

OPEN SESSION MINUTES
MINUTEMAN REGIONAL VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
REGULAR SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING
MAY 19, 2015 PM 6:30 PM
PAUL REVERE ROOM, MINUTEMAN HIGH SCHOOL

Present:

Jeff Stulin, Chair (Needham)	Jack Weis (Belmont)
Carrie Flood, Vice Chair (Concord)	David Horton (Lexington)
Alice DeLuca (Stow)	Mary Ellen Castagno (Wayland) (left 8:30 PM)
Ford Spalding (Dover)	Jennifer Leone (Lancaster)
Cheryl Mahoney (Boxborough)	Doug Gillespie (Weston) (left 8:45 PM)
Judy Taylor (Carlisle)	Sharon Antia (Lincoln) (arrived 6:35 PM)
Dave Manjarrez (Sudbury) (left 9:27 PM)	Sue Sheffler (Arlington)

Absent: David O'Connor (Bolton)

Also present: Ed Bouquillon, Kevin Mahoney, Jack Dillon, Elizabeth Rozan, Steve Sharek, Eugene DiPaolo, John Pelletier, Gina Condon, Marjorie Daggett, Diane Dempsey, DeAnne Dupont, Mike Majors, Nancy Pierce, Bob McLaughlin, Julie Kremer, Carmin Reiss, Frank Cannon, Dana Ham, Maryanne Ham, Maryann Williams

1. CALL TO ORDER: OPEN SESSION

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

2. PRINCIPAL'S REPORT, *Jack Dillon*

a. Approval of Out-of-State Field Trip and Funds for Skills USA National Competition

Terry Regan gave a brief report on SkillsUSA activities, and some of the 9 students who qualified introduced themselves, their towns, and their shops. Excitement was expressed for the competition, a few clarifying questions were answered, it was confirmed that the trip met all School Committee requirements, and the School Committee took the following vote:

ACTION 2015 #32

Moved (DeLuca) and seconded (Spalding)

To approve the Out-of-State Field Trip and Funds (est. \$24-25,000) for Skills USA National Competition June 22-27, 2015, Louisville, KY

Vote: Unanimous

b. Approval of 2015-16 Student Handbook Revisions (Social Media Policy)

Mr. Dillon called attention to the draft at the table, as a typographical error had been noticed and corrected. It was clarified that the need for this policy revision was due to updating the language. The following vote was taken:

ACTION 2015 #33

Moved (Spalding) and seconded (Leone)

To approve the 2015-16 Student Handbook Revisions (Social Media Policy) as presented

Vote: Unanimous

c. Update on School Improvement Plan

Mr. Dillon explained that the current plan covers a 3-year period, 2013-16. He explained that upon review with the School Council and Dr. Bouquillon, there was a sense that this document was not practical and needs a major revision. He explained that the deficits to the current document include that it is cumbersome and not specific enough, and he feels they can do a better job with it, particularly with new people joining the School Council. He requested taking more time with it before presenting it to the School Committee. He also explained that there are no specific required time frames outlined in the regulations. Dr. Bouquillon added that they are in compliance with the School Committee policy on the School Improvement Plan. It was agreed that he would bring the plan back to the School Committee for consideration in September.

3. SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE REPORT, Ford Spalding, Maryann Williams

a. Report on Community Presentations and FAQs

Mr. Spalding acknowledged members of the School Building Committee who were in the audience. He outlined the details included in the packet on presentations made to the community to get feedback on the preferred option, and referenced the list of Frequently Asked Questions that emerged from these meetings. He noted that MSBA requires community input, and he felt the Building Committee did their best in acquiring this input.

b. Presentation of Preferred Option and vote concerning the Preferred Schematic Report (“PSR”) and authority for OPM to submit PSR to the MSBA on behalf of the Minuteman School District

Mr. Spalding then outlined the 3 options that the School Building Committee reviewed at their meeting on 5.11.15—Renovation, Renovation/Addition, and New (628 students), and reviewed the conceptual project budget cost of each option, as prepared by KBA, shown below:

	Renovation	Renovation/Addition	New Construction with Exist Bldg Demo
	305,808 SF	284,512 SF	242,893 SF
Total Project Budget	\$176,547,602	\$175,333,834	\$144,922,478
Project Duration	60 months	48 months	32 months

He noted that the minutes from their meeting were also included in the packet, outlining their recommendation of a new building for 628 students.

