

LEXINGTON SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, October 5, 2015
S. Hadley Public Works Building, Room 221
201 Bedford Street

PRESENT: Chair Jessie Steigerwald, Alessandro Alessandrini, Judy Crocker, Bill Hurley

Superintendent Dr. Mary Czajkowski

ABSENT: Margaret Coppe

ALSO PRESENT: Interim Finance Director Ian Dailey, Director of Facilities (DPF) Pat Goddard

The meeting minutes were taken by Judy Crocker.

At **4:34 pm**, the Chair called the meeting to order.

There were no public comments.

Agenda:

Multi-School Capital Plan: Preparation for Special Town Meeting

a. Plan updates on Pre-K, Elementary, and Middle School Projects

Mr. Goddard reviewed the update given by the architectural firm DiNisco Design at the October 1 Permanent Building Committee (PBC) meeting. DiNisco is moving forward with Clarke and Diamond projects. On October 4, DiNisco and the Conservation Commission toured the sites and discussed the wetlands as they relate to the site projects. Also, the proposal brought forward by Bond Brothers was accepted for the Construction Manager project. Currently, the contract language for the preconstruction services is being evaluated.

Diamond ILP Program

The PBC also receive information requested by Mr. Hurley on re-examining the proposed ILP space at Diamond. The new proposal for \$1.3 million involves two floors and has less square footage than the original \$2.0 million plan. Mr. Hurley inquired as to why the proposal is designed for 2500 square feet when the Director of Special Education reports that the program only requires 1400 square feet. Goddard reported that the larger space is the most efficient to build and in its design. Clarke currently has 741 square feet and is overcrowded. Mr. Hurley also questioned why the approximately 1,400 cannot be constructed on one level for far less than the \$1.3 million recommended by DiNisco. Mr. Hurley stated he would not support moving Clarke's ILP program to Diamond if that is the case, and ask to double the existing 700 sq ft. currently at Clarke. Mr. Alessandrini was concerned that the Selectmen need to approve the middle school projects. Ms. Crocker reported that they had at their September 21 meeting. Superintendent Czajkowski stated that the middle

schools have no other space to reallocate and that there is no Plan B fallback plan to the current plan that involves additions at both schools.

Calendar of Upcoming Special Town Meetings (STM) – reviewed by Ms. Steigerwald.

- November 2 – STM #2
- November 9 – continuation of STM #2
- November 16 – Town Meeting Member Association information session
- December 2 – STM #1

Reconsolidation of the estimate figures will be available November 6-10 for the various boards and committees.

b. Request funds to prepare Pelham Road presentation

Mr. Goddard reviewed DiNisco Design's October 2 memo. This outlined the additional services request for the preliminary feasibility study for the Pelham property. The scope of work includes a 12 section K-5 school for 260 students, design basis narrative of existing conditions and possible re-use of systems, and preliminary site exploration. The fixed fee for these services is \$21,000. Reimbursable expenses include preliminary soil analysis using online resources, an environmental plan, and a topographical survey if permission is granted by the owners prior to purchase. The fee for these services is \$50,000.

The current expected two-year timeline to perform the necessary renovations prior to student occupancy affords more time to identify what the district needs for space. Thusly, the building's 10 classroom spaces may be expanded to 12 by either subdividing current space or expanding the building footprint.

The Committee will need to provide feedback on the programming and scope of the building use as well as how extensive any renovations of building systems should be.

Mr. Goddard addressed the question of why any building improvements are being designed only to add 5 years to the life of the Pelham building by reiterating that it is not being renovated to have a 20-year lifespan. 5 years is the short-term projection period based on the Enrollment Working Group (EWG) figures. After 5 years, the building can be re-evaluated based on the state of actual enrollment figures and the additional district capacity gained with the opening of a new Hastings.

Motion:

Ms. Crocker moved to approve an appropriation of \$71,000 to finance the feasibility designer services from DiNisco Design, specifically for the scope of work and reimbursable expenses as described in its October 2, 2015 memo to the Town of

Lexington. Mr. Hurley seconded and the vote was 3-1 (Alessandrini).

