

**Wellesley Advisory Committee
Juliani Room, Town Hall
May 2, 2018, 7:00 PM**

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

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

7:00 p.m. Public Hearing on Warrant Articles for June 5 Special Town Meeting

Mr. Hluchyj welcomed everyone to the Advisory Committee meeting and offered a brief introduction:

- First order of business is public hearing on warrant for June 5 Special Town Meeting (STM)
- General Citizen Speak for matters other than the warrant for the STM will follow this public hearing
- Purpose of the public hearing is to receive citizen input on matters to be considered at STM
- First article on the warrant is procedural; second and third are substantive
- Tonight is an opportunity for the Advisory Committee to receive input; will make no formal response to comments, but might ask a question for clarification
- Agenda for the regular Advisory Committee meeting that will follow the public hearing includes follow-up with School Committee (SC)/Board of Selectmen (BOS), should further questions arise

Mr. Hluchyj described warrant Article 1 (choose Moderator and receive reports) and invited anyone to speak to it; no one present sought to do so.

Mr. Hluchyj then described warrant Article 2 (\$2.5 million for feasibility study and schematic design for school to replace Upham/Hardy, potentially in partnership with Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA)) and Article 3 (\$1 million for feasibility study for replacement of Hunnewell School). Before opening the meeting to public comment on these two articles, Mr. Hluchyj invited Jack Morgan and Sharon Gray to speak to the warrant language for Article 2 and why it does not include reference to the Hardy School. Mr. Hluchyj noted that the warrant had not been finalized as of the prior week's Advisory Committee meeting, at which the SC and BOS had presented.

Sharon Gray, SC, and Chair, School Building Committee (SBC) and Jack Morgan, Vice Chair, BOS, and Vice Chair, SBC, came forward. Mr. Morgan spoke:

- BOS issued a statement earlier this afternoon (hard copies available in the room) summarizing the reasoning behind language of warrant Article 2, which was voted and approved on Monday night, April 30
- In particular, BOS wanted to reaffirm that nothing has changed in commitment of BOS, SC and SBC to fully analyze and consider, fairly and impartially, both Hardy and Upham sites
- Town was well on its way with a process to do just that, as well as to review Hunnewell site, before Town was contacted by MSBA and ultimately invited into their program
- MSBA has technically invited in the Upham School and that is driven in large part by the fact that the Town listed Upham as the priority school in its Statement of Interest (SOI) submissions last spring. (Town required to name one school as priority if multiple SOIs are submitted). If Town had listed Hardy as the priority, there would be warrant language specific to Hardy but would still have the same problem that Upham wasn't specifically named
- BOS is committed to working to fully evaluate both sites; committed to process outlined of redistricting to accommodate this since sites not adjacent (Bates in between); under MSBA

process, Town can't get to defining how feasibility study works until it has gone through all the eligibility requirements and created the project team and then negotiated the feasibility process

- While Town will continue to try to get clarification from the MSBA, don't want to set any expectations that it can do so before STM or indeed by September; standard process would address these questions in defining the feasibility study, which is only done after Town has been found eligible. BOS making statement (speaking in one voice, together with SC and SBC) that it is willing to be held to not going forward if process will not allow consideration of alternative sites than Upham; confident Town can find a way to work with MSBA -- \$17 million potential reimbursement is substantial impact – but BOS is committed to a process that allows full and fair evaluation of both Hardy/Upham (H/U) sites.

There was a question whether the MSBA would allow us to put any language in the warrant to mention Hardy or doing a feasibility study at Hardy: Town agreed on language with the MSBA; don't know if we negotiated to include Hardy or not.

Blythe Robinson, Executive Director, explained that very early in process MSBA contacted BOS office to discuss eligibility phase requirements; one of initial MSBA statements was to make clear that they have model language they insist that every community use, and there are very few areas where it can be modified; Town must include the name of the school chosen based on SOI; Town can decide whether or not to put a dollar amount in the article; Town can also look to its own bylaws as to other committees that need to be named because of appropriations (e.g., for Wellesley, Permanent Building Committee (PBC) must be included because it is involved in schematic design); only other thing BOS did was add Municipal Modernization Act (MMA) language as to how Town goes about borrowing.