A question was raised about the required vote (unanimous or 2/3), and it was clarified that approval is required by the Town Meetings of all member towns since the current Regional Agreement does not contain the required language that would permit approval by a 2/3 majority. A question was raised about how the proposed revisions to the Regional Agreement impact this vote, and it was clarified that the current agreement is in effect at this time, and the process needs to move forward. It was noted that only Wayland has voted to withdraw from the District. A request was made by a member to hear from the Belmont representative as to why he had voted against the new building option as a member of the Building Committee.

The member from Belmont explained that at his community’s building presentation meeting, attended by approximately 25 town officials and others, the focus remained on building size. He gave a history of Belmont’s position to vote down the 2010 Feasibility Study vote due to a lack of clarity or consensus on the building scope. He explained that the issue for Belmont remains the size of the facility, given their view that the long-term historical enrollment at Minuteman is closer to 400 students. He stressed that Belmont is not against a new building project, and does not have a particular size in mind. He noted that the key people in Belmont are not persuaded that 628 is the right number, and that some programs, such as multimedia engineering and horticulture, could be reconsidered, to reduce the size of the school. The member from Sudbury concurred, noting that there’s not enough information on all the options, that the renovation option

has been presented as an abhorrent one, and he views it as unfair to Sudbury and their students; he suggested that perhaps another option of a smaller school at lower cost could be considered. The member from Arlington noted that Arlington has a problem with the Regional Agreement issue, and that although a good job was done presenting the options to Arlington, there was considerable pushback on cost. Her view was that without the revised Regional Agreement, it won't fly.

The member from Concord reminded people that the vote is not about cost or size, but rather which version the School Committee can support, and which is the most responsible use of the collective funds. The member from Stow pointed out that the building needs to be renovated, and that costs continue to increase. She explained the benefits of an unoccupied building project (i.e., new) and expressed her opinion that the new school option is fiscally responsible to the students and the District. The member from Boxborough pointed out that her stakeholders were able to compartmentalize and analyze the data to support a new building independent of the proposed changes to the Regional Agreement. She also noted cost escalations involved in renovating in place. The member from Lexington noted that the information in the Q & A was very helpful in his community meeting, and he felt there were many reasons to support a new building.

The member from Belmont noted the vote does include a specific size, and if the recommended option is not going to be supported within our towns, it's not a good use of time and funds to begin detailed schematic plans; he noted that if the higher MSBA reimbursement rate was lost, a smaller school would make up the difference in capital and operating costs. He also noted that he was still unclear on the response to the question on the FAQ related to the cost of a smaller school, the modest cost savings of which felt counter-intuitive to him. The member from Lancaster pointed out that cost savings are not percentage based.

Mr. Spalding reviewed the MSBA process again, pointing out that the Building Committee did what they needed to do to remain in the MSBA pipeline. He noted that if the MSBA process is not followed, the risk is losing the reimbursement, and it might take another 2-5 years to get back into the pipeline. He pointed out that money is important to all the towns, and therefore coming to consensus is critical to stay with the process. Maryann Williams pointed out that there are 353 communities in the Commonwealth, that there are 1850 MSBA projects, and that MSBA considers 15 core projects/year. Minuteman is one of the 15 at this time. Mr. Spalding urged the School Committee to look at what's good for the District.

The possible decrease of projected costs, the ever-increasing costs, possible cost savings, and various student numbers were raised. Corrections were made to statements made about the way the number of 628 evolved, particularly with regard to capacity study vs. design enrollment. Concern was voiced by a member who didn't want to be on a School Committee that was against the choices for students. Concern was raised about the importance of acting in the best interest of the students, and that this was a most important vote. The member from Stow referred to some points of pride in being a part of Minuteman, particularly that Minuteman is often first to innovate. She urged being first in doing the right thing for the students, and not to crumble. The member from Boxborough noted that in her community, a comparison to Worcester was made, and it had been pointed out that great things go on at Minuteman despite the building; additionally, she noted that the School Committee had been admonished for allowing the building to get to this state of disrepair.