Ms. Crocker and Mr. Goddard will attend the October 5 Selectmen's meeting. Mr. Goddard summarized that the Enrollment Working Group's work is based on projections and as such requires the need for flexibility. The Pelham property will be associated with a range of expenses, based on when work to the building will be undertaken. For example, the roof and the steam unit ventilation system are not an immediate but a future need. The later is reliable but has its drawbacks. The same system is currently at Hastings, Diamond, and the high school.

c. Update on Operating Expense Projections and Discussion of Relationship with Capital Plan Projections

Dr. Czajkowski reviewed the discussion from the Selectmen and School Committee chair meeting held on October 4 and the work that she and Mr. Dailey have done in preparation for the October 8 Summit 1.

The DRAFT Summit 1 Lexington Public Schools FY2017-19 Three Year Budget Projections included examining projected costs above and below the line along with basic assumptions. The former represents the current level of service less 3 union settlements (salary and wages, expenses) and the latter staffing and material expenses associated with anticipated enrollment growth (percentage change in enrollment and its affect on FTE, salary and benefits).

With every 1% of student enrollment growth, it is anticipated that an additional 14 FTE will be needed. This includes general education teachers and support staff. For FY17, this represents an additional 29 FTE without program improvement requests. The staffing needs will be compounded as time moves forward. Based on EWG projections, by 2019 it is estimated that an additional 60 FTE will be needed to meet the academic needs of the increased student population. In FY19, all union contracts will be need to be renegotiated.

Below the line expenses and assumptions for Lexington Children's Place (FY17), Pelham property costs and middle school projects (FY18), and Hastings without MSBA funding (FY19) were presented. These were based on school salaries, facilities salaries, and facility expenses and did not include elementary world language projections. FY17-FY19 budget summary projections were also reported and their percentage change trended from 6.97% to 6.53% respectively.

A FTE by Category chart exhibited the sources of teacher and support staff needs expected to be tied with the anticipated rising enrollment. FY17 is projected to require an additional 30.52 FTE followed by 20.4 in FY18 and 23.21 in FY19. It was suggested that to maintain a level service budget, these FTE needs can be met by either the reallocation of existing resources or the reduction of programs.

Dr. Czajkowski introduced a new approach for Lexington's Summit process by listing key policy issues that face the district. These included:

- enrollment growth
- building capacity
- maximizing existing space/capacity
- redistricting
- service levels for various programs
- financial implications of the above

Given the multiple school capital projects and the growing enrollment demands on the operating budget, she questioned how the district can expect to deliver the same level of services in the future while being sustainable. Lexington has a robust history of receiving program improvement requests. For example, recently she received a request to form a high school crew team. These may need to be frozen.

At the Summit, the municipal expenses and needs will be presented in addition to the schools. The impact of absorbing another 600 students over the next 5 years must be taken into account. Discussion points included that it will be a challenge to sustain our current service level over the next 5 years pending Town resources; it may have been a bad idea to move the LCP out of Harrington regardless of regulatory requirements; all of the funds necessary for municipal and school services come from the same taxpayers; understanding the full picture allows this Committee and others to make better choices.

Ms. Steigerwald gave a special thank you to Dr. Czajkowski and Mr. Dailey for their thoughtful and detailed work for the October 4, October 5, and Summit meetings.

Elementary World Language will be on the October 20 Committee meeting given the information learned today.

d. Formulate Warrant Requests

Ms. Crocker inquired if the LHS HVAC system needs should also be included in this funding package. It is listed in the 5-year school capital plan and will also need to be financed thru a debt exclusion. Ms. Steigerwald would like to further discuss LHS in the context of the School Master Plan and the architectural firm SMMA's options for future LHS options and building envelop needs at the October 20 Committee meeting. The CEC would also like to better understand how the high school fits into the Master Plan. Mr. Hurley questioned the need to deviate from a preK-8 plan to now include the high school.

STM #1 is for school articles and STM #2 is for Town articles.

STM #1 articles include:

Article 2: Design development funding for Clarke and Diamond

Article 3: Design development funding for Hastings, Harrington and Fiske

Article 4: Land acquisition and site improvements for the Pelham property

Article 5: Engineering site study for traffic movement between Pelham property, the Community Center, Marrett Rd and Massachusetts Avenue

5:40pm Adjourn: On a motion made by Steigerwald and seconded by Crocker, the School Committee voted unanimously 3-0 to adjourn at 5:40pm.

Materials:

- October 2 memo from DiNisco Design to Town of Lexington
- DRAFT Summit 1 Lexington Public Schools FY2017-19 Three Year Budget Projections
- School Capital Plan project budget sheet

Place on Consent Agenda for SC Approval 3.8.16

Voted Approved by the School Committee 3.8.16