

Gorham, Randolph Shelburne Cooperative School Board
Building Committee Tuesday November 1, 2005
GMHS Library

Attendance:

Jean Tremblay, John Carpenter, Bob Demers, Kathleen Kelley, Mike Waddell, Reed Leberman, Ben Mayerson, Craig Burcalow, Keith Parent, Dave Goyette

Absent:

Dennis Pednault, Conrad Deutsch

6:30 Call to Order by Ben Mayerson, Chair.

6:45 Establishment of Membership and Quorum. Motion Made by Mike Waddell to set membership at 10 and quorum at 5., seconded by Bob Demers. No Discussion. All in favor.

6:50 Approval of Minutes. Jean Tremblay moved to accept the minutes as presented, and Reed Leberman seconded the motion. No Discussion. All were in favor.

7:00 Consensus Building. Ben Mayerson introduced this exercise as necessary to continue to make progress. We need to share our feelings about the process and the charge in order to gain consensus and move forward.

Kathleen Kelley summarized her concerns that the board must take a more active role in goal and objective setting. They must communicate what measures of success they would use. Overall, the process that the building committee has been following was good.

Reed summarized the charge is brief enough for us to accomplish in the timeframe established, but we cannot continue to digress for the charge. We need to get one with this project. He asked if Coop Board Members were expecting a recommended option or just a budget for 2006-07 to move the project forward.

John Carpenter summarized a similar train of thought. He expressed frustration with the apparent lack of planning spent by the administration on this project. We need to give a suggest budget figure to the Cooperative Board on a timely basis so that we can move on with the project. John would like to communicate with the board that none of the three options are adequate; at least we are not ready to recommend one of these options. We need more faculty and community input into this process.

Craig Burcalow said he felt uncomfortable with this process, because he does not know if this charge will benefit the town.

Patrick Low responded that the SAU Office has sent a request for extension of time to come into compliance with the accreditation requirements. He suggested that we need to use focus groups to communicate with the public the board scope of dollars involved and the tax impact and that building new maybe is in the end the more economical choice.

Mike Waddell summarized his feeling that this is such a big task it is hard to start. If there were a clear path to follow a building committee would not be needed. We need a plan forward, a budget for 2006-07 and to identify the problems with the Ed Fenn and GMHS that will not go away. We need to spend time finding a cost effective way to solve these known problems. We need to involve experts in this process.

Jean suggested we made the mistake of not recommending enough money for this 2005-2006 period, so we need to plan for enough funds to make adequate progress in 2006-2007.

Ben Mayerson summarized that we all have common feelings about the three options we are looking at present. He reread the charge. He noted that we need the administration to answer the questions of whether the designs presented in 2002 meet the current academic needs of the faculty and whether there is significant energy efficiency or relative maintenance factors, we should consider with the three plans. He said we could propose a budget for planning professionals or for architectural designs. He expressed appreciation for the wealth of knowledge and level of dedication these committee members have shown during this process. We may disagree at times, but the disagreements provide energy for growth and finding great solutions.

Bob Demers summarized that he felt we were not given a fourth and necessary charge which was to look at making Edward Fenn a k-8 and tuitioning our children to BHS. The voters will have a hard time swallowing \$14 million project for a shrinking student populations.

Others agreed with Bob that the Berlin questions will be asked and has been asked in the past. Berlin sent one building committee a letter indicating that without significant facility investment they could not handle the GMHS student populations. Mike Waddell suggested that we (as three towns joined together) have not been in a better position of being able to sustain this kind of an investment. Ben and Reed mentioned that it is not in our charge right now to discuss this option and we must complete our charge before moving onto other issues. Ben also noted that we need the best education facility not necessarily the best economic solution. Ben also noted that we should not be tripped up by the location of the off site option. The SAU and the GHMS administration should look at their wish list and report to us how each of the three options compare.

8:05 We did receive the RS Means School Building Planning Book. It will be helpful as we continue in this process.

The RFP we received was informative, but lacking in specificity. We will review them to use as a basis for developing updated and more detailed versions, when and if we are charged with that task, by the School Board.

We did receive the analysis of the NEASC report prepared by Wendy Niskanen. However, it will not inform this process and will be used later.

8:20 Timeline Planning

We need to discuss further the impact of fast tracking this project versus slow tracking the project: planning versus relying on experts to detail our needs. We need to define renovation versus replacing or building new.

There was no public in attendance for comment.

8:25 Next meeting is at 6:30pm on 11/15/05 @ GMHS. A brief outline of the next meeting's agenda was presented by Ben.

8:30 Adjournment - Motion Made by Jean Tremblay seconded by Mike Waddell (?). No Discussion. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted.

Kathleen Kelley
bwm