The new member from Lincoln expressed confusion over why the number was even being discussed at this point, and the member from Belmont noted that the right size of the school was an important discussion. The Chair pointed out that every size has risks educationally and fiscally, and that in his opinion, 628 is the best short and long term option. Mr. Spalding pointed out that in the democratic process, majority rules. The School Building Committee was honoring the majority vote of the School Committee on the 628 number and the Education Program Plan, and urged the School Committee to stick to the motion on the table, which is a requirement of the MSBA process. Mr. Spalding also urged supporting the faculty who are educating the students here, supporting the students who love the school and hope we're doing something about it. He urged considering what is best for the students and what is best for the faculty. He urged supporting the Building Committee's vote to move forward with the MSBA. The member from Sudbury noted his sense that this vote was setting the tone for the "nuclear option".

The following vote was taken by Roll Call, as required by MSBA, with 14 members present, 1 absent, 1 vacancy:

ACTION 2015 #34

Moved (Spalding) and seconded (DeLuca)

That the School Committee approve the recommendation of the School Building Committee for a Preferred Schematic Option for a New School with a Design Enrollment for 628 Students, and for the School Committee to authorize Skanska USA, the Owner’s Project Manager, to submit the Preferred Schematic Option and accompanying Report to the Massachusetts School Building Authority on behalf of the Minuteman School District, no later than June 11, 2015.

DISTRICT	MEMBER	IN FAVOR	OPPOSED	ABSTAINED	ABSENT
ACTON	VACANCY				
ARLINGTON	SUE SHEFFLER	X			
BELMONT	JACK WEIS		X		
BOLTON	DAVID O’CONNOR				X
BOXBOROUGH	CHERYL MAHONEY	X			
CARLISLE	JUDITH TAYLOR	X			
CONCORD	CARRIE FLOOD	X			
DOVER	FORD SPALDING	X			
LANCASTER	JENNIFER LEONE	X			
LEXINGTON	DAVID HORTON	X			
LINCOLN	SHARON ANTIA	X			
NEEDHAM	JEFFREY STULIN	X			
STOW	ALICE DELUCA	X			
SUDBURY	DAVID MANJARREZ		X		

5. STUDENT REPORT

There was no student report.

6. CHAIR'S REPORT

a. Secretary Appointment

A motion was made, and seconded, and the following vote was taken:

ACTION 2015 #36

Moved (Flood) and seconded (DeLuca)

To appoint Dave Horton as Interim Secretary, until the July, 2015 Officer Elections

Vote: 13 in favor, 1 abstention

b. Subcommittee Appointment

There was a brief discussion about the responsibilities of the Communications Subcommittee, and the following vote was taken:

ACTION 2015 #37

Moved (Spalding) and seconded (DeLuca)

To appoint Sharon Antia as member of School Committee's Communication Subcommittee

Vote: Unanimous

c. Update on Membership Terms/Renewals

The Chair extended appreciation to the new members from Lincoln and Lancaster, and noted that a representative from Acton has also been selected, and that she will attend the May 26 School Committee Workshop meeting.

7. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT, *Ed Bouquillon*

a. Advisory Committee Membership Notification

The Superintendent called attention to the list of Advisory Committee members included in the packet, noting that he has approved the list in accordance with Ch. 74 Sec. 6 on Advisory Committees.

b. Town Meeting Articles Update

The Superintendent updated the School Committee on the Town Meeting results, noting that 14 of the 16 towns approved the budget, with the remaining two towns (Belmont and Bolton) meeting in June. He noted that the 6 towns that did not approve the Regional Agreement Amendments in 2014 were asked to reconsider and place the item on the 2015 Warrant. Of those 6, all but Wayland placed it on the Warrant, and voted to hold, postpone, or dismiss. The representative from Wayland noted that they had voted against it in 2014, and did not receive a request to place it in 2015. Dr. Bouquillon affirmed that they had been contacted in January.

c. Review of Options Under Ch. 71 S. 16

The Superintendent noted that Ch. 71 S. 16 was included in the packet as informational, to understand the mechanics of the various options, and that there would be a detailed discussion at the June meeting.

