

**Advisory Committee Meeting
Juliani Room, Wellesley Town Hall
Wednesday, August 22, 2018, 7:30 p.m.**

Those present from the Advisory Committee included Jane Andrews, Todd Cook, Rose Mary Donahue, Bob Furlong, Mary Gard, Jeff Levitan, Dave Murphy, Lina Musayev, Betsy Roberti, Tom Skelly, and Andrea Ward.

Tom Skelly called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., welcomed new Advisory members, and reminded members that the meetings are televised.

Don McCauley, Town Moderator, also welcomed new Advisory members and said that at next week's meeting the role of Advisory Committee will be reviewed.

7:40 p.m. Citizen Speak

There was no one present for Citizen Speak.

7:40 p.m. School Building Committee/Board of Selectman re: Warrant Article 2 for October 2, 2018 Special Town Meeting

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

Busy this summer kicking off feasibility study for the Hunnewell School project, funding for which was approved last spring at Special Town Meeting (STM), and which is a Town-funded project. Tonight, here to ask for an appropriation for feasibility study and schematic design for a second elementary school renovation or rebuilding project, this one in partnership with the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA). For this project, Town's plan is to study both the Hardy and Upham sites to determine where to build the school.

BOS approved the warrant for the October 2 Special Town Meeting (STM) last night, including the language for Article 2:

- Request for \$2,500,000 to fund the Feasibility Study and Schematic Design modules for the MSBA project to address the needs of the Upham Elementary School (school invited into program by MSBA)
- Warrant language states that solution may include, but not be limited to, renovation or rebuilding of the Upham School, renovation or rebuilding of the Hardy School, or construction of a new school at another site.

Had initially planned to go forward with this article at the June STM, but heard some questions/community concerns around the wording of the warrant language and other aspects of the MSBA process, so decided to push it back knowing that the schedule would not be appreciably changed,

giving us the opportunity to engage with the MSBA and get some of those questions answered and work through the eligibility process.

Point out that warrant language includes potential for building a school at another site; don't at this time have another site, but gives us flexibility as we go into feasibility process.

Feasibility is possibly most important part of process; as a Town, we will be figuring out what we want to do. Feasibility is the search for the preferred solution to a problem; then Schematic Design will provide sufficient detail to establish scope, budget, and schedule for the preferred solution. At that point, Town Meeting and voter approval will come.

During this phase, we will advance to preferred solution, but will not make final decision.

There was a question whether, although no *final* decision will be made, there will still be a decision about which is the preferred solution: Yes, there will be a decision on a preferred solution made by the three boards in concert with the MSBA, but it will not be final until the Town (Town Meeting and voters) weighs in. Although the MSBA makes the selection of the design firm this selection is done in consultation with the Town.

Project Goals

Three of the seven elementary schools have critical system needs. The goal is not to close or consolidate schools; instead, goals are to support the town's K-5 learners academically, socially, and emotionally, address critical systems needs, and provide facilities that meet 21st century education needs, while being fiscally responsible to the taxpayers. Due to enrollment projections, plan is to rebuild two of three schools right now, although could change if enrollment trends back up.

School Facilities Projects

Projects have been underway since the late 1990s. Sprague was renovated and expanded in 2002. The deficiencies have been addressed or are being addressed at other schools. Hardy, Hunnewell and Upham remain to be addressed. Hunnewell feasibility study was funded at the June 2018 Special Town Meeting and is currently in progress.

HHU Master Plan Committee (HHU MPC)

Spent eleven months looking at these projects and concluded that: new construction or substantial renovation is needed to meet educational needs; that 19-classroom schools are the right size for Wellesley; that two schools should be built now with a potential third school built when enrollment reaches and rises past a certain point; and that should proceed to feasibility studies on Hardy, Hunnewell and Upham. Near-unanimous agreement by HHU MPC on almost every decision, except for determining whether second school should be built at Hardy or Upham.

School Committee Position Statement

- Maintain neighborhood school model
- Rebuild two schools now with enrollment trigger (“to exceed 2,350 students on a trending basis”) for third school
- Schools should be 19 classrooms each and meet MSBA standards
- Build at Hunnewell and either Hardy or Upham, in an order to be determined after further study
- Commitment to retain control of the building and land of any closed school for eventual future reuse as a K-5 school

Elementary School Capacities

SC has reiterated that it is committed to the neighborhood school model and agrees with HHU MPC that 19 classrooms – three sections per grade – is educationally appropriate school size. Currently four of the Town’s elementary schools are of appropriate size: Bates and Sprague each have 19 classrooms and Fiske and Schofield each have 18 classrooms. The remaining three schools are too small: Hardy and Hunnewell each have 15 classrooms, and Upham has 12 classrooms.