There was a question whether Town Counsel has expressed an opinion on legality of spending any portion of the \$2.5 million in Article 2 on feasibility and schematic design on the Hardy School, when the article only mentions the Upham School: Don't know that we've directed that question to Town Counsel. There was a follow-up comment that, looking at literal language, someone might challenge expenditure of money on something other than what is laid out in the article: BOS/SC will review; MSBA regulations do allow additional sites to be studied during feasibility – other districts in state have consolidated down to one school. There was a further follow-up question as to whether something general could be put into Article 2 about evaluating other sites.

There was a question whether the motion under the article might address this issue: Our understanding is that MSBA will require that motions track warrant language; need to get clarity on this; will work through questions with Town Counsel and bond counsel.

There was a question whether a proposed amendment by a Town Meeting member of the eventual motion language could put funding in jeopardy by violating MSBA language/eligibility criteria: MSBA regulations in no way preclude Town Meeting from amending, but an amendment can't go outside the four corners of the warrant; haven't engaged Town Counsel on that.

There was a question where the Town will be left with the MSBA if Article 2 is defeated at STM: Technically speaking, not required to vote funding until December 28, 2018; if Town decides not to go forward with a motion under Article 2 at this STM or it goes forward and motion is defeated, Town has more than six months to bring it forward again; not under time pressure to act in June, but may not get more information to change analysis by waiting. We have a choice as a Town this year, do we want to continue to move forward with the MSBA process (not committed by warrant/motion to spend the money if we don't reach agreement with MSBA); if we decide to go forward without the MSBA, we shouldn't think we are going to come back into their process and get reimbursement.

There was a question as to the end of eligibility period: All items in eligibility period have to be done by December 28, 2018, including Town Meeting funding vote; MSBA staggers eligibility dates for various towns and cities; our official start of eligibility period was April 2; December 28 is 270 days after April 2; clear we won't be able to get to developing scope of feasibility study until we exit eligibility period; MSBA won't talk right now with us about that, though there are ongoing conversations, and they know what we have communicated to community and they haven't said that we can't do that. There was a follow-up question as to whether SC/BOS thinking that one possibility is that Upham School might be taken offline/closed, and a new Upham school (perhaps renamed Hardy School) built at Hardy site: Yes, we are not familiar with all the ways the MSBA has done this kind of work/these types of consolidations, but there is one example from Woburn (Wyman School) that has parallels to our situation.

Mr. Hluchyj opened the floor to public comments on Articles 2 and 3; requested that speakers be respectful of listeners' time and present views as succinctly as possible (no longer than three minutes, if possible); if someone has already expressed an opinion, might ask for a show of hands as to whether others have the same opinion.

Ansley Martin, Bayview Road (Town Meeting Member (TMM) Precinct B)

- Not sure why there is confusion re: MSBA; they made it quite clear in December 2017 that Hardy and Hunnewell SOIs not invited into program; they've identified Upham as preference based on SOIs that named Upham as the priority school
- Process over the past few years put Town on path to consolidation with enrollment trigger; thought consensus was to do feasibility on Hardy/Upham; everyone knew that Hunnewell was a done deal
- Shouldn't put cart ahead of horse; need to make decision where we are going to build the schools; need to get those feasibility studies going
- Uncomfortable with a warrant article that includes design for Upham when Upham might not be chosen, unless BOS can show us that MSBA isn't that strict

Amy McCarron, Lawrence Road (TMM Precinct B)

- Under impression that warrant articles are binding – for example, when we bought that land (Worcester Street properties), we couldn't vote different parcels at Town Meeting
- Extremely concerned as a TMM that Article 2 states Upham only; appreciate all the boards' commitments, but we need it in black and white; unfortunately we were also promised during SOI phase that those weren't binding and that order of schools didn't matter, but it did; feel we have to take this language seriously; obviously its serious to MSBA; not comfortable as TMM because it locks us in
- Another issue is, had conversation directly with MSBA; was told that the money has to go to Upham; only way MSBA can fund Upham on the Hardy site is if Upham kids are redistricted to Hardy site, and we know based on Town values we're not going to do that; so in effect this makes Hardy ineligible; until we get something in writing about waiving this policy, we have to assume that's locked in

