

Sutton School Building Committee

Regular Scheduled Meeting

6/3/2009

Town Hall Meeting Room

Present: G. Coulter, D. Davis, C. DiBella, T. Harrison, R. Raymond, K. Stuart, D. Suhl,
C. Watkins, R. Weaver

Absent: M. Jerz, W. Mead, J. Smith, L. Stonebreaker

Meeting called to order at 7:05 pm.

1. Cecilia received a letter dated April 27, 2009 from the MSBA indicating that if we want to retain Flansburgh as our designer, we must submit materials documenting the selection processes used when Flansburgh was hired in 2005. Cecilia will provide the itemized list to the other members of the SSBC in an effort to compile the materials. The SSBC voted to move forward with Flansburgh at the 5/13/2009 meeting.

Given that the letter was dated April 27, 2009 and the SSBC members had not received a copy of it, Christine questioned how communication flows between the MSBA and the SSBC. Correspondence flows to the chairman of the School Committee with a copy to the chair of the SSBC.

2. **Enrollment:** Cecilia provided the SSBC with a copy of an enrollment follow-up letter addressed to the MSBA dated May 21, 2009 prepared by her. The letter identified potential residential growth, economic development along 146, and historical enrollment trends in support of an increase in the projected enrollment numbers calculated by the MSBA and provided to Cecilia and Christine at their meeting on May 5, 2009 with the MSBA..

Glenn asked if Cecilia had received updated enrollment projections to the 2006 Flansburgh Feasibility study from NESDEC. Cecilia provided the SSBC members with a projection dated January 17, 2008 and one dated December 22, 2008. The NESDEC projections do not include school choice-in students; the December 22, 2008 included pre-school. The SSBC members compared the updated NESDEC projections to the MSBA projections from the May 5, 2009 meeting with the MSBA. The two projections were similar and both were significantly less than the projections included in the 2006 Flansburgh feasibility study which had been completed by NESDEC. Cecilia pointed out that the MSBA projections are not yet final and the OPM will assist with this finalization.

Tim raised the issue that if the SSBC believes the enrollment numbers being presented are too low, and MSBA will only reimburse to their projection, can the SSBC calculate the cost difference and present it to the town as two building scenarios--the MSBA project and a second bigger project for which the Town would bear 100% of the costs over the projected cost of the MSBA project?

Roger agreed with Tim that this should be considered.

3. New Business:

Maintenance Trust Fund: As a follow-up to his comments from a previous meeting, Ken emailed Jim Smith regarding the establishment of a school maintenance trust fund which could result in extra reimbursement points for the town from the MSBA. Ken would like to see this issue on the Fall town meeting warrant. He stated that other towns have voted to put such a trust into place without allocating monies to it at the time of establishment. Roger offered to assist Ken with any legwork. Ken will continue to follow up with Jim Smith, Town Administrator.

4. Next meeting is scheduled for July 8, 2008.

Motion to adjourn by Donna, seconded by Ken. Unanimous. Meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Respectively submitted,

Christine M. Watkins
Acting Secretary