Building Deficiencies

Joe McDonough presented on the building deficiencies at both Hardy and Upham; will have photos of the deficiencies for the STM.

In summary, Hardy’s building deficiencies include those related to its age (1924 original building, 1925 addition, 1957 addition and 1993 & 1995 modular classrooms). Hardy lacks life safety systems (sprinklers) and its plumbing, electrical systems, HVAC and windows are beyond their useful life. There is significant asbestos in crawl spaces, posing hazards to FMD staff when making repairs. Transitions throughout school also create accessibility/ADA issues and the building circulation and room adjacencies are poor.

Upham has similar issues. It was built in 1957 with additions in 1967 and 1993 and the installation of wooden modular classrooms 25 years ago; lack of life safety systems (sprinklers); original plumbing, electrical systems and windows; air quality issues due to old HVAC; significant asbestos in the ceiling. There are accessibility/ADA issues and site limitations – parking, pick up/drop off and traffic. The circulation in the U-shaped building is poor.

There was a question as to what would be needed for a renovation: A renovation would be very costly; also swing space would be difficult to create with a renovation. There was a follow-up question as to whether there are constraints with the sites themselves (e.g., potential ledge at Upham and tightness of site at Hardy): Will need architects to look at all this, but both Upham and Hardy sites have a lot of potential for development/building.

Educational Deficiencies

- *Hardy Educational Deficiencies*
 - Lacks specialized spaces for delivery of services and professional collaboration, e.g. converted storage rooms with no ventilation, staff working in hallways and corners of the library
 - Lacks appropriate spaces for English Language Learners (ELL) magnet program
 - Undersized classrooms, some dating to the 1920s
 - Inefficient floor plan
 - Lacks adequate space to accommodate special equipment, appropriate furnishings and mobility needs of students
- *Upham Educational Deficiencies*
 - Lacks specialized spaces for delivery of services and professional collaboration, e.g. converted storage rooms with no ventilation
 - Lacks appropriate spaces for district wide SKILLS program (autism spectrum program)
 - Undersized classrooms
 - Inefficient floor plan
 - Lacks adequate space to accommodate special equipment, appropriate furnishings, and mobility needs of students
 - Deficiencies inherent in a two-section school

David Lussier presented on the educational deficiencies of each school and how these deficiencies have an impact on educational learning.

Staff at Hardy and Upham have overcome many of the buildings' challenges and are doing extraordinary work with students. Exciting to look at the opportunities that this work will provide. Many similarities between Hardy and Upham, e.g. lack of overall space and under-sized spaces. Teachers need smaller adjacent spaces to be able to pull out small groups of students for specific instructional needs. Currently these two schools lack appropriately-sized spaces. Neither Hardy nor Upham has a dedicated cafeteria; therefore, it is a challenge for principals to schedule physical education classes around lunch needs. These schools lack teacher collaboration space and there is no private space to meet with students, other teachers or parents. Security is also an issue, particularly at Hardy where there is no clear site line to main office. Upham houses the district-wide SKILLS program that requires dedicated spaces in classroom; district was flagged by the state for inadequate space to support this program. It's great to be able to have these in-district programs but need appropriate spaces for them. Because there is no other space, OT and PT are delivered on the stage/behind curtain in Hardy and Upham café-gym-atorium. Upham does not have an elevator; Hardy has an elevator, but it is not in a great location. Both these schools lack the size and appropriate spaces for kids to learn and for teachers to deliver appropriate services.

There are school tours scheduled: Upham, September 6, from 7 – 9 p.m. and Hardy, September 12, from 7 – 9 p.m. These tours will be followed by question and answer sessions.

MSBA

MSBA is a quasi-state agency established in 2004 by the legislature to fund public school capital improvement projects. MSBA's revenues come from 1% of the state sales tax. Although Upham was the school invited into eligibility process by the MSBA, understanding with MSBA is that Town will also be looking at Hardy as alternative site. Wellesley has worked with MSBA before (on new High School and on accelerated repair program for Middle School windows). MSBA's mission is to "partner with Massachusetts communities to support the design and construction of educationally appropriate, flexible, sustainable, and cost-effective public school facilities." MSBA's goals are aligned with SC/BOS goals for this project.