[At 8:30 pm, Ms. Castagno left the meeting.]

d. Review of Impact of new State Vocational Regulation on 9th Grade Exploratory Programs

The Superintendent called attention to materials explaining the impact of the new State Vocational Regulation on 9th Grade Exploratory Programs, and requested a vote to urge the Board of Education to rescind this regulation. Clarification was requested on the procedure related to urging, and it was determined that the Administration would draft a letter and review it with the Officers. The issue of reliance on out-of-district students was raised, and the concern that it's not the School Committee's role to get involved in choices a community makes were points raised. The Chair expressed his opinion that

students need to be in an environment that best suits them, as being in the right or wrong program can make a difference in their lives, and they need access to transformative alternatives. The member from Lincoln noted the need to speak against bad educational policy, and offered to testify when/if there is another opportunity. She noted that the regulation does exactly the opposite of allowing a community to make a choice. Issues raised included equal access to available spaces, the importance of early exposure to options for students, the history of this issue, the negative impact of this regulation on students, the lack of commitment to Ch. 74 education, and the suggestion of admitting choice students. Appreciation was expressed to those members who kept the students in mind in their consideration of this issue. The following vote was then taken, with 13 members present:

ACTION 2015 #38

Moved (DeLuca) and seconded (Flood)

To urge the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to rescind the regulation on 9th Grade Exploratory Programs

Vote: 11 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention

[At 8:45 pm, Mr. Gillespie left the meeting.]

8. ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT, Kevin Mahoney

a. E&D certification as of July 1, 2014

The Assistant Superintendent called attention to the E&D certification included in the packet as informational, and offered some clarifying comments.

b. Update on State Budget (Ch. 70/Regional Transportation)

The Assistant Superintendent called attention to the updated "cherry sheet" included in the packet, which outlined the 2016 Local Aid Estimates for Ch. 70 and Regional School Transportation, and explained this as informational, to keep the School Committee up-to-date with this evolving number in the budget.

c. Surplus Furniture from Concord-Carlisle High School

The Assistant Superintendent explained that Concord-Carlisle High School held a surplus furniture day recently that provided local non-profits and schools to claim furniture and equipment for re-use. He explained that Minuteman was able to acquire a number of chairs, desks, and folding-chair carts.

d. Acceptance of Scholarship: The Ryan Eaton Memorial Scholarship Fund

The Assistant Superintendent explained the request to approve the Ryan Eaton Memorial Scholarship Fund, established by parents Tim and Patricia Eaton at a fundraiser, which Ford Spalding attended. He noted the details of the scholarship as follows:

The Ryan Eaton Memorial Scholarship was established in the memory of Ryan Eaton, a member of the Minuteman High School Class of 2014. He passed away shortly after graduation and was not able to realize his dream. Ryan had a passion for cooking and for life. If you were down he could always cheer you up and never wanted anyone to feel left out. He would go out of his way to make everyone around him feel special and was always willing to lend a hand or to just listen. This scholarship goes to a graduating senior who exemplifies this passion for life and compassion for others.

He noted that this request is pursuant to School Committee Policy DDA Section C, that it begins with \$6000, and annual fundraising is anticipated. The following vote was taken:

ACTION 2015 #39

Moved (DeLuca) and seconded (Weis)

To approve the Ryan Eaton Memorial Scholarship Fund as presented

Vote: Unanimous

e. Car Donation: 1964 Factory Five Cobra

The Assistant Superintendent called attention to the details in the packet relative to this car donation, and the Superintendent called up a picture on his device, which he shared. It was noted that this vehicle will not be registered, as there will be no street driving beyond school property. The following vote was then taken:

ACTION 2015 #40

Moved (DeLuca) and seconded (Flood)