There was a question from Mr. Hluchyj as to whether the MSBA specifically said the funding cannot be used at Hardy: The MSBA said the new school must include the Upham students; money must follow the Upham kids. Mr. Hluchyj followed up by asking whether Ms. McCarron was assuming that the Upham kids can't go to Hardy: Yes, based on redistricting maps generally referred to.

At the conclusion of Ms. McCarron's comments, Mr. Hluchyj asked the residents present whether they shared the concerns that had been voiced thus far, and there was a unanimous show of hands.

Mr. Hluchyj invited additional speakers to come forward.

Albert Berry, Avon Road (TMM Precinct B)

- Concerns are mainly on Article 2 and fact that Hardy wasn't mentioned a single time; very much in favor of doing feasibility study at Hardy
- Would like to know if MSBA is even aware that Town purchased those parcels of land (on Worcester Street); concerned that in effort to tread very carefully with the MSBA, Town has not made them aware of land purchases; everything had previously been in Upham's favor and in order to preserve funding possibility for Town we're not being as transparent with the MSBA as we should be
- Many TMMs voted in favor of purchase of land due to Hardy school and feasibility study and Hardy is not even mentioned in Article 2

Jim Roberti, Weston Road (TMM Precinct B)

- Speaking in individual capacity, not as a member of Planning Board
- Long history of supporting schools on each override and debt exclusion since early 1990s
- Appreciate all the boards' hard work over last several years
- As previous member of SC, learned that leadership needs to be effective in communication with public, especially with neighborhoods and parents affected by changes; need to act in unison so there is a partnership; sometimes "trust me" is not enough
- When SC voted to change SOI forms to reflect Upham as priority, Hardy was alarmed; their fears were allayed; SC May 2017 statement to do feasibility studies gave comfort; after MSBA choice of Upham school in December, were told "don't worry"
- Acquisition of Worcester Street land changed his mind about viability of school at Hardy (now in favor)
- Warrant language is now out and public is being asked to trust SC; community's antennae are now up again – only two feasibility studies; name of school in Article 2; where will Upham students go and will they be given priority over Hardy kids
- Another trust issue is voting of schematic design funding now; current rush to judgment despite 270-day eligibility period pushes trust issue to breaking point; 40B developments may generate more children; Town agrees that Hunnewell should move forward – why not go with that at June STM and wait on H/U; we could look to guidance from Unified Plan and communicate with MSBA – put the brakes on and wait for clarity on Article 2

Ann-Mara Lanza, Oakland Street (TMM Precinct D)

- Really wants this to move forward and very concerned; Town needs new schools; we've been waiting a long time
- Not from Precinct B, but the wording of the warrant article matters; although believes the intent of the boards, Town Meeting (TM) doesn't vote based on intent; it's a contract; supposed to give community notice of what's being discussed at TM; doesn't want wording to be reason we don't move forward with this
- Question whether there is back and forth of emails about whether we can add language in about alternative sites

Gary Farner, Weston Road (Precinct B)

- Agrees with some of comments; important to be transparent
- Hears that reason Upham was selected was because someone who preferred Upham made it the priority; wonder why we didn't make Hunnewell the number one priority and avoid this problem; can we go back to MSBA and ask them to do a site visit on Hunnewell
- Requests that Article 2 be deferred; don't have input from Town Counsel that's been communicated in a meeting such as this; don't know MSBA rules regarding amendments to warrants and motions; don't have enough information in public to move forward with this

Catherine Mirick, Kingsbury Street (TMM Precinct H)

- Warrant article so narrow right now – if we voted on a motion that looked like this it would be arguable whether we could vote something that includes Hardy
- Regarding the language approving feasibility and schematic design at Upham – could we change it to “replacement of Upham school *currently located at*”
- Concerned this is going to be voted down at TM