An Advisory member requested that the SC/BOS discuss how the current warrant article has changed from the version presented last spring: Learning how to work with the MSBA is a process; have had several conversations with MSBA in which Town's whole master planning and redistricting approach, and intention to rebuild at one of these two schools (Upham or Hardy) at this point, have been discussed; MSBA explicitly confirmed that they were supportive of this approach; went a step further and got confirmation and approval in warrant language to explicitly say that project might involve building at Upham or at Hardy or at another site (don't have one at this point but keeping it there to allow flexibility); hasn't changed our intent about what we were trying to achieve with this project, just being more explicit than MSBA might have been in a typical process.

There was a question whether Article 2's language had been approved by Town Counsel and MSBA: Yes, Article 2's language has been approved by Town Counsel, bond counsel and MSBA.

There was a question whether, if we build at Hardy, we are prohibited by MSBA from building at Upham later: Given that project is meant to meet needs of Upham students, then if we build at Hardy, we cannot continue to use Upham in its current condition indefinitely as a K-5 school; MSBA has no issue if enrollment goes up and we decide to build a third school at that site, or renovate that school; MSBA interest is very clear; they want to avoid a bait and switch; were we to build at Hardy, they couldn't tolerate us re-opening Upham and using it for a K-5 school indefinitely in its current condition, since they

have already certified the needs there; nor would Town ever do that, since we've just presented why Upham is inadequate in its current condition; so SC's and MSBA's interests are aligned; have explicitly confirmed with MSBA, however, that we can use Upham in its current condition on a temporary basis, e.g., for swing space for Hunnewell project.

There was a question about the possible future use of Upham for the SKILLS program: Did not discuss specific programs with the MSBA, but the MSBA is very clear about not using current Upham for traditional K-5 use; hard to think we would separate one specialized program (like SKILLS) outside of a regular school setting, since those programs have to have inclusive setting.

There was a question whether adding the possibility of "construction of a new school at another site" (in addition to existing choices of renovating/rebuilding either Hardy or Upham) to the warrant article language introduces problems/unknowns: MSBA has not reached same conclusion as us (regarding lack of additional available sites); likely they will reach it, but they are not there yet; in a typical MSBA case no sites would be listed in the warrant article – MSBA is permitting Town to do this given concerns about warrant language last spring; feasibility study is an open-ended search for possible solutions; have to go through the MSBA process.

Partnership with the MSBA

- Project phases are similar to the typical Town process – Feasibility, Design, Construction
- Choosing consultants
 - Owner's Project Manager is chosen by the Town, with MSBA approval
 - Designer is chosen by an MSBA selection committee, with Town Participation
 - Construction Manager is chosen by the Town, with Inspector General approval (assuming CM@Risk)

The Construction Manager selection is the same process for any municipal project. The Construction Manager selection is not part of MSBA approval.

MSBA Process

- Highly structured, prescribed process - requires adherence to MSBA standards developed and refined over the past 10 plus years
- Along the way:
 - Documentation of progress at each step is to be submitted to the MSBA
 - SBC will work closely with MSBA technical staff at every step
 - Approval is required from the MSBA Board of Directors at certain milestones.

MSBA Reimbursement

- Certain expenses from feasibility, design and construction are eligible for reimbursement
- Reimbursement rates vary from town to town
 - The base percentage is 31%
 - Plus the ability to pay percentage, which is 0% for Wellesley
 - Plus incentive percentage points ranging from 0 – 18% for various practices such as superior maintenance (up to 2%, with an average of 1.4%); energy efficiency, sustainable design and construction (up to 2%) and other things such as the Model School Program where a successful design of another school can be re-used and modified as needed.

There was a question as to the average reimbursement percentage: Hillside School in Needham has a 34.7% reimbursement rate – the base of 31% plus 2% for sustainability and energy efficiency and 1.7% for superior maintenance.

MSBA Invitation

SC submitted statements of interest (SOIs) for Hardy, Hunnewell and Upham every year since 2014. Based on a lower prioritization by MSBA of Wellesley's needs, SC did not expect an invitation. However, Upham was invited into the program in December 2017 – only 15 of 83 SOIs submitted statewide resulted in an invite. With this invitation, the MSBA validated the needs of Upham building and students; MSBA has confirmed SC's ability to study both the Upham site and the Hardy site as a solution to meet those needs. If we build at Hardy, we cannot continue to use Upham in its current condition as a K-5 school.

