



The Chairman opened the meeting at 4:00 PM

Present: Superintendent Steve Stone, Dennis Piendak, Barbara O'Connor, Phil Thibault, Linda Trouville, Renee Young, Rob Sheppard, Nicholas Botelho, Marybeth Veilleux, Andrew Graham, Rebecca Duda
Absent: Dave Martin, Sefanie Fields, Mike LaCava

Present from Liro-Hill: Paul Kalous, Peter Martini, Vivian Varbedian, Andy Vo, John Abbott

Present from Mount Vernon Group: Frank Tedesco, Al Cuevas, Bill Peters, Dennis Grudkowski, Vanessa Rogers.

Minutes

Mr. Thibault made a motion to approve the minutes of January 15 2025. Mr. Sheppard seconded the motion. The motion carried with all in favor.

Review Draft PSR Package of Conceptual Design

Mr. Kalous began the discussion of the two phases of the preferred schematic design report the PDP and the PSR. The Committee will be voting on this next week. This is a critical part of the process and they have had some cost estimating done as well. Mount Vernon Group will go through the design scheme and then discuss the pros and cons of each. Then they will take questions so that next Wednesday the Committee can make an informed decision. Superintendent Stone wanted to thank everyone for the work that has been put into this up to this point.

Mr. Cuevas began the PowerPoint presentation with the options chart and they would go through the slides.

Greenmont Avenue – Code Upgrade: This would be a code upgrade for the entire school. One hundred percent of the cost would be paid for by Dracut. It would be phased construction over a ten-year period to do the work. It does not meet education program. High operating cost for a small building. Limited enrollment capacity creates inequities in class sizes across the district. Accessibility upgrades reduces programmatic areas. Limited community use in this school and does not allow for consolidation.

Campbell School – Code Upgrade: This would be limited site work in this neighborhood school. The cost to upgrade would be one hundred percent paid by Dracut. It would be a phase construction of ten years. The existing layout limits programs. It would not meet the educational program because the accessibility upgrades reduces the program. It does not consolidate schools.

Campbell School Addition/Renovation: 580 students and 70+ Pre-K: Upgrade to a 21st century school, full accessibility upgrade. Parent and bus separation and improves site circulation. Exterior spaces for learning and recreation. Some of the pros and cons would be phased construction while fully occupied,

program adjacencies partially achieved. The existing layout limits program and layout. Community separation is not ideal. Does not consolidate schools the 580 Addition/Renovation project leaves shortcomings at the Greenmont School unaddressed. The addition renovation risks negative long term overall district student enrollments, affecting district finances.

Campbell School Addition/Renovation: 860 Students and 70+ Pre-K: This would upgrade to a 21st century school and full accessibility upgrade. Parent and bus separation and improved circulation. Will allow for exterior spaces for learning and recreation and consolidation of schools. Some of the negatives are phased construction while fully occupied, program adjacencies partially achieved, existing layout limits program and layout. The community separation in the school is not ideal. The addition renovation risks negative long term overall district student enrollments affecting district finances.

New Construction Campbell School 580 Students and 70+ Pre-K: Upgrades to a 21st century school, full accessibility upgrade. Parent and Bus separation and improves site circulation. Exterior spaces for learning and recreation, consolidates schools. Fully meets educational program and adjacencies. Distinct classroom and neighborhoods, clear separation of community and school functions. Least disruptive for student learning during construction.

New Construction Campbell School 860 Students and 70+ Pre-K: Upgrades to a 21st century school, full accessibility upgrade, parent and bus separation, improves site circulation. Exterior spaces for learning and recreation. Consolidates schools, more robust exterior learning and recreational opportunities, fully meets education program and adjacencies. This construction would be least disruptive for the students learning and shorter time frame versus the addition and renovation program. Simpler wayfinding and compact education footprint. The negative is site disruption during construction.

Mr. Graham noted that some of the classrooms at the Campbell School were not intended to be classrooms. The renovation does not change occupancy and the renovations can be very expensive. Superintendent Stone noted that there have been many, many discussions on the parking and cueing of vehicles on the site.

The new concept with the long driveway down to a parking area of an additional sixty cars was discussed and Mr. Piendak had some site work concerns on it. He stated that seems like a long ways off from the school. It was noted to be about 1/3 of a mile. Site work is not usually covered by MSBA. Mr. Kalous noted that if the site work exceed 10% the MSBA does not participate. Mr. Tedesco stated they think they have the space and they are trying to make it more economical.

The Committee and Design Team went over the Estimated Costs of the options explained. It was noted that the soft costs are not included in these estimates and are an added 32% for the renovation options and 30% for the new construction. The MSBA reimbursement was stated at 57%+ however with the ineligible costs it could be closer to 45-55%. The cost per square foot is coming in at \$840 per square foot. Mr. Tedesco noted that other schools they have recently bid the cost per square foot was \$832-\$999 so they are within range.

There was a short discussion on energy programs and geothermal. A question by Mr. Sheppard was about the tax impact on residents. Mr. Tedesco stated they do an analysis of the cost on the average tax bill.

Schedule

There will be a Community Forum slated for February 26, 2025 and Vivian Varbedian asked if it was going to be offered hybrid and she suggested it should be for the most participation.

The Committee will reconvene next Wednesday February 12 2025 for the final conceptual plan vote.

Public Comment

No one was present for public comment.

Adjournment

Mr. Thibault made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:25 p.m. Mr. Sheppard seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.