Patricia Adams, Elmwood Road (Precinct A)

- Concerning the absence of Hardy name in application to MSBA and in the warrant article, feel that Hardy residents’ concerns have been brushed off; quick and careless attempt to do something
- Town expects clarity and transparency; would say to SC and Superintendent and board members here that it is paramount to say what you mean and mean what you say; it means overlooking something very important here by not mentioning Hardy School
- Wonder if it might be possible to have a separate warrant article that mentions Hardy; desperately in need of legal opinions
- Wants to preserve all three schools
- Visited three parcels on Worcester Road; looked like a good place for an access road; hoped would make Hardy a more attractive site than it previously was

Joelle Reidy, Prospect Street (TMM Precinct D)

- Schofield parent; believes it is important to hear that this is not HHU only; coming here to represent a good portion of Precinct D – not to support either/or but to ask some questions
- While we were promised that purchase of Worcester Street properties for \$3.5 million would go into feasibility study for Hardy and make Hardy a better candidate, concerned that we are now focusing on Upham
- If had been told there was no way land was going to be taken into consideration, would never have voted to purchase it

Katherine Cort, Fisher Avenue (TMM Precinct B)

- Warrant article will be voted down at TM without language about Hardy
- Has been following process since 2015; Hardy and all schools should be included; need to keep all three schools; Town is on the wrong path
- PAWS program is going to need space -- why not put what we need there now while we build these three buildings into elementary schools and consolidate and cluster; don’t isolate the preschools
- Feels like has been duped and lied to with the warrant language; moved here for schools and honesty

After the last speaker finished, Mr. Hluchyj closed the public hearing and opened the regular meeting of the Advisory Committee.

8:08 p.m. Citizen Speak

Lauren Linn, Willow Road (Precinct B)

- Wondering if during any of Town-wide elections we could ask community if it wants two schools or three schools; so many people want three schools
- Could move to Weston if we wanted bigger schools
- Before you get into MSBA find out what entire Town wants; asking for opportunity to weigh in

8:10 p.m. Warrant Articles for June 5 Special Town Meeting: Follow-Up with SC/BOS

Sharon Gray and Jack Morgan came forward, along with Matt Kelley, Vice Chair, SC.

Mr. Hluchyj asked how the Upham School became listed as the Town's priority: In March 2017, HHU MPC had made its recommendation (12-6 in favor of building Upham); deadline for MSBA process was the first week of April; Town was in a position to refile SOIs it had filed previously; SC had a good conversation around priorities (Schofield had been priority in 2013; Hardy had been priority in 2014, 2015 and 2016); came to agreement that would make Upham priority in acknowledgement of HHU MPC process, but with commitment that both sites would be considered; at the end, SC and BOS all agreed.

Mr. Morgan also noted, re: the prior question, that a decision on priorities had to be made; four BOS members started with inclination to stick with Hardy because of prior submissions and one BOS member advocated making Hunnewell the priority, but the issue there was absence of swing space. Mr. Morgan noted that he has been involved in school planning and elementary school planning for a long time; trying to work with community on this for a long time; tremendously unfair statements being made blaming Superintendent for all the decisions and suggesting he is driving consolidation; in addition to being insulting to the Superintendent, it's insulting to the 21 members of the HHU MPC who all came to that conclusion; will also make it very difficult in hiring senior level public employees in this Town in the future.

Mr. Hluchyj noted that Mr. Morgan's point was well-taken, and suggested that Town residents might be misunderstanding the process: Clarify that process is being driven by the elected boards, not Town staff.

An Advisory member asked for clarification on what the reasons were for shifting the priority school from Hardy to Upham: Everyone had a different reason; discussion around fact that HHU MPC had made a recommendation after 11 months of study; seen by many SC members as acknowledgement of value of fully examining both sites; very difficult choice to make, but had to do it; SC was pretty strong that we have to pursue any opportunity to get funding from the state; if we had specified Hardy, we would be in exactly the same situation we are now.