Role of the SBC in an MSBA Project

SBC is the body that is responsible for the development of the project and works in consultation with SC and BOS. SBC will be required to vote on the preferred solution to move to Schematic Design phase but SC and BOS must also agree on this preferred solution. In the Feasibility phase, SBC has primary responsibility. In the Schematic Design, Design Development, and Construction phases, the PBC, per Town Bylaw, has primary responsibility.

The MSBA process is built around consensus and the required steps are to make sure communities have consensus. All steps are documented so the process is transparent.

A question was asked regarding revisions to the SBC's charge: Revised charge states that boards (SC, BOS, SBC) must reach a consensus regarding preferred solution; however, SBC is expected to make the recommendation. The committees are meeting together fairly often (once a quarter) and coordinating their efforts.

Community Engagement

Community engagement is critical for both the project's success and MSBA approval. The project has evolved based on community feedback. SBC will be engaging the community and specific constituencies through focus groups and community presentations. Specific constituencies include parents, sustainability groups, historical groups, neighbors, and those interested in playing fields/gym spaces. The MSBA will want to know specific ways in which SBC engaged community. SBC has a continued commitment to transparency and working hard to reach a consensus for the Town.

MSBA Process Phases or "Modules"

- Module 1: Eligibility Period
- Module 2: Forming the Project Team
- Module 3: Feasibility Study
- Module 4: Schematic Design
- Module 5: Funding the Project
- Module 6: Detailed Design
- Module 7: Construction
- Module 8: Completing the Project

Currently we are in Module 1, the Eligibility Period. Modules 2-4 will be funded by the article before this STM.

Module 1 has eight tasks that need to be completed by December 28, 2018. Four have been completed.

- ✓ Initial Compliance Certification
- ✓ Creation of SBC
- ✓ Education profile
- ✓ Enrollment projections

- Maintenance practices summary
- Enrollment certification
- Funding for Feasibility Study and Schematic Design

Enrollment Certification

- Biggest deliverable of eligibility period
- MSBA develops its own enrollment projections, based on:
 - Female population data (historical and projected)
 - Birth data and fertility rates
 - Historical enrollment data
 - Potential housing development
- MSBA develops design enrollment from a 10-year average of projected enrollments
- MSBA reviews data, process, and result with Town
- Town and MSBA reach agreement on “design enrollment”

Design Enrollment

- Final certification is not yet available
- Discussions indicate close agreement between MSBA and SBC on the target capacity
- Scenario 1: Renovation/addition or new construction of a three-section school
- Scenario 2: Renovation of Upham at its current capacity

Expect enrollment certification to be completed by October 2, 2018. The MSBA develops its own enrollment projections based on a 10-year average of projected enrollments; Town and MSBA need to agree on the enrollment projections. August 10 meeting suggested that MSBA target enrollment is very close to Town’s target – within 5 to 10 students. Although do not expect renovation to be the right answer, MSBA requires Town to consider the renovation of the building and demonstrate to the community that renovation option was considered. The costs to generate a list of all possible solutions, including renovation, are included in the \$2,500,000 request.

SC/BOS is targeting the October 30, 2018 MSBA Board meeting for the completion of all Module 1 tasks so can move onto Module 2 (prior to expiration of December 28, 2018 deadline).

There was a question whether, if MSBA enrollment projections are significantly lower than ours, will the MSBA support a 19-classroom school: Conversations with MSBA suggest that their projections are very close to ours and would not preclude a 19-section school; very pleased to have close alignment with MSBA on target numbers, given that sometimes MSBA is way off with other towns.

What’s Next

- Module 2: Form the project team
 - OPM and designer selection
- Module 3: Feasibility Study
 - Define the scope
 - Conduct the study
 - Deliverables:
 - Preliminary Design Report
 - Preferred Schematic Report
- Module 4: Schematic Design – PBC takes over

There was a question as to how much of the \$2.5 million is eligible for reimbursement: Because we are studying multiple sites -- \$1.25 million is for the feasibility study of all sites and \$1.25 million is for schematic design of the selected site -- all expenses are potentially eligible for reimbursement; study of both Upham and Hardy eligible for reimbursement.

