Joseph McDonough to Blythe Robinson and David Lussier (February 16, 2018)