To accept the car donation of the 1964 Factory Five Cobra as presented

Vote: Unanimous

f. Budget Transfer Request: For Site Improvements

The Assistant Superintendent called attention to the details on the budget transfer request for site improvements as described in the packet, and noted a revision in the amount, from \$24,000 to \$36,500 due to an additional amount in the owner options, based on an existing conditions survey, in case this is not available through KBA. He confirmed that this work is in compliance with procurement law. The following vote was then taken:

ACTION 2015 #41

Moved (Spalding) and seconded (DeLuca)

To transfer the sum of \$36,500 (as amended by Mr. Mahoney) from account

#0100000.04.5200.02.747.6.3 – Health/Life Insurance account to be transferred to account

#0100000.08.7200.01.721.6.3 – Capital Building Improvement

Vote: 11 in favor, 1 abstention (with 12 members present)

9. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

a. School Committee Self-Evaluation: Reminder of May 26 Workshop, Dave Horton

Mr. Horton made a request to Mr. Dillon to have a brief report on the activities related to the staff meeting on May 28 regarding recruitment and retention of students and the work with consultant Mark Perna.

He reminded members of the upcoming School Committee Workshop, and explained, for the benefit of new members, how it evolved out of the School Committee self-evaluation this year.

b. Superintendent Negotiations and Evaluation Subcommittee

Commending the work of his colleagues on this subcommittee, Mr. Horton reviewed the process for the Superintendent's evaluation. That the data are not analyzed other than a summary, the elimination of numeric summaries, the value of having had clear progress reports with qualitative and quantitative detail, and improvement over past evaluations were points raised. The Superintendent commented that it is a challenge to meet the state requirements for these evaluations. He clarified that he had explained there would be no District Progress Measures Report this year, and he requested that a more realistic and practical 3 or 4 specific goals be articulated going forward, rather than 12. He also noted that there are 4 priorities the Minuteman faculty has determined:

1. integrating vocational technical and academic curriculum;
2. providing all students with Executive Binder Training;
3. providing an integrated reading consultancy across the curriculum, and
4. utilizing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to engage in conversations about Teaching and Learning.

and that an additional one on educational technology is under consideration. He noted that the evaluation was a good process this year, and he extended appreciation to various staff members who helped him gather the qualitative/quantitative data. He also expressed hope that it could be simpler going forward.

Mr. Horton noted that according to the current contract with the Superintendent, \$3,714 is the maximum salary increase he is eligible to receive for FY 16. With his current salary of \$185,700, this would bring the FY 16 salary up to \$189,414, and it was confirmed that this is within the range of vocational superintendent salaries in this region. A member expressed concern about increased number of out-of-district students, the per student cost for a Minuteman student, town assessments, teacher attrition, and math scores available on the DESE website. The Chair expressed that he is happy to support this vote for the Superintendent's raise. Other comments included points of pride for Minuteman's achievements, and the urging for School Committee members to be more engaged with the school, to spend more time at Minuteman, and to attend the graduation. The following vote was then taken:

ACTION 2015 #42

Moved (Mahoney) and seconded (Antia)

To approve a salary increase of \$3,714 for the Superintendent, based on the current contract

Vote: 9 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions

[Mr. Manjarrez left the meeting at 9:27 PM.]

10. SECRETARY'S REPORT

a. Approval of Past Open Session Minutes

The following vote on the past meeting minutes was taken:

ACTION 2015 #43

Moved (Horton) and seconded (Spalding)

To approve past Open Session Minutes of 4.14.15

Vote: 9 in favor, 2 abstentions (with 11 members present)


Ms. Flood commented that she had not been at the last meeting, and commended Ms. Rozan on the preparation of the minutes, as by reading them, she was able to be informed about what occurred at the meeting.

11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,


Elizabeth Rozan
District Assistant


David Horton
Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE MINUTES OF 5.19.15

A. DeAnne Dupont Comments

5/19/15

the flip of the least expensive option

I am DeAnne Dupont from the Town of Arlington. I wish for a copy of my statement to be included in the minutes of tonight's school committee meeting.