An Advisory member asked the SC to confirm/clarify that the MSBA team visited all three schools during its August site visit: Yes, they visited all three schools; very appreciative of Wellesley's organization/preparations; made statements indicating they recognized the deficiencies and problems; spent essentially equal amounts of time at each school. There was a follow-up question as to what conversation took place at that time with the MSBA about consolidation: Talked about HHU MPC process; talked about where Town was; talked about need for Hunnewell and for either Hardy/Upham; talked about partnering on two schools; put everything on the table; we've been talking about consolidating down to two schools all along.

There was a question whether, given Town's assumption that MSBA would be okay with either school, it would be possible to get further reassurances from them: If we insist on having full clarity, it's tantamount to saying we don't want to partner with MSBA.

Example in Whitman-Hanson of an MSBA elementary school project that requested a feasibility study for a particular school, turned out to be a consolidation situation, and district built on another site; named the one school in feasibility; when they made decision to consolidate to other site, the language changed.

There was a question whether it would be possible to do feasibility studies for H/U, decide which school to go forward with, and reapply to MSBA at that time: Issue with reapplying is that it will further delay processes and it has negative impacts on students who are in what many believe to be deficient conditions; face reality that we submitted SOIs for four or five years and didn't get admitted to eligibility;

think Town has to move forward with these projects – either move forward with MSBA or fund them ourselves and accept that we are not in MSBA process; sincerely hope we can find something that makes more people comfortable with MSBA process.

There was a question whether the \$2.5 million in Article 2 is intended to fund feasibility studies for one or two sites: Article 2 appropriation includes \$1.25 million that is intended to fund the initial work on feasibility starting on two sites (that’s why bigger than \$1 million requested in Article 3 for Hunnewell feasibility); based on premise that you’re not going to literally go to every last detail on two sites; will sort some things out; common costs in some areas. There was a follow-up question whether it would be possible to break Article 2 into different motions, one for Upham that would conform to MSBA and one that would study feasibility and schematics of Hardy: Reality is, if intent is to get MSBA funding, then doing feasibility outside of MSBA does not make any logical sense.

There was a question as to why schematic design is included at this stage, since that’s not usually part of Town process with feasibility: Driven by MSBA process, which consists of two Town funding votes, one now for feasibility and schematic design, one later for detailed design and construction.

There was a question about the comment made during the public hearing that any MSBA funding has to follow the Upham students: SC has had multiple conversations with MSBA where we have clearly laid out what we are planning to do and MSBA has not framed it to us in that way; they’ve had every opportunity to say that’s not acceptable, and they have not done so.

There was a question about whether Upham kids would end up going to Hardy: Maybe 15% of Upham students are on autism spectrum; space needs for district-wide Skills program currently located at Upham are high, and likely that program will end up located in the rebuilt school; perhaps that 15% could be applied to “following the students” from Upham to Hardy.

There was a question whether the language in Article 2 could be changed to refer to the Upham school “*currently located at*”: MSBA always uses the same words; we’ll take this input and see where we can go with the MSBA; as of right now, it’s not in their boilerplate language; if you put in language that says you’re going to replace a building, they will say, “slow down, Wellesley” – intent of this phase of process is to take needs that have been validated and determine a solution – won’t commit to building a new building at Upham, let alone at Hardy.

There was a question whether the MSBA knows about the purchase of the Worcester Street properties adjacent to Hardy: That information comes in much later in the process; not trying to hide land from MSBA, but quite confident that they will say that’s nice, that’s your business, as for instance they have with us going ahead with Hunnewell.

There was a question concerning the significance of the MSBA’s December 2017 letter of acceptance that said that Upham was chosen: The statement that Hardy was “not accepted” does not mean Town can’t use Hardy site to build replacement for Upham School; what MSBA did was to validate needs at Upham; that’s our foot in the door, our entry into program; doesn’t mean can’t consider Hardy site as part of Upham project. The BOS and SC decided not to file further SOIs (which would have been due April 1, 2018) for Hardy and Hunnewell driven off logic that was previously articulated; need to move now to get these buildings addressed; given our experience – something like 83 SOIs submitted statewide and 15 accepted – conscious decision that Town needed to move forward to address needs of school and not keep deferring while we wait for MSBA; exceedingly rare to get two schools into program at the same time.