Feasibility Study – Module 3

- Develop feasibility study scope, with MSBA approval
- Generate and study potential solutions
 - Renovation or new construction
 - Evaluate multiple sites (Hardy/Upham/others?)
- Evaluate potential solutions to narrow and select short list
- Determine preferred solution
 - Community engagement
 - SBC, SC, BOS vote
 - MSBA Board approval

In Module 3 the scope will be developed after the project team established. As part of this, the team will look at the educational program and the rough spaces needed to deliver this program. From all of this a preferred schematic report will be produced. The result of Module 3 will be a recommendation of Upham or Hardy.

There was a question whether new site selection criteria will be developed during feasibility process, since important for Town to hear how decision is made: Yes, but can't develop these now (too soon); MSBA doesn't have specified site selection criteria going into the project, though we know what their interests are.

There was a question whether we are confident that the BOS will grant the three properties that were purchased by the Town to be considered in the site selection: Public commitment by BOS during April STM that BOS would make those parcel available for consideration during feasibility study.

Schematic Design – Module 4

- Permanent Building Committee assumes primary responsibility
- Perform schematic design on preferred solution
- Sufficient detail to establish scope, budget, and schedule.

The MSBA wants to make sure there is a fully developed plan that comes out of schematic design, in terms of scope/budget/schedule, that can then be brought to Town for approval.

What's Down the Road

- Module 5: Funding the Project
 - Approval of proposed solution and funding
 - Town Meeting deliberation and vote
 - Town-wide debt exclusion vote
- Module 6: Detailed Design
 - Design development
 - Construction documents
 - Bidding
- Module 7: Construction
- Module 8: Completing the project

Project Timing – Best Guess

November 2018 – Complete Eligibility Period

May 2019 – Form project team

May 2020 – Complete Feasibility Study

November 2020 – Complete Schematic Design

March 2021 – Town Meeting and debt exclusion votes
 May 2022 – Complete Detailed Design
 May 2024 – Complete construction
 September 2021 – Open new school

MSBA says elementary projects are running five-seven years; above schedule is set at about six years. It will take about six months to create the project team. The feasibility study will take a year or longer. Schematic design will take another 6 months to complete.

A question was asked as to the timeline and if the feasibility study and schematics would be completed before going to the Town for a vote: Yes, the MSBA requires the feasibility study and schematic design to be completed before the Town votes; wants Town to look at the results of schematic design to make funding commitment; need to go through the process if we want money from the state for the project.

There was a question as to when the decision of Hardy or Upham would be made: Spring 2020, after feasibility and entering schematic design.

Hardy/Upham Appropriation Breakdown

Feasibility Study Phase Cost:

Owner’s Project Manager (OPM)	\$200,000
Basic Architectural Services	\$350,000
Topographical Survey	\$90,000
Wetlands Flagging	\$20,000
Hydrant Flow Test	\$10,000
Hazardous Materials	\$40,000
Traffic Assessment	\$50,000
Geotechnical	\$40,000
Environmental Phase 1	\$40,000
Sustainability	\$20,000
Swing Space Study	\$50,000
Cost Estimating	\$40,000
Board Presentations	\$15,000
<u>Community Presentations</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>
Subtotal	\$980,000
<u>Feasibility Contingency (15%)</u>	<u>\$147,000</u>
Feasibility Total	\$1,127,000
<u>Project Contingency</u>	<u>\$123,000</u>
TOTAL	\$1,250,000

Schematic Design Phase Cost:

Owner’s Project Manager (OPM)	\$200,000
Architectural/Engineering	\$500,000
Final Traffic Assessment	\$40,000
Final Geotechnical	\$20,000
Final Environmental, Phase 1	\$20,000
Sustainability	\$40,000
Cost Estimating	\$20,000
Board Presentations	\$10,000
Community Presentations	\$20,000
Reimbursables	\$20,000
Technology	\$15,000

Focus Groups (Charettes)	\$20,000
FF&E Planning	\$15,000
OPM's Estimates	\$20,000
<u>Printing/Submittal Exch/Other</u>	<u>\$13,000</u>
Subtotal	\$973,000
<u>Schematic Contingency (18%)</u>	<u>\$176,000</u>
Schematic Total	\$1,149,000
<u>Escalation</u>	<u>\$101,000</u>
TOTAL	\$1,250,000

FMD clarified that the deliverable out of the feasibility study will be a report (1,000 page document with appendices, etc.). Instead of a single site, we really have two; basically, doing two feasibility studies. The cost is slightly higher but there will be some efficiencies as some surveys can be used for both sites. The feasibility costs were developed from historical information; checked these costs against MSBA data (17 new elementary schools) and our costs are in reasonable range.