Since there was no public comment before the vote for the building I realize that my comments will have no impact, but I wanted to share them with you anyway. The information that I have sent around was from a presentation in October 2013. After requesting several times for similar information for the proposed 628 student school and not receiving the information, it appears that no one on the Building Committee was provided similar information for the 628 school and was not provided details of the costs. I find it difficult to believe that the renovation add-on would cost ~~only slightly less~~ *drastically significantly more* than a new school.

change in

There is always an allure to something new. Errors are made in calculations. I have seen errors made by big four accounting firms that went through several layers of reviews. *The building committee members could not provide information to demonstrate the reason for this increase.* During the building meeting in Arlington we were advised that we could complete the survey online. However one could not easily find the link to this on the Minuteman High School website. After much searching I requested info on how to get to the survey and it was sent to me, but the person who sent it to me failed to inform me that the cut-off was only hours away and I needed to complete it immediately.

I want to have on record that at the Arlington building meeting we were assured by Dr. Bouquillon and Mr. Ford that the allowance for the site improvements would cover all costs for ALL of the new athletic fields that would be displaced by a new building and there would be no costs for these that would be borne by only the in-district schools. We were also advised that the existing building would be demolished and that there would no longer be swimming facilities. I extrapolate from this information that the school will be less desirable for summer camps since the swimming pool is a large draw for camps. The Building and School Committee had to make their decisions before they were advised of annual operating costs for the various scenarios. We were advised at the Arlington building meeting that these would not be available to the Building & School Committees until after the vote was taken.

In my opinion the School Committee has had to make a decision without all of the necessary information and details to make a fully informed decision.

Based on Daedelus Estimate dated 10/23/2013

OPTION	Option 1	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Description	Repair High School	Renovation Student School	New Construction High School	Renovation Student School	Partial Renovation New Addition Student School	New Construction 800 Student High School
Location	758 Marrett Road Lexington	758 Marrett Road Lexington	758 Marrett Road Lexington	758 Marrett Road Lexington	758 Marrett Road Lexington	758 Marrett Road Lexington
New Construction SF		25,515	224,997	35,717	198,388	323,537
Renovation SF	305,808	233,168		301,467	139,900	
Total Square Footage	305,808	258,683	224,997	337,184	338,288	323,537
Construction Cost	\$ 37,783,399	\$ 52,319,416	\$ 58,330,107	\$ 65,807,153	\$ 76,121,830	\$ 79,454,100
Site Development	\$ -	\$ 7,570,000	\$ 9,070,000	\$ 7,570,000	\$ 7,570,000	\$ 9,070,000
Direct Trade Cost Subtotal	\$ 37,783,399	\$ 59,889,416	\$ 67,400,107	\$ 73,377,153	\$ 83,691,830	\$ 88,524,100
Design/Price Contingency 10%	\$ 3,778,340	\$ 5,988,942	\$ 6,740,011	\$ 7,337,715	\$ 8,369,183	\$ 8,852,410
Building Cost	\$ 41,561,739	\$ 65,878,358	\$ 74,140,118	\$ 80,714,868	\$ 92,061,013	\$ 97,376,510
Demolish Existing Building	\$ -	\$ 394,088	\$ 1,659,008	\$ 50,499	\$ 900,067	\$ 1,659,008
HAZARDOUS Waste Abatement	\$ 820,000	\$ 1,195,000	\$ 1,320,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 1,070,000	\$ 1,320,000
Trade Cost SubTotal	\$ 42,381,739	\$ 67,467,446	\$ 77,119,126	\$ 81,585,367	\$ 94,031,080	\$ 100,355,518
General Conditions & GRs	\$ 8,400,000	\$ 5,734,733	\$ 5,783,934	\$ 6,934,756	\$ 7,992,642	\$ 7,526,664
General Requirements (GRs) 2%	\$ 847,635	w/ GC's above	w/ GC's above	w/ GC's above	w/ GC's above	w/ GC's above
Insurance 1 10%	\$ 558,599	\$ 805,224	\$ 911,934	\$ 973,721	\$ 1,122,251	\$ 1,186,704
GC Bonds 1 10%	\$ 564,744	\$ 814,081	\$ 921,965	\$ 984,432	\$ 1,134,606	\$ 1,199,756
Permit by Owner 1% w/Fees	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fee 3%	\$ 1,557,152	\$ 2,244,645	\$ 2,542,109	\$ 2,714,348	\$ 3,128,418	\$ 3,308,059
Estimated Construction Cost	\$ 54,309,869	\$ 77,066,128	\$ 87,279,067	\$ 93,192,625	\$ 107,409,006	\$ 113,576,703
Escalation mid point const. 10%	\$ 5,430,987	\$ 7,706,613	\$ 8,727,907	\$ 9,319,263	\$ 10,740,901	\$ 11,357,670
Construction Cost Escalated	\$ 59,740,856	\$ 84,772,741	\$ 96,006,975	\$ 102,511,888	\$ 118,149,907	\$ 124,934,373
Construction Schedule Phasing Approach	48 - 60 Months Phased & Occupied Swing Space Req.	36 - 42 Months Phased & Occupied Swing Space Req.	24 Months Single Phase No Swing Space	42 - 48 Months Phased & Occupied Swing Space Req.	30 - 36 Months Phased & Occupied Swing Space Req.	28 - 30 Months Single Phase No Swing Space
Temp Space Cost	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ -
Fees (OPM/Design/Permits) 15%	\$ 8,961,128	\$ 12,715,911	\$ 14,401,046	\$ 15,376,783	\$ 17,722,486	\$ 18,740,156
Other Soft Costs	\$ 1,920,000	\$ 2,175,000	\$ 2,175,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000
Project Contingency 10%	\$ 5,974,086	\$ 8,477,274	\$ 9,600,698	\$ 10,251,189	\$ 11,814,991	\$ 12,493,437
Total Project Cost	\$ 81,596,070	\$ 111,640,927	\$ 122,183,719	\$ 136,139,860	\$ 154,687,384	\$ 160,167,966
Reimbursement 40% of Eligible Costs						