There was a comment from an Advisory member that tonight’s conversation illuminates huge challenge in explaining that Hardy site is not being excluded from the way Article 2 is structured; it’s so specific on Upham that it’s hard to understand how money can be spent on a feasibility study of Hardy in a

meaningful way – is there any flexibility with the wording of the motions: Will ask MSBA some more questions; what’s happened so far is that MSBA has validated needs at Upham; there will be a feasibility study for needs at Upham; one way to meet those needs would be to build new building on Upham site, but another way might be to rebuild on Hardy site and to redistrict Upham kids to Bates: we can’t decide scope of feasibility until basically next winter; we aren’t obligated to partner with the MSBA; this allows us opportunity but doesn’t obligate us in any way.

There was a question when Module 3 (Feasibility Study) is crystallized: Checklist that shows what MSBA is looking for; vote by SBC on final option; looking for SC and BOS to agree with that final option; look to see if community informed and engaged.

There was a question as to when these funds would be spent: MSBA very clear that they want the Town to demonstrate before end of eligibility period – before MSBA starts working – that Town has approved the funding. There was a follow-up comment that may be worth explaining that this is a vote to keep us eligible to participate with MSBA, but that no action will be taken until agreement, etc.: Yes, note that appropriation is to the SBC, not the MSBA; everything will require approval of SBC/SC/BOS.

There was a question as to what the SC/BOS will be looking for in defining scope of feasibility, what kinds of things would cause the Town not to reach agreement with MSBA: Don’t want to go into MSBA negotiations with a bunch of stipulations; however, no support within BOS for going ahead with a process that doesn’t allow for full consideration of Hardy and Upham sites; HHU MPC came up with concrete recommendations (e.g., sizes of schools and desire to rebuild, not renovate), and clear that SBC is not going to allow those to be taken off the table. There was a follow-up question as to whether there will be a specific document that defines the scope of feasibility: Feasibility agreement is a formal document that lays all this out; no shortage of documentation, plus all of it done through open meetings.

There was a question whether Town has been in touch with MSBA to receive approval for language in Article 2: Yes.

There was a question whether, if MSBA comes back and says “we meant Upham,” Town can appropriate additional funds for Hardy: Question for Town Counsel and Finance Department; MSBA cannot direct us; we can propose and they can say yes or no, but we are driving the train.

There was a comment that the MSBA can impose conditions on us (e.g., with construction of the new High School, we lost some sizing/square footage): A lot depends on magnitude of disagreement; if we find we can’t study Hardy, we may walk away; if it’s the High School and it’s 600 square feet vs. 900 square feet, probably won’t walk away.

There was a question whether it would be possible to get a side letter from the MSBA that says something along the lines of, “it is possible to use another site on which to build another school; it’s reasonable for towns to redistrict” – have MSBA say they are not precluding us from doing any of this: We are going to try to do that with the MSBA; will also check with Town Counsel and see what warrant article and motion are restricted to; working diligently; still trying to actually get to something that we can use.

There was a question about the timing relative to changing warrant language: You would end up cancelling this warrant and issuing a new one; believe has to be done with 14 days notice to TM.

There was a question whether it would be possible to reduce the funding in Article 2 to just the amount needed for Upham and have a separate article for Hardy: Then you’re not ever building a school at Hardy with MSBA; have a lot of trouble thinking that MSBA would approve our doing a separate feasibility study of Hardy. Just to follow that logic through: If you reduce appropriation in Article 2 and study only Upham site with MSBA, and separately we appropriate funds for Town-only feasibility study of Hardy,

and run both studies in parallel; maybe decision in the end will be we pay 70% for a school at Upham (in partnership with MSBA) or we Town-fund a school at Hardy – that really disadvantages the Hardy people – not sure that’s any more palatable. We don’t know the plusses and minuses of all the sites – that’s why we want to study them more.