Two contingencies as part of feasibility study costs: (1) feasibility contingency is for any item in the project that changes; and (2) project contingency is for something outside the scope of the project. These figures are budgets, not actual fees; will be negotiating fees.

There was a question whether the requested appropriation includes the costs for studying a third site: If a third site is identified, funding to study it would come from the project contingency budget that is part of the appropriation.

A member of Advisory commented favorably that, although we are essentially doing two feasibility studies here (Hardy and Upham), these numbers are not double the Hunnewell feasibility numbers presented last spring and encouraged SC/BOS to be prepared to explain to STM how these numbers differ from a feasibility study of a single site.

Once preferred solution is identified, move onto schematic design; list of elements funded in schematic design phase are similar to those of feasibility phase, but now going from broad brush level of feasibility to drilling down during schematic design.

There was a question whether there will be a different design firm for schematics: Generally same design firm for schematics as for feasibility; MSBA picks the design firm. There was a follow-up question as to whether Town has ability to veto the design firm: No. There was a further follow-up question regarding the use of Model School Program: If you pick a model school, then generally you get model school architect, and design fees should be less.

There was a question as to how timing of this project intersects with Hunnewell project: Feasibility for Hunnewell began in June 2018; possibility of going to Town Meeting for design funds for Hunnewell in Fall 2019 depending on results of that feasibility study (Early Hunnewell scenario); theoretically in Spring 2021 could potentially have debt exclusion vote for both projects at the same time.

HHU: Estimated Impact to Median Tax Bill

- Assuming \$40 million net cost to the Town of the Hardy/Upham project in partnership with the MSBA
- “Early Hunnewell” scenario in combination with Hardy/Upham project:
 - Total cost to the Town = \$95 million
 - Peak impact on median tax bill = \$619 in FY24
- “Late Hunnewell” scenario in combination with Hardy/Upham project:

- Total cost to the Town = \$101.5 million
- Peak impact on median tax bill = \$644 in FY 27

(FY18 actual median tax bill = \$12,599, for a home valued at \$1,051,000)

BOS reviewed the tax assumptions and \$6.5 million will be saved for an “Early Hunnewell” timeline, if there is a viable path for early construction (i.e., swing space can be found); if Hunnewell project depends on using swing space at “old Upham” or “old Hardy,” can’t begin until after MSBA project is done.

There was a question whether the Cameron Street lot is being considered for Hunnewell: Yes; number of different municipal entities own property adjacent to Hunnewell, and there are also wetlands. A member of Advisory commented that hopefully we can think cooperatively about this given that \$6.5 million is at stake.

There was a question as to what will happen to the building that is not selected and what will the building be used for: No answer at this time; there will be a separate process to determine that; need to consider all the Town’s needs; however, will be retained as school property to preserve ability to build a K-5 school in the future if enrollment increases.

A member of Advisory commented that it is good to hear that the Town’s relationship with the MSBA has progressed over the past few months.

There was a question as to whether there had been any discussion/movement concerning swing space for the Hunnewell project: SBC has been studying swing space and attempting to create a solution for a phased construction; continuing the dialogue with the community on this.

9:20 p.m. Minutes Approval/Administrative Matters

The Public Hearing for Article 2 is September 5. A question/suggestion was raised as to whether it would be possible to include with the notice of our public hearing some indication of where to get information, or provide a link or reference to the tape of tonight’s presentation.

SBC has a subcommittee on outreach and they plan to rebuild the website with a link to both these projects. The Superintendent’s office will also send out notices to all school parents. A member of Advisory suggested that tonight’s presentation be posted on SBC’s website.

Andrea Ward made and Lina Musayev seconded a motion to approve the minutes for June 25, 2018. The motion passed unanimously

9:30 p.m. Adjourn

Tom Skelly made and Betsy Roberti seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.

Items Reviewed During Meeting

- *MSBA Project Hardy/Upham: Presentation to Advisory Committee for Article 2 Special Town Meeting, October 2, 2018, School Committee and Board of Selectmen (August 22, 2018)*