- NOTES
- 1 Assumes Construction Start June 2016/Mid Point of Construction varies and is not calculated
 - 2 Cost Estimates are highly conceptual and considered "Order of Magnitude" only
 - 3 Approximate Cost to Demolish Existing Building and Replace with 3 soccer fields \$5,545,000 included in new options above
 - 4 New pool cost not included in New Construction Options above and would need to be calculated

May 19, 2015 Voting Tally - PSR

MINUTEMAN SCHOOL COMMITTEE		In Favor	Opposed	Abstained	Absent
SCHOOL DISTRICT	MEMBER				
ACTON	VACANCY				
ARLINGTON	SUE SHEFFLER	X			
BELMONT	JACK WEIS				
BOLTON	DAVID O'CONNOR		X		X
BOXBOROUGH	CHERYL MAHONEY	X			
CARLISLE	JUDITH TAYLOR	X			
CONCORD	CAROLYN C. (CARRIE) FLOOD Vice-Chair	X			
DOVER	FORD SPALDING	X			
LANCASTER	JENNIFER LEONE	X			
LEXINGTON	DAVID HORTON	X			
LINCOLN	SHARON ANTIA	X			
NEEDHAM	JEFFREY STULIN, Chair	X			
STOW	ALICE DELUCA	X			
SUDBURY	DAVID R. MANJARREZ		X		
WAYLAND	MARY ELLEN CASTAGNO		X		
WESTON	DOUGLAS P. GILLESPIE	X			
TOTALS		11	3	0	1

With 14 members present (1 absent, 1 vacancy)

Minuteman School Committee vote concerning the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) and authority for OPM to submit PSR to the MSBA on behalf of the Minuteman School District:

MOTION: That the School Committee approve the recommendation of the School Building Committee for a Preferred Schematic Option for a New School with a Design Enrollment for 628 students, and for the School Committee to authorize Skanska USA, the Owner's Project Manager, to submit the Preferred Schematic Option and accompanying Report to the Massachusetts School Building Authority on behalf of the Minuteman School District, no later than June 11, 2015.