There was a comment/question that if the remarks tonight and the emails Advisory has received are reflective of where TMMs are – not sure, but possible – seems by not addressing these concerns in advance, we jump over the cliff together at TM because Article 2 won’t get passed and then where does that leave us: Logical conclusion is that if we come to something that is as clear as we can get with the MSBA and it gets voted down at TM, will need to come back and go to Town-funded process; at some point we’re going to find out the MSBA has things that they’re going to insist on; if we don’t see those as being aligned with what’s best for Town, we’ll need to come back and do it 100% on our nickel.

An Advisory member echoed the concern as to whether the Town is authorized/allowed in an Upham-worded warrant article to appropriate money for studies at Hardy; fact that BOS sponsored recent acquisition of land adjacent to Hardy, however, shows that BOS wasn’t trying to scuttle Hardy as a site; from point of view of doing the right thing, it’s clear that’s what BOS/SC wants to do, and to study both sites; we’ve got to move forward on these school buildings.

9:25 p.m. Discussion of STM Warrant Articles

An Advisory member echoed the questions concerning the legal ramifications of the scope of Article 2, but also echoed belief that the intent of the boards has consistently been to do the right thing.

Another Advisory member expressed support for the articles; has been involved for a long time; believes that acquisition of land has reduced problems with Hardy site; likes opportunity for Town to get \$17 million from State, as Advisory is also here for the taxpayers; let’s get along with the process.

An Advisory member observed that a lot of the emails are still brooding over the issue of reducing the number of schools from seven to six; would help to explicitly communicate (or re-communicate) that Town is doing a consolidation.

Another Advisory member echoed that point; had been thinking we went over that lightly last week (e.g., decisions by the HHU MPC details about enrollment trigger and the 19-classroom schools); perhaps Advisory could opine on that; there was good discussion within HHU MPC about the advantages of the 19-classroom school, endorsed by principals; enrollment is down, so building a third school in that situation is a little tough on the taxpayers – subject has been very thoroughly vetted but probably does need to come back for consideration by Advisory; a lot of discussion about what is a neighborhood school, for example, Fiske, where students come from all over but still consider it a neighborhood school.

An Advisory member noted the need to understand the legal issues around the warrant; still supportive of this; observed that this is so early in the process that we don’t know what we don’t know yet; would be a shame for Advisory to go down a path that precludes funding from the state at this early juncture, since there will be a feasibility process that will provide for Town input at outset and at decision point; need to start journey and preserve ability to get reimbursement.

Another Advisory member expressed agreement with prior points; would like to get confirmation that we can spend those funds on Hardy the way it’s worded, although presumes that was implicit in Town Counsel’s prior review; if possibility to make motion language more specific, or get outside documentation, that would be great; but walking away from possibility of 30% funding at this early stage, and not allow process to go forward, given all of the built-in processes and commitments and assurances

we've gotten and all the actions Town has taken (including acquisition of land that makes Hardy so much more of a viable option) would be a real mistake.

An Advisory member expressed the desire to move forward and do feasibility studies on both sites and make best decision for Town; need to get clarification that that can be done with the warrant article as written or get additional information/clarity.

Another Advisory member echoed the need to get more clarity from the MSBA; in favor of going forward, but believes that a few additional weeks to get more education/guidance would be time well spent.

Mr. Hluchyj concluded the discussion with the statement that Advisory should not formally vote on the warrant articles at this point; would like clarification from Town Counsel about flexibility of warrant language and, if possible, assurances from MSBA that Town is not precluded from studying Hardy.

9:40 p.m. Minutes Approval

Andrea Ward made and Tom Skelly seconded a motion to approve the minutes from the Advisory Committee's April 23 and April 24 meetings. The motion passed unanimously.

9:41 p.m. Adjourn

Ria Stolle made and Tom Skelly seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.

Items Reviewed During Meeting

- *Board of Selectmen Statement Regarding Article 2 of STM Warrant, May 2, 2018*