

**SOUTH PORTLAND SCHOOL DEPARTMENT
SECONDARY SCHOOLS FACILITIES COMMITTEE**

April 3, 2008

MEETING NOTES

These notes were prepared by Steve Bailey to the best of his understanding. If you find any inaccuracies, please contact the Superintendent of Schools Office at 871-0555 within one week after receiving the notes.

Present: Tom Blake, Suzanne Godin, Kathy Germani, Randy Martin, Polly Ward, Dave Brochu, Gene Swiger, Ralph Baxter, Jr., Carrie Hall-Indorf, Jeanne Crocker, Jake Viola, Megan Welter, Dan Cecil, and Steve Bailey

1. Welcome
2. Approved of minutes from March 20, 2008
3. Prioritize list and costs from aspects of SPHS plan to answer the question: can it be phased so that it would be more economical.
 - a. Consideration of plans by Harriman: Dan Cecil reviewed his handout that described a 3-phase plan. It included a work outline by section, and provided an 8x11 representation of the stages and costs of the work.
 - b. Identification of projected costs by prioritized segment of the plan: Dan reviewed section A of Phase 1 of the Project Budget Sheet. This included dollar estimates and the need for multiple trailers to house students during each phase of the construction. Points Dan raised included:
 - i. Reduce cost by temporary boiler room in annex when rebuilt?
 - ii. Redundancy of utilities while phasing
 - iii. More trailers / with less money than original plan
 - iv. Location for trailers—need gravel pad at least (to avoid the peat bog)
 - v. Location for staging area?
 - vi. What about DEP work that will have to be done anyway?
 - c. The committee asked Dan to stop at this point in time. It has major questions, and this phased plan seems to be a horrendous scenario.
 - d. The Role of the Committee is to advocate for the three secondary school facilities. We have an opportunity to present in front of the Council and help identify to the council the scope and detail of the plan.
4. Recommendations to Board of Education to bring to the CIP planning meeting.
 - a. The SSFC recommends to the Board of Education that we pursue one middle school. This is the norm across the state for districts our size; EPS supports a single middle school with a student population of 500 - 800 students. Might a one middle school design enhance partial funding by the State. State will ask for studies to help answer questions that are raised through our studies and application process; One middle school will provide savings in construction costs (1 vs. 2); Memorial is in dire straits, even using the current state scoring rubric. More studies are needed before an application can be prepared for the middle schools. Gene Swiger urged the committee to study the water (spring?) on the Memorial site before plans go too far. There was unanimous support from the committee for this recommendation.

- b. Regarding the SPHS. The committee urged conversations with the State (Scott Brown) to learn as much as possible regarding the next round of funding and when the application process might be opened again. (Current understanding is that applications may not open again until the summer or fall of 2009, if then). So, for SPHS...do we apply for state funding? How long can we wait? We do have information needed to prepare the application for the State for SPHS. Even so, it appears as if new information from the State is to favor RSU consolidation efforts, and the list is already long at the State Department. Jeanne Crocker made proposal to continue efforts on the high school project...reduce the scope of the planned work...move ahead with the middle school studies to get ready to prepare an application to send to the State.
 - c. Recommendation to the Board of Education:
 - i. Prepare to go to referendum on SPHS with a reduced scope in the fall of 2009, and to bond during 2010. Look to get commitment on date for vote on SPHS. Why the high school?
 - Heard comments from public
 - SPHS needs attention...however, reign in the plan
 - Extensive testing has been completed
 - The investment in the renovations is for 50+ years
 - There are pressing needs w/in DEP studies
 - NEASC Accreditation—needs to see a plan for scheduled improvements
 - Based on overall needs: educational and physical plant
 - ii. If in the process of this work, applications are also opened up for construction, one will be filed with the State for funding.
 - iii. Use Revolving Renovations funds for work where possible. This was attempted recently with the proposed Beal Gym roof repair, when only \$83,000 of the total cost of \$945,000 was approved by the State through RR.
 - iv. Begin with testing studies for the middle school site to prepare an application. Revised rules for scoring might be ready by 2009. If there is no capacity by 2010 to open up the application process, move forward with referendum for the middle schools.
5. Next meeting CIP planning meeting w/ City Council and Board of Education, April 28, 2008 @ South Portland Community Center, 6:30 p.m.
- a. Suzanne will prepare recommendations to present to the Board of Education for inclusion within the City CIP considerations. One will address the high school, the other the middle schools. Included within each project memo will be the Purpose and Description of the project, Need, Cost, and Funding sources. The Board of Education will meet on April 14 and will have recommendations to bring to the City Council meeting on April 28.