

**Maynard Public Schools**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**Dr. Mark R. Masterson**  
**Office: (978) 897-2222 Fax: (978) 897-4610**  
**masterson@maynard.k12.ma.us**

**TO: SC**  
**FROM: Mark**  
**DATE: March 1, 2007**  
**RE: MHS Facilities issues**

The School Committee has made facilities issues a top priority as it looks to this May's Town Meeting and the fall Meeting. In terms of the HS our challenge is to meet the high NEASC standards expected for continuing Accreditation, i.e. develop plan(s) and demonstrate progress. Simultaneously we must collaborate w/MSBA. And the SC/Supt. must promote District facilities needs such that the community will understand and support hard choices. The following is a conceptual framework to meet these ends:

Recommendation: The SC should appoint a Building Committee, who would work with the Business Administrator, the Superintendent and MSBA to:

- Develop a thorough understanding of current facilities needs.
- Review the District Educational plan, the foundation to Fowler project.
- Collaborate with MSBA to determine the facilities solution.
- Oversee building design, construction documents, bidding and construction.
- Educate the community.

Plan A:

A1. We have made application to MSBA for consulting and funding assistance. SC members have met with Katherine Craven, Executive Director of MSBA. Consonant with MSBA's new processes the SC is advancing this May a 'feasibility' study warrant. Our intent is to have MSBA work with us perhaps as early as this April to agree as to the best way to move forward, i.e. that end-result they would agree to fund, either a new HS building or substantial renovations with additions. Such funding decisions will not be made until after July 1, 2007. That said, Plan A is work w/MSBA; develop a plan they will co-sponsor and fund. Given expedient MSBA notification to proceed, Plan A is the best, most preferred way forward.

A2. We will need, and should consider warranting this May, a land survey (boundaries, wetlands, contours, etc....) and a geotechnical investigation, e.g. soil sample, ledge, wet-land identification, etc. Moving forward such a warrant has the advantage of "placing the building issue before the community" and generating needed funds in preparation for actions we know are necessary.

Plan B:

Knowing that the current HS facility needs renovation to meet NEASC standards, we must formulate a 'short-term' plan to address problems identified by NEASC and our recently completed facility study.

B1 This May we will advance a second warrant, (in addition to the 'joint feasibility study warrant' Plan A, above) to replace the HS boiler, and a third warrant to remove an underground storage tank.

B2. We must plan and make progress towards resolving our HS facilities issues, or lose Accreditation. NEASC has identified two major facility issues directly affecting curriculum

delivery: inadequate library/media space and resources and inadequate science labs. Yet, since we may receive, as early as this summer, a MSBA funding commitment, we should first address those NEASC issues that are 'most portable' (to a new facility) e.g. computers, library resources, science equipment, etc. and at least initially invest least in non-transferable capital improvements, e.g. renovations in a building we expect to soon abandon..

For the Fall Town Meeting, October of 2007 we might advance capital warrants that address NEASC facilities issues, but do **not** invest "good money after bad" either fiscal or political capital, i.e. renovate a building. We could consider 'modular' science labs affixed to the building. (Or will spending \$500,000 on 'modular' science labs suggest to the community that the problem is solved?) Any 'capital' resources in modular science labs could relatively easily be moved into a new facility. There is a pronounced transience to modular classrooms, not characteristic of monies invested in facility renovations, e.g. a science lab or library/media center. Asking the community to invest in renovations to the current facility will detract from their willingness to follow the Facilities Advisory Council's recommendation to construct a new HS building. In summary Plan B must advance NEASC needs, but not invest significantly in a facility we believe should be replaced.

Health and safety issues, e.g. ventilation, locker room upgrades, etc. might be addressed; but how much and how soon could be modulated in conjunction w/NEASC. If MSBA comes into our HS this spring and suggests we may well "be in line" for funding, I believe NEASC would listen to a planning process that does not invest significant fiscal or political capital into a facility slated for demolition.

#### Plan C:

Suppose that MSBA says this summer MSD will receive no funding, or after X years we have received no 'hint' from MSBA that the District will in fact receive funding, then what?

C. Build a new facility without state assistance, bonding \$45M, a difficult option. Several districts have, during the State funding moratorium, done exactly this; and others will. Their hope and ours would be that, subsequent to a bond passing, the State will recognize relative needs and assist. The obvious risk is such a course of action comes w/no guarantees of eventual State assistance.

#### Plan D.

In the absence of State assistance in the near future, the District could begin a schedule of renovations of the current facility. Such 'maintenance renovations' are unlikely to qualify for State assistance. Over time this option would cost *more* than a new facility, would be accompanied w/significant challenges to the educational process, and, if planned as "repairs only" result in a less adequate building when 'completed'. This option is a prolonged extension of Plan B, and is the least preferable, most expensive plan.